

Americans had no security against what he called “the economic effects of sickness.”

Truman knew in 1945 that “the time has arrived for action to help them attain that opportunity and that protection.”

Senator KENNEDY—the man who, more than any other, has dedicated his life to our fight for fair health care—echoed Truman’s call. He said:

One of the most shameful things about modern America is that in our unbelievably rich land, the quality of health care available to many of our people is unbelievably poor, and the cost is unbelievably high.

Senator KENNEDY did not give this speech last month, though it would have been very timely if he had. He did not give it last year, though it would have been equally relevant and true. He did not even give it last decade, or the decade before that.

It was in 1978 when Senator KENNEDY decried our shameful system. Yet his words and his cause are as urgent today as ever. In fact, since then our need for reform has gotten significantly worse.

Today we are closer than ever to getting it done. But I know Senator KENNEDY agrees that it should not have taken more than 30 years for Truman’s call to compel his echo, that it should not have taken another 30 years for us to come as far as we have today. And I know we cannot afford to wait another 30 years—or even 1 more year—to act.

But for some, more than 60 years of work to stabilize health care for those who have it and secure it for those who don’t is “rushing it.”

Someone who was born when Harry Truman first called for reform in 1945, but lived his or her entire life without the ability to afford health care as it got more and more expensive every year, would today—finally—be just months away from becoming eligible for Medicare. I don’t think that’s “rushing it.”

For too many, the interests of the insurance rackets still outweigh the interests of the American people.

The difference is that those of us who know we cannot wait any longer know that the American people must come first.

Those who oppose the reform we so desperately need like to talk about it in the abstract.

They use code words, scare tactics and sound bites. They rely on misinformation—like the myth that your government wants to control your health—and misrepresent the real issues.

But reforming health care is not about the abstract, because health care isn’t just theoretical. Neither is it about rhetoric or politics. It is about people.

Unlike just about any issue we debate and discuss in this body, health care affects every single living, breathing American citizen.

So I find it curious that in the weeks and months we have talked about

health care this year, I haven’t heard our opponents say a single word about real families with real problems—families with real diseases, real medical bills and real fears.

This is what health care is about: It is about people like Lisa, in Gardnerville, NV. Lisa lost her job and with it her health care. Now she can’t afford to take her sick daughter to the doctor to find out why she gets seizures.

It is about people like Braden in Sparks, NV. Braden owes a hospital \$12,000 for a trip to the emergency room—the only place he could afford to go for medical care because he doesn’t have health insurance.

It is about people like Alysia from Las Vegas, NV. Alysia has suffered with a kidney disease since birth, but she can’t get coverage because in the language of the insurance business, her lifelong disease is a preexisting condition.

It is about people like Steve in Henderson, NV. No health insurance company will cover Steve because he has Parkinson’s disease. That doesn’t just mean he can’t get the care he needs to help him cope with this terrible illness—it also means that if Steve gets the flu, or breaks his arm or needs a prescription, he can’t afford any medicine or treatment at all.

It is about people like Caleb, a high school student from outside Reno, NV. Caleb was born without legs, and needs new pairs of prosthetics as he grows bigger in his teen years. But his insurance company has decided it knows better than Caleb’s doctors, and has decided that last year’s legs will have to do.

When we say we are fighting for health care reform that lowers costs, we aren’t talking about a balance sheet—we are talking about people like Lisa, Braden, Alysia, Steve and Caleb.

When we say we are fighting for reform that brings security and stability back to health care, we aren’t talking about policies and contracts—we are talking about people like Lisa, Braden, Alysia, Steve and Caleb.

When we say we are fighting for reform that will no longer let insurance companies use preexisting conditions as an excuse to deny you the coverage you need, we aren’t talking about fine print—we are talking about people like Lisa, Braden, Alysia, Steve and Caleb.

We are talking about the hundreds of thousands just like them across Nevada, and the millions like them across the country.

This cannot be about politics. This must be about them.

Nearly half a century ago, America fearlessly confronted the most confounding medical and economic issue of its day. And a former Senate majority leader reminded us that we must resist the temptation to let the legislation on the written page distract us from its application in the real world. We were asked to look beyond policy and look instead to the people it affects.

