

other country adopts these Draconian measures, which they have all said they are not going to do.

While I stand ready to support clean energy technology, nuclear power, I could not possibly support a bill that is going to wreck our economy in a very precarious time and that will send jobs away from America at a time when we know we need to increase jobs in America. It will be sending American jobs overseas where it is easier to do business and where regulation is more stable.

Mr. President, what are we doing? What are we doing talking about more taxes and more regulations that will not impact the global environment? I hope that as these bills are vetted in committee, we will stop and say: Let's do something rational. Let's promote clean energy. Let's promote nuclear power. Let's don't hold back those who would be willing to make that investment and take that chance.

We should not pass cap and trade, which will tax and regulate our energy industry and it will not help the environment. That is a lose-lose proposition. I hope Congress and the majority in Congress will see that this is the wrong way and stop the cap-and-trade bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for 15 minutes.

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise to speak again about the issue that is the topic of the day for us in the Congress—*independent of the question of Afghanistan and Iraq, which is our No. 1 concern—and that is the question of health care.*

Today, the Speaker of the House and the Democratic leadership and membership of the House unveiled their plan. It is 2,000 pages long. They made the representation that, in some way, it wasn't going to increase the deficit. This is a bill that is going to cost between \$1 trillion and \$2 trillion over 10 years. The idea that it is not going to increase the deficit is so unbelievable just on its face that it doesn't even pass the laugh test. If you believe that, then maybe the Speaker of the House should sell you a bridge in Brooklyn—or even in Oakland, for that matter. That one doesn't work, by the way. The simple fact is, when you increase the size of the government by \$1 trillion or \$2 trillion, as this bill proposes to do by massively creating a massive new entitlement called a government-forced insurance plan, there is no way you are going to be able to cut Medicare enough, as it is proposed in this bill, or raise taxes enough, as it is proposed in this bill, to meet the cost of that pro-

gram. There is no way it is going to happen. So to claim that this won't add one dime to the deficit, as the President claimed he would not do when he spoke to the Congress, is just not believable.

Under this administration, we have seen a massive expansion in the debt of this Nation. They represent constantly that they just inherited this from the Bush administration. Yes, a fair amount of it did come over from the prior administration, but the budget they sent here, which has a trillion-dollar deficit every year for the next 10 years, isn't the Bush budget, it is their budget. The budget they sent over here, which raises the debt in this country from 40 percent of GDP to 80 percent, isn't the Bush budget, it is the Obama and Democratic budget.

The representation was that we would go out and spend almost \$1 trillion—\$800 billion—on a stimulus package, and that would create jobs. What it created was debt for our children.

The numbers are starting to come in now. It was represented in New Hampshire specifically, this administration said there would be 16,000 jobs created in New Hampshire by the stimulus package. Since the stimulus package has passed, we have lost 12,000 jobs in our State, and \$400 million has been spent in New Hampshire. The administration argues \$400 million created 3,000 jobs. They have to use some pretty creative accounting to get to those 3,000 jobs. Even if we give them the benefit of the doubt, that is over \$130,000 that it has cost Americans per job.

Did we have that money to spend? No. We sent the bill for that package to our children. We put it on their backs. In fact, almost 50 percent of that stimulus package is going to be spent after this recession is long over. It is going to be spent after the year 2011.

Chairman Bernanke, head of the Federal Reserve, said the recession was over. He said that about 2 weeks ago. Granted, the pain and suffering and the difficult economic times certainly are not over, and we do need to be concerned about that. But in 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, even in 2019, there will still be money being spent under that stimulus package, and all of it will have been borrowed, borrowed from our children, and they will have to pay it back.

Then we had the Cash for Clunkers Program which was allegedly going to be this great stimulus initiative. That has been looked at by an entirely independent group, *edmunds.com*, which is an automobile site on the Web. They tell you a car's value and give you an independent assessment of its qualities, pluses, and minuses. They took a look at that program. They said there were 690,000 vehicles sold during the Cash for Clunkers period. But they concluded—they are not conservative, they are not liberal, they are not moderate. They are just a professional group of people looking at what happens in the area of automobiles. They

concluded that only 125,000 of those cars would not have actually been purchased or sold by the dealer were the Cash for Clunkers Program not in place. In other words, the vast majority of cars would have been sold; they would have been bought under Edmunds' estimates.

