

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in a period of morning business until 3 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally controlled and divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. BEGICH. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Senator BEGICH pertaining to the introduction of S. 3150 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

REMEMBERING STEWART UDALL

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I was talking with the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Wyoming about Stewart Udall, whom the majority leader also talked about a little earlier. He is the father of Senator TOM UDALL and the uncle of MARK, and a great, distinguished American. He lived 90 long, good years, and did so much in our country to focus on conservation and the outdoors. So we remember and celebrate his life and send from our family, and I am sure from the entire Senate, our best wishes to our colleagues TOM and MARK and to their families.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I have been in and out of public life a long time, and I have never had anything affect me in a personal way like the health care debate. I got up this morning in West Millers Cove in Blount County and drove to the Knoxville airport, and almost every single person with whom I talked on the way into the airplane had something to say to me about the health care debate. When I get on the plane, here comes another fellow right down the aisle, hands me a note, and says: Thanks for all your hard work. None of them are for the health care bill passed last night. They are all deeply concerned and deeply worried about it, and they see it as I see it. They see it as a historic mistake.

Unlike the Social Security bill, the Medicare bill, the Medicaid bill, the civil rights bills of 1957 and 1964 and 1968 and later, all those bills passed with significant bipartisan support. But the bill last night was a com-

pletely partisan act. The only thing bipartisan about it is the opposition to it. I think it is important that we continue to say why that is true.

The fundamental mistake is that the bill basically expands a health care delivery system that we all know is too expensive at a time of enormous concern about the national debt. In the middle of a great recession, we are expanding a health care delivery system that we know is too expensive; instead of focusing our attention and working together to set as a goal of reducing the cost of the health care delivery system so more Americans can afford to buy insurance. That is the basic difference of opinion.

The Democrats believe we should expand the system we have now. Of course, they make some changes, but basically it is an expansion of a system that is too expensive, and they make it more expensive. We believe what we should do, instead, is to reduce the cost of the American health care delivery system, and by doing so make it possible for more Americans to be able to afford health insurance.

Here is what the bill does now, as we see it. It imposes even larger taxes on job creators in the middle of a recession. It will mean Medicare cuts and premium increases for millions of Americans. The Medicare cuts, it is said, are alright because there is some fraud and abuse in Medicare. We agree with that. But what we are saying is that Medicare, according to its trustees, is going broke by 2010, and every penny of savings in Medicare ought to go to Medicare to help make it stronger. This bill spends almost all the money on a new entitlement, and the bill last night cuts Medicare even more deeply.

Some say: Well, it only hurts providers and hospitals. Well, those hospitals are the ones that may announce, as some are announcing, that we are not going to accept Medicare patients anymore because we are already being reimbursed so little. But it also cuts Medicare beneficiaries' benefits. The Congressional Budget Office says that fully half of those who have Medicare Advantage—and that is one out four Medicare beneficiaries in the country—will see their benefits cut. That is what this bill does.

As far as premium increases go, the President and I had a little friendly discussion about that at the health care summit. I said: For millions of Americans, individual premiums would go up. He said: No, they won't. I said: With respect, Mr. President, the Congressional Budget Office says yes, they will, by 10 to 13 percent, on the average. He said: Oh, no, oh, no, they will be getting a better policy. But that is like saying: If the government requires you to buy a better car and it is more expensive, it may be better but it is still more expensive. For a variety of reasons individual premiums are going to go up, and one is the government requirement that you buy a better policy.

Senator COLLINS, who was the insurance commissioner in Maine, has surveyed her State, and her conclusion is that 87 percent of the individual policies there will be more expensive under this bill. It is true that maybe half of those persons would get subsidies—paid for by taxpayers—but that still leaves maybe 40 percent of the individual policies in Maine where individual premiums will go up. They will go up because we are dumping more people into Medicaid—the State program for low-income Americans—and we don't reimburse physicians and hospitals adequately for those patients.

Today, one-half of doctors won't see new Medicaid patients. So what do hospitals and the doctors do when they do see a Medicaid patient? They transfer part of the cost of seeing that patient—that Medicaid patient—on to someone who has private insurance. So that forces premiums to go up.

