

These dedicated men and women leave behind family, friends, and communities. Their careers often take them through dangerous parts of the world, where the threat from crime, disease, war, and terrorism is very real.

All too frequently their sacrifices and achievements go unrecognized. On occasion, they make the ultimate sacrifice.

Because we just celebrated the Fourth of July, let me return for a moment to the founding generation.

Those first Americans who sacrificed for liberty established more than our Republic. They left us with a democratic legacy that reminds us everyday of our rights and our duties as equal citizens.

The descendents of those revolutionaries, when they designed and ornamented this magnificent Capitol, enshrined a powerful message. The paintings in the Capitol Rotunda, just steps from here, narrate the story of how America achieved its greatness.

They tell not of the force of arms or the achievements of a powerful few. Rather, taken as a whole, these eight paintings celebrate the evolution of American citizenship.

The turning point in this narrative is highlighted by Trumbull's iconic portrayal of the drafting of the Declaration of Independence.

But the last painting in the cycle is the most poignant and recalls the climactic movement in the development of our citizenship.

Washington, at his height of popularity, willingly yields his power and authority back to the people by resigning his commission.

With his sacrifice in that moment, the American people were truly free, and those who laid out this cycle of paintings did so to acclaim this birth of American citizenship.

They remind us that our citizenship is a pact between equals, that no American should ever rule arbitrarily over another.

It is this notion of citizenship that governs the relationship between the American people and our Federal employees.

As a commonwealth of citizens, we entrust our fellow Americans who work in the Federal Government to perform that noble task so yearned for by the 56 men who wrote and signed the Declaration.

They secure our unalienable rights by constituting a government deriving its "just powers from the consent of the governed."

Their hard work and their sacrifices protect our lives, preserve our liberty, and enable all Americans to pursue happiness.

I call on my colleagues to join me in honoring and recognizing the immeasurable sacrifice made by John Granville and all civilian Federal employees who gave their lives in service to our Nation.

Their names will forever be inscribed on the eternal Declaration that continually secures our freedom.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the majority be preserved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, in the last few years, I have traveled all over this country talking to people about health care. After listening to countless Americans—including in two town-hall meetings last week—I proposed in the past health care reforms that would have ensured health care coverage was more affordable, accessible, portable, and suitable for all American families.

Health reforms need to be consistent with our American values of freedom, choice, and limited government. The key to these reforms is to put our citizens in charge of their own health coverage. Rather than being stuck in a job because the job provides health care, or worse, losing health insurance if the economy causes you to lose your job, we need to change our system and allow Americans to obtain coverage options with a tax credit for policies not limited by State boundaries or government dictates.

Just this past week, I had the great good fortune to visit two of the finest health care institutions in this country. First, I spent time with hundreds of patients, doctors, nurses, and health care leaders at the world-renowned MD Anderson Cancer Center in Houston, TX. I heard from patients who had come to this center of excellence from 90 countries and States, including Arizona. Why do patients come to the United States of America from all over the world? It is because the highest quality health care is in the United States of America. And I repeat, the fundamentals of this discussion and debate sometimes go astray from the fact that the highest quality health care in the world is available in the United States of America. The key to it and our challenge is to make that health care available and affordable to all Americans. The path we are on will destroy the quality of that coverage and will, in fact, make health care the same as it is in other countries. The reason they leave there is to get high-quality health care in the United States of America. It is the best—our

system—because innovation and technology are allowed to flourish.

Later in the week, in my home State of Arizona, I visited one of the premier children's hospitals in the country. Phoenix Children's Hospital is a destination medical facility for children all around the Southwest and in the country. At Phoenix Children's Hospital, I also met with patients, physicians, nurses, medical executives, and average Arizonans. During this visit, not one health care provider in Phoenix told me they wanted more government control over health care. In fact, they told me the opposite. PCH has experience with Medicaid, and time after time I was told of the problems providers face every day with the government Medicaid Program. The program is a vital safety net for the low income, but we have to recognize the important lessons we have already learned about government running health care programs.