So we spent about \$3 billion to buy 125,000 cars. That works out to \$24,000 per car. Who did that bill go to? That is going to our kids too.

Just in the last 2 weeks—well, almost every week around here we hear proposals to spend money and not pay for it. A week ago, somebody suggested from the administration that we should spend \$14.5 billion by sending \$250 to every Social Security recipient. Why did that come about? That came about because people were starting to realize senior citizens were getting a little upset with the fact that under the health care proposals that have been coming forward from the Finance Committee, from the Labor Committee, now from the House, that under these proposals Medicare was going to be significantly reduced. Seniors were going to lose their Medicare benefits so that a brandnew entitlement could be created which had nothing to do with seniors and be partially paid for with these reductions in Medicare payments.

In fact, if you are on Medicare Advantage, under the Finance Committee bill, you can forget it. That program is gone. There are a lot of seniors in this country who have Medicare Advantage. They like it. They think it is a good way to get health care. But the majority of the Medicare cuts come out of Medicare Advantage. Basically, they are wiping out that insurance benefit. Talk about losing your insurance. The President says nobody is going to lose their insurance today who has it; nobody is going to lose it.

Right on the face of it, when Medicare Advantage gets wiped out, every senior who has that is going to lose it. They are going to be moved over to the standard Medicare. And for what? To pay for a new program, a new entitlement program that has nothing to do with seniors and has nothing to do with making the Medicare system more solvent.

If we are going to reduce Medicare payments, and there are adjustments we need to make in the Medicare system, it should go toward making that system solvent. Why is that? Because the system is insolvent.

It is inconceivable that the White House would suggest that we should add \$14.5 billion of new spending to the Social Security Program, which is also going to be insolvent in a few years, because seniors were upset and they were realizing what was going to happen to them under Medicare. They wanted to sort of give them some walking-around money, the old Chicago way—walking-around money. If we give people money, maybe they will not be upset by things.

I think most seniors understand that, sure, they would love \$250, but how does that work? When we total that all up, that is \$14.5 billion of debt which is going to be given to their children and their grandchildren to pay when those grandchildren and children already are getting a massive debt, almost \$50 trillion of unfunded liability just in Social Security and Medicare alone.

We have to ask ourselves: Should we put another \$14.5 billion on their backs simply to make a political statement? Of course not. But that was proposed.

Then a week ago, it was proposed that we should do a \$250 billion fix to reimburse doctors fairly. Doctors are not reimbursed fairly under Medicare. They are not. That is an interesting fact because if we look at all these proposals that are being talked about from the other side of the aisle, they are saying: Oh, everybody in America will have Medicare. That is a great idea. The fact is, Medicare does not reimburse doctors for what the real costs are. So a lot of doctors don't want to do Medicare.

The reflection of that fact is, they proposed the \$250 billion doctor fix. They didn't want to pay for it. That is a $\frac{3}{4}$ trillion. That is a lot of money. All that debt goes on our children's backs. Our children have to pay for that spending. That was the proposal that came from the other side of the aisle.

Fortunately, some folks on the other side of the aisle—I congratulate them, 12 Members on the other side of the aisle in the Democratic Party and one Independent—said: Wait a minute. We are going to join the Republicans on this one. You can't do this. This is not right. You cannot spend \$250 billion on fixing the doctors fix, which should be fixed, and then take that bill and give it to our kids and grandkids. You have to be more responsible.

Over the years, every year we have fixed the doctors fix. We have fixed it now for 10 years, and we have paid for it. But this was not going to be paid for.

These ideas for spending money and not paying for them have become fairly common around here. But the biggest item is clearly going to be this health care bill which is a brandnew entitlement representing \$1 trillion to \$2 trillion of new spending.