It was 44 years ago today—July 30—that President Johnson signed into law the bill that would create the Medicare Program. And on this day in 1965, in Truman’s hometown and with the former President at his side LBJ said the following:

Many men can make many proposals. Many men can draft many laws. But few have the piercing and humane eye which can see beyond the words to the people that they touch.

Few can see past the speeches and the political battles to the doctor over there that is tending the infirm, and to the hospital that is receiving those in anguish, or feel in their heart painful wrath at the injustice which denies the miracle of healing to the old and to the poor. And fewer still have the courage to stake reputation, and position, and the effort of a lifetime upon such a cause when there are so few that share it.

But it is just such men who illuminate the life and the history of a Nation.

Today, each of us can be that leader. We each can fulfill the vision of Harry Truman and Lyndon Johnson—each of whom brought honor to this Senate chamber—and of TED KENNEDY, who still does.

Today, if we can each look past our partisan passions and see the patients, the parents, the people who need our help, we can once again renew the life and history of America, and of all Americans.

#### ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on my amendment to the fiscal year 2010 Energy and Water Appropriations bill.

This amendment prevents the Department of Energy from spending taxpayer dollars on companies that invest significant resources or do business in Iran’s energy sector to fill the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

Earlier this year, the Department signed contracts with energy giants Shell, Vitol, and Glencore to add almost 17 million barrels to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Open source material indicates that these three companies make up a majority of Iran’s gasoline imports.

Companies that sell gasoline to Iran should not receive the support of the American taxpayers, and this body has now gone on record multiple times opposing government contracts with companies that have substantial investment in or do business with Iran’s energy sector.

My amendment does not penalize the Department of Energy for this activity, but prevents this sort of thing from happening again. Ending taxpayer support for Iran’s energy sector is a commonsense step and crucially important. Most major importers of gasoline to Iran have substantial ties to the U.S. Government, and unanimous adoption of my amendment sends a clear message to those involved in Iran’s energy sector: You can do business with us, or you can do business with Iran—not both.

## MODELING AND SIMULATION R &amp; D

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, during yesterday's consideration of the fiscal year 2010 Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill, I noted that the managers included certain report language related to modeling and simulation capabilities for an unconventional fossil fuels program. I would like to ask the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee if their intent was to improve modeling and simulation for unconventional fossil energy technologies, by working in collaboration with universities and industry to establish joint programs for research and development.

Mr. DORGAN. Yes, that is our intent. This legislation would spur innovation and improve modeling and simulation efforts.

Mr. WARNER. I am pleased to learn that, because the Virginia Modeling and Simulation Center—VMASC—at Old Dominion University has extensive experience in modeling, simulation, and visualization of complex systems and events. Its capabilities include a complete suite of visualization software that can incorporate geospatial information with simulation and analysis of energy-related systems and the impact of those systems on various aspects of the environment. It also has extensive experience modeling critical infrastructure components of fossil fuel, electric and natural gas systems. VMASC has also developed capabilities for modeling policy aspects of global warming that can be adapted specifically to fossil fuel systems, and help to identify unconventional oil, natural gas, and coal resources.

VMASC has developed capabilities to model the production of unconventional resources using a combination of computational techniques that can be adapted to simulate a wide variety of scenarios associated with the fossil fuel industry and its relationship to environmental impacts.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I worked to develop this initiative to incorporate a capability that the Department has failed to cultivate, yet offers tremendous potential to develop our domestic fossil energy potential. The University of Utah's Simulation and Computing Institute which has worked with both the Office of Science and NNSA computing programs is a leading computing program with tremendous potential to contribute to this effort. This outstanding computing capability is coupled with the vast oil and gas production capabilities at the 25 year-old Energy and Geoscience Institute. This organization operates on seven continents and shares research and technology with its 66 corporate members that all have energy production experience. The goal of this program will be to facilitate the development of unconventional fossil energy resources utilizing state of the art computing simulation and modeling capabilities.