When you have a provision in the bill, as this bill does, which says that my policy can't go up much when compared with my son's policy, well, that might keep my policy from going up so much, but my son is going to be paying a lot more. So younger Americans are going to be very surprised as the cost of their policies goes up. Then the provision in the bill with the requirement to buy policies was weakened, and because it is weak, a lot of young people especially may not join the policy. When they do not, that will leave sicker and older people within the system, and that will help drive premium costs up as well. So for all those reasons, for millions of Americans, it is accurate to say that premiums will go up.

I was at the University of Tennessee this morning—a tremendous university. Dr. Chu, the President's Energy Secretary, is visiting there today and tomorrow. I wish I could be with him to talk about the work they are doing, between the Oak Ridge National Laboratory and the university and its science program. Senator BINGAMAN has visited there before. But one of the undercurrent stories in America today is the condition of America's public higher education. State funding for public higher education has been flat for the last 10 years.

Why is that? Because Medicaid costs continue to rise. Governors can't control those budgets or control those costs, and the reason they can't is because we write the program up here and then send them about a third to 40 percent of the bill. They cannot afford it, so what do they do? They cut the amount of money that goes to the University of Virginia or the University of Tennessee or the University of New Mexico or the University of Wyoming and then what happens? Either quality goes down, fewer students are served, fewer faculty are attracted or tuition goes up, which is why the students are protesting in California about the 34-percent increase in tuition at the University of California. They probably didn't even imagine the reason for that

is the Federal Government is causing Medicaid costs to continue to rise and Governors, therefore, make cuts and tuition goes up. This bill will make that worse.

Then, on top of that, you have the last-minute takeover of the Federal student loan program. Suddenly, 19 million students—well, 15 million of those 19 million will go to the Federal Government to get their loan, beginning in July, instead of to 2,000 lenders across the country. The Government is saying we are going to save money. That may be true. But guess what the Government is going to do with its money. They are not going to say: Because the Government can borrow the money at 2.8 percent it is going to cost us less to operate the program, therefore, we are going to give students the savings. They are going to spend the savings. So they are going to borrow it at 2.8 percent and loan it to the students at 6.8 percent. That is overcharging America's students to help pay for the health care program.

These students are not Wall Street financiers. They are working people, some of them pretty grown up, in their thirties and forties, going back to Walter State Community College. They often have a job. They are not going to be very happy when they find out they are paying higher interest. The estimate that we have made in our office is it might be \$1,500–\$1,700 dollars over 10 years in more interest. That is the amount the Governor is going to be overcharging them to pay for other government programs, including health care.

The action that is being taken may be historic. But we believe that it is a historic mistake and that throughout the rest of this year the debate will not end about health care; but it will change. It will be larger than just health care.

As the President himself said last year, the health care debate is a proxy for a larger debate about the role of government in America's life. We believe that is a debate our country should have, and we believe the country will soundly reject a policy of more taxes, more spending, more debt, and more Washington takeover.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I heard my colleague's comments about health care. I will plan to return to the Senate floor to discuss health care in some detail in the next couple days.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

REMEMBERING STEWART UDALL

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about a great American who has inspired me and countless others with his leadership and commitment to public service. That great American is Stewart Udall.

At the outset, I extend my condolences to my friend and colleague, Stewart's son, TOM UDALL, and his wife

Jill; his nephew, my friend and colleague, MARK UDALL, and his wife Maggie; and all the Udall family for this enormous loss. In several conversations I had with Stewart in recent years, it was clear that TOM's own exemplary public service and I'm sure MARK's as well, were a source of great pride for him.

Stewart Udall is best known for his lifetime of service in preservation of our public lands. His accomplishments as Secretary of the Interior under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson are legendary. Those accomplishments were recounted yesterday in the New York Times. It said:

... he presided over the acquisition of 3.85 million acres of new holdings, including four national parks Canyonlands in Utah, Redwood in California, North Cascades in Washington, and Guadalupe Mountains in Texas—six national monuments, nine national recreation areas, twenty historic sites, fifty wildlife refuges and eight national seashores.