During these events, I was repeatedly told that we need reform. They also told me about the problems they face in the government-controlled Medicare and Medicaid Programs, both with massive unfunded liabilities. They want a stable system that keeps costs under control, gets everyone covered, pays fairly, encourages innovation, and maintains America's standing as providing the best health care in the world. But none of them told me we need more government control of health care or government-controlled health insurance.

I have listened to Americans. But I am worried they are not being heard here in Congress by those who control the agenda in the White House and the Senate. If President Obama and the Democratic leaders were listening, we would not have a bill before us that costs too much, taxes too much, covers too few, and puts government in control at every turn.

This country has fought for over 200 years for the fundamental values that I fear are being eroded by the other side's appetite for one-size-fits-all government control of one of our most cherished economic gems.

First, this administration takes over the banking industry. Then they take over the auto industry. Along the way, they tell us \$787 billion in more and bigger government, along with \$1.8 trillion of debt this year alone, is the answer to our ailing economy. Now they are telling the American people they were not aware of the economic situation and, guess what, they are going to want another stimulus package. I think that idea would be soundly rejected by the American people. And now they are telling the American people that we must rush to pass a new government health care plan that we cannot pay for, will increase taxes, and kill jobs. We are talking about one-sixth of the gross national product of America. And it is pretty obvious the other side wants to jam this through in the next 4 weeks. We should not do

that. They still have not come up with ways to pay for this grandiose takeover of the American health care system.

Americans are losing health care coverage every day. And it gets back to the issue of affordability, not quality. But the Democrats cannot produce legislation that responsibly makes coverage available to all Americans without trillions of dollars in new spending.

This weekend, after a 4-week delay, we finally received new provisions in their new government-run health care plans. Here is what we know about the legislation before us:

The Congressional Budget Office says the preliminary cost estimate for the new language they reviewed was nearly \$900 billion in new spending. The other side says this is a cost reduction from an earlier version of the bill. Do not be fooled by the smoke and mirrors. After an inexplicable 4-year phase-in that delays several provisions in the Democratic bill in an effort to hide costs through accounting techniques, the bill will actually spend \$1.5 trillion when it is fully implemented. And that is not counting the hundreds of billions of dollars in new Medicaid spending promised by that legislation.

CBO also tells us the HELP Committee bill still leaves over 30 million Americans without coverage. Mr. President, for all the spending being proposed, don't you think we should be covering more than 40 percent of the uninsured? When the final numbers come in, don't be surprised if the cost of this "rush" proposal is at or above \$2 trillion. What is worse, the sponsors cannot tell us how we will pay for such a massive price tag.

My colleagues and I plan to continue talking to the American public. I suggest the other side in the Senate talk to all Americans about what they need rather than making these decisions for them.

Again, Mr. President, we cannot risk running through a legislative proposal in the next 4 to 5 weeks and be sure that we are not making serious and fundamental mistakes. And the serious and fundamental mistake is the approach to this legislation, which is, the quality of health care in America can and must be preserved; it is the cost that needs to be brought under control. We can bring those costs under control by innovative techniques, by competition, by allowing Americans to go all across America to get the health insurance of their choice—the same way we have been able to reduce costs in other sectors of our economy, as technology has improved the quality of our lives.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I am glad I was here to listen to the thoughtful comments of the Senator from Arizona. His leadership on the HELP Committee in trying to help make certain we help Americans have access to health care they can afford and that we do that in a way that

leaves them with a government they can afford and with choices so they do not have government in between themselves and their doctors has been very important. I thank him for his leadership.

