

their liability premiums. Today, most Texas doctors are paying lower liability premiums than they were almost 10 years ago.

All major physician liability carriers in Texas have cut their rates since the passage of the reforms and most of them by double digits.

Texas's reforms prove lawsuit reform can improve access to care, expand the number of doctors and types of care hospitals are able to offer, and help reduce medical costs. According to a conservative estimate by the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, if Congress adopted only a few of the proposed lawsuit reforms, the deficit would decrease by \$54 billion over 10 years.

Madam President, \$54 billion is how much it would save the government. To put this in perspective, this is twice as much as the Finance Committee plans to raise by taxing medical devices.

During the Finance Committee markup, CBO's Director, Dr. Elmen-dorf, added that he felt the savings to the private sector would be approximately equal to the \$54 billion saved by the government.

Madam President, \$54 billion to decrease the deficit, and the savings in the private sector is another \$54 billion. Under this conservative estimation, which is substantially less than what third-party estimates have shown, enacting medical liability reform would save at least \$100 billion between the government and the private sector over 10 years.

So why would the Democrats leave medical liability reform out? Well, they did put a Sense of the Senate in the Finance Committee bill. What are the savings from the Sense of the Senate to the private sector and the government? A big, fat zero.

I will tell you why the Democrats left out medical liability reform. It is because it would hurt a Democrat special interest group: they are known as trial lawyers.

Howard Dean, the former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, put it simply:

[T]he reason why tort reform is not in the bill is because the people who wrote it did not want to take on the trial lawyers in addition to everybody else they were taking on, and that is the plain and simple truth. Now, that's the truth.

I hope as the debate unfolds on the floor that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will change their mind about enacting serious medical liability reform. My medical care access protection amendment is not a battle of right versus left. It is a battle of right versus wrong.

This amendment is the right prescription for patients. We need to secure patient access to quality health care services when they need it the most. I urge my colleagues to adopt this commonsense amendment when it is brought to the floor.

One last comment. We are going to be adding what is called the doctor fix. We are going to be adding the doctor

fix unpaid for. It is \$250 billion over the next 10 years. I have been talking a lot about the Federal debt and what we are doing to our children. The other side wants to do what we all want to do around here; that is, make sure doctors' fees in Medicare are not cut because they are already paid at a very low rate, but they are doing that without honoring what they talked about known as "pay-go".

We heard a lot about that during the campaign: We need to pay for everything. We cannot keep adding to the deficit. They accused this side of the aisle as being fiscally irresponsible. Now they are going to add \$250 billion, take it off the table, and say: Well, it does not count. We are just going to add to the deficit \$250 billion; that we can fix the doctors' payments, but we are not going to pay for it.

I think this is pretty outrageous. That is why we are going to have amendments to attempt to fix what is happening to the doctors but to do it in a fiscally responsible way so we are not adding to our children's and our grandchildren's tax burden in the future.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, parliamentary inquiry: What is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is just under 3 minutes remaining in morning business.

Mr. McCAIN. And then?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the Senate will turn to the conference report on homeland security.

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining time in morning business be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Morning business is closed.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2892, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2892), making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, having met, have agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, and the Senate agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of October 13, 2009.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, I speak today in support of the conference report providing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2010. I especially wish to thank my ranking member, Senator GEORGE VOINOVICH, for his cooperation in producing the agreement that is now before the Senate. It has been 8 years—8 long years—since the attacks of 9/11. There are some people in this country who have become complacent about the threat of another attack. Don't count me as one of them. I am not one of those people.

There have been numerous terrorist attacks around the globe, including the London, Madrid, and Mumbai bombings. Just last month, a Denver man was indicted on a charge of conspiracy to use weapons of mass destruction. Where? In New York City. So we must continue to be vigilant. Nor can we be complacent about Mother Nature's power to wreak havoc with a major earthquake, flood, or hurricane, meaning that such disaster relief will require the funding provided in this bill.

This year, I have set five goals for the Homeland Security Department, five goals that I trust we all share. What are they? No. 1, to secure our borders and enforce our immigration laws. No. 2, to protect the American people—your people, my people, the American people—from terrorist threats. No. 3, to prepare for and respond to all disasters, both manmade and natural. No. 4, to support our State, local, tribal, and private sector partners with resources and information. No. 5, to give the Department of Homeland Security the management tools it needs to succeed.

I believe the conference report we are presenting today meets those goals.

Funding for the Department of Homeland Security totals \$42.8 billion. Do you know how much money that is? That is \$42.80 for every minute since Jesus Christ was born. That is a lot of money. It is an increase of \$2.65 billion