What is that money going to be used for? It is going to be used basically to create a new government-inspired insurance program to compete with the private sector in the area of supplying health care. That would be OK except for the fact that as the Speaker of the House has said, that government plan is going to be used to save money. There is only one way that a government insurance plan can save money; it has to underprice the private sector. How does it do that? It uses the authority of the government to set price controls. It uses the authority of the government to control procedures that people are able to get. It uses the au-

thority of the government to limit innovation because innovation is costly.

Inevitably because of that—price controls, controlling access to doctors and hospitals and procedures people can get, and controlling innovation—it inevitably deteriorates the quality of health care generally for the public.

Equally important, of course, under the scheme that has been developed that we have seen so far—although we have not seen the specifics because they are being developed behind closed doors on the Senate side. We have seen the House bill, but we haven't had a chance to read the 2,000-page bill. But the scheme that came out of the Finance Committee, equally important, the practical effect would have been that employers would have been encouraged to basically drop employees from their private insurance plan and cause those employees to migrate over to the public plan—intentionally, of course—through a whole series of activities which would make it much more practical for an employer simply not to insure people but to pay a penalty instead and put employees on a public plan.

There will be a natural contraction in the private insurance community because there would be a price-controlled government plan and a natural movement of people over to the government plan because the penalty for employers not insuring people is significantly less—at least in the HELP Committee bill—than the cost of insurance and, therefore, employers will look at it and say: It is cheaper to pay the penalty than insure the folks. So I will just pay the penalty and people can go over and get a public plan. They lose their insurance.

Mr. President, 180 million, 190 million people in this country have private insurance. They are pretty happy with their doctor and their health care. They may not be happy with the insurance company—most of us are not—but they are pretty happy with their doctors and their health care. If they are forced on to a public plan, that is going to put this bureaucrat between you and your doctor. It will mean if you have a government plan, you may have to call Washington to see your doctor.

It also means, as I said earlier, in order for the public plan to work and be cost effective in the sense of saving money, as the Speaker of the House says that is how she has to save money, it has to have price controls, it has to have control over access, it has to have control over innovation, all of which inevitably leads to delay and a lesser quality health care system.

The goal on the other side of the aisle—we all understand this because they have been public about this; there is no subtlety about it—is to move to a single-payer system where there is one insurer in the country, and that is the government.

The same group that is bringing us the swine flu vaccination program is going to bring us all our health care.

Think about that. We don't have to go too far for an example of how the government has a hard time managing fairly large issues of health care when it comes to the practical application of taking care of people who need assistance. All we have to do is look at what is happening in the swine flu program to recognize that the government may not necessarily, in all instances, do such a great job of delivering health care.

For example, today you cannot get your swine flu vaccination in most places in this country because it is not available. Yet that is the system which a large percentage of members of the other party seem to desire, a single-payer system where government supplies it much along the lines of what we see in places such as Canada and England.

I don't think it is healthy for you. I don't think it is healthy for patients. It is certainly not healthy for our children because it means they are not only going to get a lesser health care system, they are going to get this huge bill, this massive bill which is going to come out of this \$1 trillion to \$2 trillion increase in the cost of government.

It is hard to understand—it has to be intuitive to people, and I know it is to most Americans—that if we increase the size of government by \$1 trillion to \$2 trillion, we inevitably end up passing on massive debt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used his 15 minutes.

Mr. GREGG. I ask for an additional 1 minute.

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

Mr. GREGG. As I said, it has to be intuitive, and I know it is intuitive for most Americans, that if we increase spending of the government by \$1 trillion to \$2 trillion—and our estimate is this program costs \$2.2 trillion in fact—and we cut Medicare to try to pay for that, or we try to raise taxes to pay for that, we are like a dog chasing a tail. It never will happen. The two ends just don't meet. They just don't meet. And what happens to the part that doesn't meet? That is called debt, and it goes to our children. It is not appropriate to do that after we have already put so much debt on their backs, especially in the last few months.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). The Senator from Iowa.

BIOFUELS AND THE EPA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, last week, President Obama delivered a speech at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology on the environment and on clean energy. He made an appeal for congressional support for biofuels, wind, and solar energy, clean coal technology. Naturally, as father of the wind energy tax credit of about 18 years ago, I share President Obama's support for homegrown renewable energy. When the President was in the