

around talking about that this is a nationalization of health care, it is a socialization of health care, it is going to be government bureaucrats. Well, if that is the case, why is the private insurance industry not only cooperating but pledging to participate in cost reductions? They must feel their security and safety financially and economically are not being jeopardized.

So we are going to pay for this. We are also going to expand coverage in a way where not only you can get it, but you can keep the coverage. The same thing goes with respect to keeping your doctor.

One of the guiding principles the President announced initially was: If you like your health care, you can keep it. We have stayed true to that principle in terms of the construct that has emerged from the HELP Committee.

We have also tried to provide assistance to those people who need health insurance that is affordable. They will have the choice of a health plan that meets their needs and their budget. Again, many of the proposals my colleagues on the other side have made throughout the years, including tax credits are not sufficient to pay the premiums, and as such are ineffectual. We are going to make sure you not only have insurance but that you can afford that insurance.

So we have listened to a whole range of proposals. We have listened to those who are proponents of the single-payer system. We have listened to those who stress a strong community option. I think we have clearly staked our reform on a more competitive market that will have a public option to spur competition but will not in any way displace the primacy of private health care insurance.

We are moving forward with this legislation. We have created a system where citizens can come and select the choice of private insurance or a community option, a publicly-organized option. We have also insisted upon insurance reform so that preexisting conditions, limits on policy payments—all of those things would be a thing of the past.

We believe this legislation will provide greater stability for Americans, not only financially but for peace of mind, the notion that when I go to the doctor, I won't have to worry, will the insurance company accept this claim; when I go to the doctor and I make the claim, will I then be told that what happened to me 20 years ago was a pre-existing condition and my visit will not be covered; the peace of mind that if I have employer-based health care and I lose it, then I will be able to access a plan for me and my family. I think these are important aspects of this legislation, as important as some of the financial aspects.

We also want to make sure we increase the efficiency, the efficacy of the health care system. We have adopted quality measures. We have learned

from experience that we can make changes—some of them are very simple—that will increase the efficiency and the effectiveness of health care. One simple approach is a checklist of safety measures in ICU that has been adopted in my State of Rhode Island. Studies have found that the checklist cuts infection rates 66 percent within 3 months and within 18 months of implementation saved about \$75 million and 1,500 lives. Those types of innovations, those types of reforms are designed now to be dispersed throughout the system.

We also have to prevent readmission to hospitals, and we have adopted legislation in the bill that will help do that by clearly planning for the discharge of a patient. We are building up the workforce which is necessary. We have emphasized significantly the issue of wellness and prevention. Our bill will provide coverage for all recommended preventive services, remove barriers to access, such as copayment and deductibles for preventive services, and encourage employers to offer wellness programs.

As has been said before, we want to transform the system not only organizationally and financially, but we want to transform it from a system that treats sickness to one that promotes wellness. This legislation will go a long way to do that. And in doing that, it will affect the cost for all of us.

I think we also have to recognize that everyone has to be a part of this effort. If we were to require insurers to take everyone but not require everyone to purchase insurance, we would have the classic problem where the healthy would not buy insurance, the sickest who need insurance would buy it, and the system wouldn't work. It would be too costly for those who need coverage and those who don't have coverage would get sick, and drive the costs up higher and higher. So our legislation requires the responsibility of every American to participate. We will help those who are of modest income to meet this obligation.

We also are still working through many significant issues. I think the time we now have will be used wisely. There are many different aspects of this legislation that we recognize can be improved, and we hope they will be by the Finance Committee deliberations and by our floor deliberations.

My colleagues are proposing ideas. For example, Senator ROCKEFELLER has suggested that we use the procedure for the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission—these are experts on health care—to provide not simply recommendations but binding policies subject to a vote by Congress on the types of treatments that would be offered, the medical issues that have to be addressed. I think this would give us an interesting way to deal with the issue of effectiveness of treatment as well as cost of treatment, and I think this is something we must consider as we go forward, again, dealing with this issue of cost which is so central.

I raised this issue with Chairman Bernanke, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve. He, in his rather professorial way, certainly recognized the need for reform, but he also stressed that reform from an economic standpoint has to have cost containment, cost controls, and I think this idea Senator ROCKEFELLER has proposed is something that has to be seriously looked at.

We have reached a point now that we need reform. We can't afford to wait. This is the second time in my relatively brief career in the Congress that we have faced the issue of national health care reform. In 1993 and 1994, we faltered. It has gotten worse since then, not better, and it will get much worse if we don't succeed this time.

So I would encourage all of my colleagues to work together. What I sense is that Americans want, need, and deserve access to comprehensive, affordable, quality, efficient health care. That is what my constituents are asking for.

We have a plan for overall reform as well as to bring down spending. The current path is unsustainable. Those who advocate a less costly, better health insurance system have an obligation to offer something more than a tax credit proposal here or there or give all of the responsibility to the private sector. We need a real plan. A plan that will give all Americans the security and stability that they need in their health insurance plan. We cannot afford another missed opportunity. I urge all of my colleagues to come together on this most vital of issues and pass health care reform this year.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAUFMAN). The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. BOND pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 224 are located in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to speak today because I have tremendous concerns about the potential effects of the Waxman-Markey climate change bill, concerns about the destruction of jobs and concerns about the cost to our economy.

The Waxman-Markey bill may create some green jobs. If it does, great. We need green jobs in my State. We need green jobs all across the country. In

Wyoming, we are developing our wind resources, so we need the green jobs, and Wyoming has world class winds. But to me, this bill also costs jobs. And Americans want all jobs, not just some jobs. People don't want to lose the jobs they have with a promise that they may get a green job in exchange someday down the line. Americans want all the jobs. They want to keep the ones they have, and they want to create more jobs, more opportunities. To me, the Waxman-Markey bill fails to do that.