Mr. DORGAN. I agree that high performance computing applications are

important research tools that can help lead to breakthroughs in energy production. North Dakota State University, NDSU, uses computational modeling and simulations to help analyze theories and validate experiments that are dangerous, expensive or impossible to conduct. Through its Center for High Performance Computing, NDSU is collaborating with the Department of Energy and its national laboratories on a number of energy research projects.

The capabilities of VMASC, University of Utah, North Dakota State University and other institutions should receive due consideration as the Department of Energy executes this provision.

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

EXECUTIVE ACCOUNTABILITY ACT  
OF 2009

• Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I draw the attention of the Senate to a bill I recently introduced, S. 1529, the Executive Accountability Act of 2009. This legislation is similar to H.R. 473, introduced in the House of Representatives in January by Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

"Those who cannot learn from history are doomed to repeat it." That is Santayana's Law of Repetitive Consequences, and it is the reason I introduced this legislation—that we might learn from history so that we do not repeat it.

The Executive Accountability Act certainly addresses lessons learned from the debate leading to the Iraq conflict, but it is also a lesson we should have learned, and should have corrected, as a result of executive branch actions leading to and during the Vietnam conflict, World War II, the Mexican War, the Spanish-American War and other points in our history when Presidents have distorted the facts, withheld critical information, or exaggerated circumstances in order to sway public opinion and congressional will.

History is replete with examples that know no partisan allegiance. Presidents from both parties have fallen into the trap of inflating fear and distorting facts, if not resorting to outright fabrication, in order to win approval for or justify using military force.

Democratic President Lyndon Johnson misled Congress during the Gulf of Tonkin incident in 1964, publicly announcing that a second attack had occurred. On the same day, however, a naval commander in the Gulf of Tonkin cabled that a review of the second attack was doubtful, calling for a complete evaluation before any further action was taken. Without the complete facts, Congress passed the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, leading the United States into a war that ultimately took more than 55,000 American lives.

Republican President Richard Nixon expanded the Vietnam conflict in 1969

by authorizing bombing operations in Cambodia and directing that they be conducted clandestinely. Operational reports of the bombings were either not made or were falsely described as having occurred over South Vietnam rather than Cambodia. A few Members of Congress were informed, secretly, of the bombings, but the remainder of Congress was deceived about the secret bombing campaign over a nation with which the United States was not at war.

Most recently, of course, another President, his Vice President, and other Cabinet officials, used scare-mongering tales of "smoking guns" and "mushroom clouds"; of non-existent weapons of mass destruction; dubious tales of mobile biological laboratories; fictional African trips to buy yellowcake; and, improbable and unsupported rumors of alliances between dictators and terrorists to stampede a fearful nation and a spineless Congress into a so-called "preemptive" invasion of another sovereign nation.

President Abraham Lincoln, an opponent of the Mexican-American War during his service in the House of Representatives, well understood the dangers of preemptive war and the need for the constitutional check on executive power inherent in the requirement for a congressional declaration of war or an authorization to use military force. Lincoln condemned President Polk for driving the U.S. into war with Mexico by putting U.S. forces in danger on disputed territory. Polk then inflamed public and congressional anger by asserting that Mexican soldiers had shed U.S. blood on U.S. soil. Lincoln explained his concerns with his usual eloquence:

Allow the President to invade a neighboring nation, whenever he shall deem it necessary to repel an invasion, and you allow him to do so, whenever he may choose to say he deems it necessary for such purpose—and you allow him to make war at pleasure. Study to see if you can fix any limit to his power in this respect, after you have given him so much as you propose. If, today, he should choose to say he thinks it necessary to invade Canada, to prevent the British from invading us, how could you stop him? You may say to him, "I see no probability of the British invading us," but he will say to you, "be silent; I see it, if you don't."

Lincoln went on to say,

The provision in the Constitution giving the war-making power to Congress was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons. Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This, our Convention understood to be the most oppressive of all Kingly oppressions; and they resolved to frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us. But your view destroys the whole matter, and places our President where kings have always stood.

Lincoln's insight considered preemptive wars only against neighbors. One can only imagine what he would think of the global reach that the current military might of the United States