TAXPAYER STOCK OWNERSHIP

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, the Senator talked about spending and debt. During my week in Tennessee last week, if I heard about anything, it was about too much debt. People are genuinely worried about the amount of new debt and spending in Washington. But if I heard anything else last week, it was about too many Washington takeovers. Senator MCCAIN mentioned some of them. He mentioned banking. He talked about, perhaps, student loans. He mentioned the health care industry. And he mentioned the automobile industry, which is what I would like to talk about for a few minutes this morning.

Yesterday was good news for General Motors. The judge in the bankruptcy case apparently approved a plan that by the end of the week should free General Motors from bankruptcy, and we could have a new GM, for which I wish great success because General Motors has made great contributions to our State of Tennessee over the last 25 years. Its Saturn plant has helped to attract hundreds of suppliers and has produced a good car, although they never made any money for one reason or another. But they made a great contribution to our State. So the good news is General Motors is going to get out of bankruptcy. The bad news is that the U.S. Government still owns 61 percent of General Motors, as well as about 8 percent of Chrysler. And it was paid for with real dollars.

Mr. President, \$50 billion or so in taxpayer dollars went to buy 61 percent of General Motors. Well, I have a solution which I would like to discuss, offered by the Senator from Utah, Mr. BENNETT; the Senator from Arizona, Mr. KYL; the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, other Senators, and myself. Our legislation would direct the Department of the Treasury, within 1 year after General Motors comes out of bankruptcy, to distribute all of the government stock in General Motors and in Chrysler to the 120 million Americans who pay taxes on April 15—in other words, a stock dividend. We want to give the stock to the people who paid for it. The idea is pretty simple: I paid for it, I ought to own it. Not only would that stop the incestuous political meddling that seems to go on here in Washington with General Motors—Washington cannot seem to keep its hands off the car company—it would also create an investor fan base of 120 million Americans who might be interested in the success of General Motors or be a little more interested than they are today.

Think of the Green Bay Packers. The fans own the team, and the fans are

even a little bit more interested in who the quarterback might be than they might otherwise be. Well, if 120 million Americans owned a little bit of General Motors, the New GM, they might be a little more interested in the next Chevy and it might help General Motors succeed.

I can suggest one thing that will make sure the company does not succeed, and that is to keep the ownership of General Motors in Washington, DC, with meddling politics interfering with the executives and the workers who are designing and building and selling cars—or who, I might say, ought to be designing, building, and selling cars.

Madam President, about how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. GILLIBRAND). The Senator has 6 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Thank you, Madam President.

When I first suggested that what we ought to do is just give the stock to taxpayers, I think some of my colleagues thought I might be being facetious. But this is a very normal corporate event. It is called a stock distribution or a corporate spinoff. In 1969, Procter & Gamble did a spinoff with Clorox, its subsidiary. Procter & Gamble decided its Clorox subsidiary was not a part of the core business of Procter & Gamble anymore, so it simply gave shares of Clorox to people who owned the major company, Procter & Gamble. Time Warner did it with Time Warner Cable in March of 2009. PepsiCo did it with its restaurant business in 1997 by spinning off KFC, Pizza Hut, and Taco Bell.

If you stop and think about it, it is the simplest way to solve the problem. The President has said he does not want to micromanage General Motors and that he plans to sell it. But the President himself has already fired the president of General Motors, put in the board, and called the mayor of Detroit and said he believes the headquarters ought to be in Detroit instead of Warren, MI. Next, you have the chairman of the House Financial Services Committee calling up General Motors saying: Don't close a warehouse in my district. Senators from Tennessee and Michigan and other States are saying: Please put a plant in our states. We have at least 60 Congressional committees and subcommittees that could have the General Motors and Chrysler executives drive their congressionally approved hybrid cars to Washington to testify all day when they ought to be home trying to figure out how to make a car that would sell better than a Toyota or a Nissan or a Honda or some other company.

So let's get the stock out of Washington and into the hands of the taxpayers.

Madam President, I have twice presented a car czar award to try to put a spotlight on the political meddling in Washington, DC. Once I gave it to BARNEY FRANK, the chairman of the House