

As CMS pointed out, it is unlikely these Medicare payment cuts are going to be sustainable without driving hospitals and doctors and other health care providers out of business. When they start reacting to this and those Medicare cuts are no longer sustainable, then you have built in all this new spending, and there is no way to pay for it without raising taxes dramatically, which would be, I guess, something the other side—since they have already demonstrated a significant willingness to raise taxes in this bill or borrowing, neither of which is good for the future of the country or our economy.

Right now, our economy is trying to come out of a recession. Small businesses, which create the jobs in our economy, are faced with higher taxes under this bill. They have come forward and said—every conceivable business is saying this will drive up the cost of doing business, and it will raise the cost of health care in this country.

So you have all these small businesses saying we are not going to be able to create jobs. You have that specter out there. You also have the idea of the Medicare cuts, which are, according to the CMS actuary, unlikely to be sustainable, leading to borrowing and debt, which means we are already running a \$1 trillion deficit every year and piling more on the Federal debt and there will be a movement here to raise the debt limit by almost \$2 trillion. So we will pass this on to future generations, future young Americans, who are going to bear the cost of this massive expansion of the Federal Government.

There isn't anything in this that is good for the American public, which is why they are reacting the way they are, and why you are seeing these 61 percent of Americans coming out in the polls against it.

I say to my friend from Wyoming, his thoughts with regard to this issue, these Medicare cuts being sustainable, how it is going to impact the delivery of health care around this country, and what it will do to future generations in terms of the additional debt and borrowing.

Mr. BARRASSO. As my friend knows, small communities—

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I am sorry to interrupt my friend. I ask unanimous consent that he have 1 minute to finish, after which the floor would go to the majority.

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

Mr. BARRASSO. To follow up, the small communities of this Nation have great concerns about these cuts in Medicare because the small community hospitals that stay open know they have to live within their means. When Medicare cuts total over almost \$½ trillion, it is the small communities that have just one hospital in a frontier medicine mode taking care of people who may live 50, 100, or 150 miles away, those hospitals' very survivability is at stake.

That is why we cannot pass this bill, which will hurt seniors, raise taxes on the American people, cost jobs, and cause people who have insurance to have their premiums raised. For all these reasons, this bill is the wrong prescription for America.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, first of all, I ask unanimous consent that the amount of time by which the other side went over the allotted time be added to our block of time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICING

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to speak about something a colleague of mine spoke about last night, which I think he believes separates us when, in fact, it doesn't.

Before I do that, I wish to talk for a moment about the amendment of mine now pending on the floor of the Senate, dealing with the issue of prescription drug pricing.

I offered this amendment, along with my colleague, Senator SNOWE, with the support of a broad bipartisan group of Members of the Senate—Republicans and Democrats—at a time when there has been so few bipartisan amendments. The amendment I have offered is, in fact, bipartisan and had bipartisan speeches in favor of it in the last several days. That is unusual, but I think it is also refreshing.

The amendment is very simple. It has been around for a long time. It has been hard to get passed because the pharmaceutical industry is a very strong, assertive industry. It is a good industry, but I have strong disagreements with their pricing policies. This amendment simply says the American people ought to have the freedom to access FDA-approved drugs wherever they are sold—as long as they are FDA approved—and offered at a fraction of the price they are sold at in the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to show on the floor, once again, two bottles of pills.

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

Mr. DORGAN. This bottle contained Lipitor, perhaps the most popular cholesterol-lowering drug in the world. This was made by an American company in an Irish plant—made in Ireland and shipped around the world. This bottle, as you can see, is identical to this one. One has a red label and one has a blue label.

The only difference in a circumstance, where you have the same pill, put in the same bottle, made by the same company, is the price. Americans pay \$4.78 per tablet and, in this case, folks in another country pay \$2.05. Why the difference? Again, it is

not just one country. This bottle is shipped to virtually every other country, including Great Britain, France, Germany, Spain, Canada, and it is sold at a much lower price.

The question is, Should the American people be required to pay the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs and not have the freedom to access those drugs in the global marketplace?

Some say: Well, if you did that—if you allow the American people to access that drug from Canada or Germany at a fraction of the price, we would get counterfeit drugs.

It is interesting that in our amendment we actually have more safety provisions than exist in our domestic drug supply. There does not now exist a tracing capability, pedigree, or batch lots. That would be a part of our amendment. That doesn't exist for America's drug supply today. We will actually improve the safety of the drug supply with this amendment.