The administration says that the Waxman-Markey bill will create millions—millions—of new jobs. This administration also promised that after Congress passed the so-called “economic stimulus package” they would create or save 3½ million jobs. Since the bill's passage and being signed into law, unemployment has reached 9.5 percent in this Nation. Last month, almost half a million people lost their jobs.

The administration's economic experts said that unemployment would not exceed 8 percent if the stimulus package passed. It passed, and was signed into law, but they were wrong. And not just by a little.

In an interview with George Stephanopoulos, Vice President BIDEN acknowledged that administration officials were too optimistic when they predicted that unemployment rates would peak at 8 percent. The Vice President said that “the administration and I misread the economy.”

Well, is it possible, then, that the administration is misreading the economic predictions of millions of new jobs being created in this bill? The administration failed to make the grade on the \$787 billion stimulus package, and I believe the administration is failing again by supporting this misguided climate change bill.

It is a fact that the climate change legislation will cost jobs in the American economy. That is why there is language in the bill to retrain workers who lose their jobs. Why will this legislation cost jobs? The Waxman-Markey climate change bill is designed to make fossil fuel more expensive. Advocates say we must make fossil fuel more expensive to change the behavior of businesses and of consumers. That means making everything that is powered by fossil fuel more expensive. Fossil fuel powers your car, your home, your office; it powers the airplanes we fly in, the trains we ride in, trucks; things that we use for our own transportation but also things where we ship goods from farms and small businesses to the marketplace all across this country and even abroad.

All these things will be made more expensive because of the climate change bill that passed the House. When you increase the cost of bringing goods and services to the marketplace, especially in a recession, it becomes a recipe for economic disaster. It leads to lost jobs and lost economic opportuni-

ties. We can't afford in this country to lose more jobs.

By deciding to pass Waxman-Markey, the majority will increase the cost of doing business. The legislation will increase the cost for every small business. The legislation will force them to pay more for everything that uses energy. Those costs will put businesses in debt or even out of business. Jobs will be lost and unemployment will continue to climb.

The administration talks about creating green jobs. Well, we certainly want those jobs, but we also want the red-white-and-blue jobs that have powered America for centuries. There was a Washington Post article on July 21 entitled “U.S. Green Jobs Seen Taking Years of Planning.” Let me emphasize the word “years.” The article mentions upfront that:

Alternative energy jobs can provide vocations across many sectors of the economy, but policy to spark them can take years to develop.

Not now, not 6 months from now, not a year from now, but years into the future. Promises of immediate green jobs being created across the country because of this Waxman-Markey bill are another misreading by this administration. The economic stimulus package was simply the first thing the President misread. Those jobs never materialized. The green jobs promised in Waxman-Markey may also take years to develop. However, the job losses that the bill creates will occur immediately.

In an Investors Business Daily editorial on July 17 entitled “Following California Off a Green Cliff,” the editor states that:

America remains the richest country on Earth, but it might profit from adopting a bit of the attitude displayed by much poorer but up-and-coming economic rivals such as China and India. Those nations don't take prosperity for granted. That is why they aren't such good sports on global warming. They prefer to get rich and then go green.

The author goes on to say:

The U.S. isn't so poor that it can't afford strong environmental policies. But it can't afford to take its prosperity for granted either.

Let me repeat a couple of lines from those quotes: First, that America remains the richest country on Earth. And that last line: But it can't afford—that is we, the United States—to take our prosperity for granted. We here in Congress—the Members of this Congress—cannot afford to take the prosperity of this Nation for granted. If we pass Waxman-Markey, or a bill similar to it, that prosperity will erode further. We should create jobs, and we should create more wealth in this country. We need to keep business costs low so businesses can expand and create wealth for our Nation. We can do that by making America's energy as clean as we can, as fast as we can, without raising energy prices for the businesses and the families of America.

Our end goal must be to do everything we can to keep the jobs we have

now and also to find ways to add new green jobs. Americans want all of these jobs and more. We need them all.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I want to make a few comments on the Defense bill that passed late last night. Senator LEVIN and Senator MCCAIN did a very fine job in working through all the difficulties we faced and tried to put together a bill that would support our troops. Indeed, I was on a video conference this at noon with a group of Alabama National Guardsmen and their families, an MP company from Prattville, AL, that is undertaking its third deployment. The company was last deployed to Guantanamo and now they will be going to Iraq. We owe a great deal to these people who put their lives on the line for us. They leave their families and loved ones and go into harm's way to execute the policies that we have set. As a result, we must never forget what we owe them. I hope we never do.

I think the bill we passed has some good things in it. Some are troubling to me. I did not speak last night, in the late evening, about section 1031 of the National Defense Authorization Act entitled “Military Commissions and al-Qaida.” It was an important little amendment and I want to share a few thoughts about it.

What we discovered was in the Defense authorization bill, al-Qaida was removed from the unlawful enemy combatant definition. My amendment put that back into the bill. If you are a member of al-Qaida, you have earned the designation of an unlawful enemy combatant, or belligerent. We are now using the words unlawful enemy belligerent. Those individuals are people who operate outside the rules of warfare. They do not wear uniforms. They deliberately and systematically target women and children and innocents. They do not comply with the rule of law, the Geneva Conventions, and they, therefore, are not given the normal and full protections of the Geneva Conventions.

A person who is at war with the United States, as al-Qaida has repeatedly announced that it is, who does their military activities without complying with the Geneva Conventions, deserves to be attacked. They deserve to be killed or captured by the U.S. military. If captured, they deserve either to be prosecuted or held until the hostilities are over. That is what the