I ask unanimous consent that the obituary from the Times be printed in the RECORD, after my comments.

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

[See exhibit 1.]

Mr. BINGAMAN. His commitment to and achievements in conservation and preservation are unequalled in our country. He was a moving force behind all of the landmark environmental legislation of the 1960s, including the Clean Air Act of 1963, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1965, the Wilderness Act of 1964, the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, the Endangered Species Act of 1966, the National Trails System Act of 1968, and the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968. Long after leaving public office, he was instrumental in securing the enactment of the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act of 1990 which I was proud to support.

But his commitment to our public lands was part of a larger lifetime commitment, a commitment to public service.

With all the rancor and heated rhetoric that surround us in Washington today, it is easy to lose sight of what is good about our system of government. And one of the very best things about our great country, and our system of government, is that it has attracted to public service many of the best among us to devote their lives to work for us all.

Stewart Udall was one of those people. He devoted his life to pursuing the common good the greater good and left this Nation a better place because of it.

Stewart cared deeply about the people of this great country and that caring was evident in each encounter that he had. My wife Anne has fond memories of heartfelt conversations she had with Stewart where he spoke forcefully about the challenges we face. I myself was fortunate to always hear from him words of encouragement and constructive advice whenever we would visit.

Stewart Udall set the highest standards for public service and for decency as a human being. As Ben Jonson said of Shakespeare, "he was not of an age, but for all time." Stewart Udall had, as he urged his grandchildren to have, "a love affair with the wonder and beauty of the earth." We are all the richer for it.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Mar. 20, 2010]
STEWART L. UDALL, 90, CONSERVATIONIST IN
KENNEDY AND JOHNSON CABINETS, DIES
(By Keith Schneider)

Stewart L. Udall, an ardent conservationist and a son of the West, who as interior secretary in the 1960s presided over vast increases in national park holdings and the public domain, died Saturday at his home in Santa Fe, N.M. The last surviving member of the original Kennedy cabinet, he was 90.

Mr. Udall had been in failing health after a fall last week, according to a son, Senator Tom Udall of New Mexico.

Though he was a liberal Democrat from the increasingly conservative and Republican West, Stewart Udall said in a 2003 public television interview that he found in Washington "a big tent on the environment."

The result was the addition of vast tracts to the nation's land holdings and—through his strong ties with lawmakers, conservationists, writers and others—work that led to landmark statutes on air, water and land conservation.

President Obama said in a statement Saturday night that Mr. Udall "left an indelible mark on this nation and inspired countless Americans who will continue his fight for clean air, clean water and to maintain our many natural treasures."

Few corners of the nation escaped Mr. Udall's touch. As interior secretary in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, he presided over the acquisition of 3.85 million acres of new holdings, including 4 national parks—Canyonlands in Utah, Redwood in California, North Cascades in Washington State and Guadalupe Mountains in Texas—6 national monuments, 9 national recreation areas, 20 historic sites, 50 wildlife refuges and 8 national seashores. He also had an interest in preserving historic sites, and helped save Carnegie Hall from destruction.

"Republicans and Democrats, we all worked together," Mr. Udall said in a television interview with Bill Moyers. But by the time of that interview, Mr. Udall added that Washington had been overtaken by money and that people seeking public office fought for contributions from business interests that viewed environmental protection as a detriment to profit at best.

In his years in Washington, he won high regard from many quarters for his efforts to preserve the American landscape and to educate his fellow Americans on the value of natural beauty, points he made in his 1963 book "The Quiet Crisis." The book, whose aim, he wrote at the time, was to "outline the land and people story of our continent," sold widely.

It was Mr. Udall who suggested that John F. Kennedy invite Robert Frost to recite a poem at Mr. Kennedy's inauguration. Mr. Udall accompanied Mr. Frost to the Soviet Union in 1962, a trip meant to foster better ties with Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev.

Mr. Udall also held evenings at the Interior Department with the poet Carl Sandburg and the actor Hal Holbrook. In addition, he invited the Pulitzer Prize-winning author Wallace Stegner to be the department's writer in residence. It was Mr. Stegner's presence that prompted Mr. Udall to write "The Quiet Crisis."