I didn't offer this amendment to cause trouble for people. I know this is causing great angst in the Senate. We have been tied up several days now on this issue. I know the pharmaceutical industry has a great deal of clout. This issue revolves around \$100 billion, \$19 billion of which will be saved by the Federal Government in the next 10 years and nearly \$80 billion saved by the American consumers because they can access FDA prescription drugs at a fraction of the price.

So I understand why some are fighting hard to prevent this. But this is important public policy. The price of prescription drugs has gone up 9 percent this year alone. Every single year, the price of prescription drugs goes up. Every year since 2002, drug price increases have risen above the rate of inflation. We can't, in my judgment, pass health care reform through the Congress and say: Yes, we did that, but we did nothing about the relentless increases in the price of prescription drugs. We will solve that not by imposing price controls but by giving the American people freedom. They are told it is a global economy. Well, it is a global economy for everything except the American people trying to access prescription drugs at a fraction of the price in most other countries.

Again, I didn't offer this amendment to try to cause trouble; I offered this amendment to try to solve a problem. This Congress should not, in my judgment, move ahead with health care reform and decide it ought to leave the question of the American people paying the highest prices for prescription drugs—leave that alone and let that continue to be the case for the next 10 years or the next 20 years. I will speak more about it later.

#### TRADE WITH CUBA

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I came to the floor to speak about a speech a colleague, for whom I have great affection, gave yesterday on the floor of the

Senate. He was concerned about a provision in the appropriations bill that is now being considered, a provision dealing with the sale of agricultural commodities to Cuba.

My colleague said the provision would undo current law, where the Castro regime in Cuba would have to pay in advance for goods being sold to them because of their terrible credit history.

That is not an accurate statement. I expect there is just a misunderstanding. I would be very happy if my colleague would wish to have a colloquy on the floor to set out the law and the provision in the bill so all of us understand the same thing.

No. 1, I helped write the law that finally opened just a small crevasse—the ability of our farmers in America to sell their agricultural commodities into the Cuban marketplace. Why did I do that? Because we have an embargo on Cuba that, in my opinion, has failed for 40 or 50 years. At the time that embargo included restricting the sale of food to the Cuban people.

I do not think we ought to ever embargo food shipments anywhere in the world. I think it is immoral. I do not think we ever ought to use food as a weapon. Yet that is exactly what has been done.

Our farmers could not sell agricultural commodities into Cuba. Canadian farmers could. French farmers could. German farmers could. American farmers could not.

I changed the law, along with a Republican colleague, with a Dorgan-Ashcroft amendment. We changed the law. We opened it just a crack so American farmers could sell their commodities into the Cuban marketplace. But it had to be for cash. The Cubans had to pay cash in advance. I support that. I helped write the law.

In fact, what I would like to do is put up a copy of the current law. The current law indicates “cash in advance.” We have sold about \$3 billion of agricultural commodities into the Cuban marketplace since the law was passed, and they have paid cash in advance.

What happened was, President Bush decided just prior to an election that he wanted to send a signal that he was really tightening things with Cuba. He decided to change the definition—not by law but by administrative fiat—and he said “cash in advance” will mean the Cubans have to pay for the commodity even before it is shipped from a port in the United States. For four years up to then, the government allowed U.S. farmers to ship the goods from the port and then have the Cubans pay cash when the commodity arrives in Cuba. The President made that change as an attempt to shut down the sale of agricultural commodities to Cuba.

Here is what the Calgary Herald, a Canadian newspaper, said: “Cuba to Buy \$70 Million of Canadian Wheat.” Then in the body of the article it says:

Cuban food purchases from Canada will increase 40 percent this year due to difficulties

buying from the United States which is requiring payment before shipment of the food sales.

As I said, President Bush tightened the rules to say that “cash in advance,” in a law I wrote, shall be interpreted as meaning you must pay even before the shipment. I have never even considered the phrase could be interpreted like that, but that is the way the law is now being administered.

In the pending appropriations bill, there is an amendment I included. It is not, in my judgment, something we ought to debate. It is just there. We ought to understand it. It very simply says this.

During fiscal year 2010, for purposes of . . . the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 . . . the term “payment of cash in advance” shall be interpreted as payment before the transfer of title to, and the control of, the exported items to the Cuban purchaser.

It takes the definition of “payment of cash in advance” back to how it was originally interpreted after I got my bill passed and we started selling into the Cuban marketplace. It restores it to what it was.

My colleague yesterday said this would undo the current law where the Castro regime would have to pay in advance. Obviously, that is not the case. It is just not the case. “Payment of cash in advance shall be interpreted” to mean “payment before the transfer of title to, and control of, the exported items . . .” There is nothing here suggesting credit be offered to the Cuban regime. This only resolves an issue that was created when President Bush wanted to shut off agricultural commodity shipments to the country of Cuba. As I indicated, the result of the Bush administration’s interpretation is what the Calgary Herald wrote about: American farmers, watch the Canadians grab your market.

Why on Earth should we withhold food shipments anywhere? It makes no sense to me. Why should we say to our farmers who produce foods—and we need to export that food—that the Canadians can have an advantage, the Europeans can have an advantage, they can service that market but we cannot, even though we require cash in advance. Lets make it even harder by requiring payment before shipping even. That makes no sense to me. That is why I wanted to correct it. I wanted to correct it to get it back to what the law reads.

My colleague who spoke on this issue yesterday is a good Senator and somebody I like a lot, but he indicates that this amendment of mine undoes current law where the Castro regime would have to pay in advance. That is just not the case. That is not the case.

Maybe the best way for us to resolve this is, let’s do a colloquy on the floor to put in the RECORD the exact language, because the shipment of agricultural commodities to Cuba in the future will continue to require cash payments in advance. That is just a fact.

Let me say also, my colleagues—I use the term plural—who feel very strongly about this issue, the Cuba issue, we have common cause. I have no truck for the Cuban Government. I want the Cuban people to be free. I have no sympathy for the Cuban Government. But it is interesting to me that our engagement with Communist China and Communist Vietnam, for example, is to say that constructive engagement through trade and travel is the best way to address those issues. We believe that. Except we say in Cuba that we do not believe it. We restrict the right of the American people to travel to Cuba, which is slapping around the rights of the American people in order to poke our finger in the eye of Fidel Castro, I guess. And we do other things that make no sense.

My colleagues who have raised these issues actually won on one issue that kind of bothers me. I also put an amendment in this legislation that I understand now has been emasculated. Let me describe what that was.

Most people do not know this, but we have airplanes flying over Cuba, at least in international waters, broadcasting television signals to Cuba. I was able to get that shut down in an amendment in the appropriations process because we are broadcasting television signals to Cuba to tell the Cuban people how great freedom is—they can hear that on a Miami station 90 miles away—but we are broadcasting television signals being broadcast by an airplane and the signals are signals the Cuban people cannot see. Isn’t that interesting? It is called TV Marti. Here is a picture of what TV Marti broadcasts. That is the television screen for TV Marti. The Cubans block it easily, and the Cuban people do not see it and cannot see it.

We started out broadcasting that with aerostat balloons. They called it Fat Albert. This is the second one. The first one got loose. Fat Albert got loose. It was tethered on a big, long tether, hanging way up in the air, to broadcast television signals to the Cuban people that the Cubans were blocking. So we are spending a lot of money broadcasting television signals that nobody can see. In the first case, we had aerostat balloons, huge balloons, tethered way up in the air, spending millions of dollars a year. One got loose and flew over the Everglades, and they had a devil of a time trying to capture Fat Albert. So they got a second Fat Albert and kept broadcasting signals no one could see. But that wasn’t good enough. In fact, they decided: You know what, we are going to get ourselves a big fat airplane and we will fly that airplane around and broadcast signals to Cuba from an airplane. And those signals, too, by the way, are routinely blocked and no one can see them. In my judgment we should not waste that kind of money.

John Nichols, professor of communications and international affairs at Penn State University had this to say.

He is one of the experts on communications policy.

TV Marti's quest to overcome the laws of physics has been a flop. Aero Marti, the airborne platform for TV Marti, has no audience currently in Cuba, and it is a complete and total waste of \$6 million a year in taxpayer dollars.

The \$6 million is just for the airplane. They spend much more than that on TV Marti.

It is a total and complete waste of \$6 million a year in taxpayer dollars. The audience of TV Marti, particularly the Aero Marti platform, is probably zero.

We have been doing this for 10 years and more. Since I raised this issue, we have spent  $\frac{3}{4}$  billion broadcasting television signals into a country that cannot see them.

Let me continue:

TV Marti's response to this succession of failures over a two-decade period has been to resort to ever more expensive technological gimmicks, all richly funded by Congress, and none of those gimmicks, such as the airplane, have worked or probably can work without the compliance of the Cuban Government. It is just the law of physics.

In short, TV Marti is a highly wasteful and ineffective operation.

I put in an amendment that cut \$15 million out of this program. I know it is radical to say you should not broadcast to people who cannot see them. I suspect this must be considered some sort of jobs program. That would be the only excuse for continuing funding.

I had an amendment that shut down TV Marti. If ever—ever, ever—there were an opportunity to cut government waste, this is it. This is just a program that accomplishes nothing and has no intrinsic value at all. But in the middle of a very significant economic downturn, when deficits have spiked up, up, way up, I apparently cannot even get this done. I got it done in the Senate, but it did not get through the conference. I guess for the next year or so—Fat Albert is retired—the airplane will still fly. And here is a television set in Cuba sees of TV Marti snow, static. We will continue to spend \$15 million or so so the Cubans can look at static on their television sets. It is not much of a bargain for the American taxpayer, I would say.

I only point this out because I lost on this issue. Those who feel strongly that we ought to continue to do this won. I hope that one day, perhaps we could agree that when we spend money, let's spend it on things that work, spend it on things that are effective, spend it on things that advance our interest and our values. This certainly does not.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise this morning to speak about health care and our children and the health care reform, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, as relates to our children.

The chart on my left makes a couple of fundamental points.

For children, health care reform must follow one simple principle, and I also say it is only four words: No child worse off. When I say "no child," of course I am speaking of children who do not often have a voice. Obviously, if they are children from a family that is very wealthy, I think they will be just fine no matter what happens here. But children who are poor and children who experience and have to live with special needs are the ones I am talking about when I say "no child worse off."

I filed many weeks ago—actually, months ago now—a joint resolution, No. 170. I was joined in that resolution by Senator DODD, Senator ROCKEFELLER, Senator BROWN, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and Senator SANDERS. We filed that resolution just to make this point with a couple more words than "no child worse off," but that was the fundamental point to guide us through this process because sometimes in a debate on something that is this significant, and parts of it are complicated to be enacted into law—it is a challenge to pass health care reform. I think we will. I think we must. But we do need guiding principles, and I believe one of these should be "no child worse off" for special needs children.

A lot of the child advocates across America have told us, for many years, something so simple but something very meaningful in terms of providing further guidance for this debate. Children are not small adults. That does not sound so profound, but it really matters when it comes to health care. We can't just say: If you have a health care plan for adults, it will work for kids, do not worry about it. Unfortunately, that is not the case.

If we do not do the right thing, we could lose our way on that basic principle. We have to get it right, and we have to give poor and special needs children a voice in this debate. I do not think there is any question that Senators on this side of the aisle are guided by that basic principle.

I want to next turn to the bill, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and walk through some of the provisions. There are many good provisions in the bill for children, but I want to walk through a couple.

How does it help children? That is a fundamental question. You cannot escape the basic implications of that. First, the bill eliminates preexisting condition exclusions. That is in the first couple pages of the bill. Obviously, it has an enormously positive impact for adults. We have heard story after story of literally millions of Americans denied coverage year after year because of the problem of preexisting conditions. It has special meaning when it comes to children.

No. 2, the bill ensures that benefits packages include oral and vision care. We know what that means for children, and in particular we are thinking about the horrific, tragic, and prevent-

able death recently of Deamonte Driver of Maryland, a young boy who lost his life because his family did not have the coverage for an infected tooth—an infected tooth, not something that is complicated to deal with. His family couldn't afford the care. A child in America died from an infected tooth that would have cost \$80 to treat.

So when we talk about insuring benefit packages that include oral and vision care, that doesn't say it too well until you connect it to the life and the death—the tragic death—of a young child not too far from Washington, DC.

Thirdly, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act will mandate prevention and screenings for children. This is so important. We know our poorest children, who have the benefit of being covered by Medicaid, get these kinds of services so we can prevent a child from getting sicker or prevent a disease or a condition or a problem from becoming that much worse for that child.

As I said before, children are not small adults, so we have to make sure we have strategies and procedures in place that deal with the special needs and the special challenges that children face in our health care system.

Finally, the act has increasing access to immunizations. I don't think I have to explain to any American how important immunizations are. The Centers for Disease Control will provide grants to improve immunizations for children, adolescents, and adults.

Let me move to the third chart. The third chart outlines some other provisions for children. Here are three more ways the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act helps children, among many others. It creates pediatric medical homes. People may say: What is a medical home? What does that mean? Well, I need simplicity just like anyone does. This is my best summary of a medical home.

A medical home obviously isn't a place. It is treating people in the way they ought to be treated in our health care system. The ideal—and I think this bill gets us very close to meeting this goal—is that every American should have a primary care physician and then be surrounded by the expertise of our health care system. Children especially need that kind of help. So we want to make sure every child not only has a primary care physician—in this case a pediatrician—but also has access to all of the expertise that pediatricians and our system can give them access to.

Next, the act strengthens the pediatric workforce. We can't just say we want children to have access to pediatric care. We have to make sure we have the workforce in America to provide that kind of care.

Thirdly, the act expands drug discounts to children's hospitals. Before this act, before the act that we are debating, children's hospitals did not have access to a program that provides discounts on the drugs they need for