most Americans. We will see higher taxes for a lot of Americans. We will see higher taxes for sure—for certain for a lot of small businesses. And I think we are going to see a lot of businesses that are going to just say-and we have already seen reports of that, as a lot of these businesses look at the impact this would have on their bottom lines—it will cost them a lot to cover their employees. It might be cheaper to pay the penalty and to just shove them into one of the government-run exchanges. I think that is something we have yet to see the impact from.

My prediction would be we will see a lot of small businesses, and for that matter a lot of large businesses, that will come to that conclusion and say it makes absolutely no sense for them to continue to provide health coverage for their employees when they can have the government do it and save their companies a lot of money.

So I think the unintended consequences are something we have yet to see, but we do know for certain the consequences of this legislation, these analyses that have been completed, and studies that have been done by those who are supposed to know a lot about this subject—by that I mean the Actuary at the Health and Human Services Department, as well as the Congressional Budget Office—they are now seeing higher insurance costs, higher premiums, and a significant reduction in the so-called deficit reduction that was promised by the administration.

Furthermore, because of the double counting that is done and the way in which Medicare revenues are double counted—CLASS Act revenues are double counted—even for that matter Social Security revenues, payroll taxes are double counted in this—dramatically understate the deficit impact and the long-term debt implications of this legislation and what it will mean to the next generation of Americans who are going to be stuck paying our bills.

I say all that, not to be the Grim Reaper. We tried during the course of this debate to illustrate as much as we could these very points. We tried to offer amendments that we thought made more sense in terms of controlling costs; to actually address the actual underlying drivers of health care costs in this country as opposed to just expanding coverage, which is essentially what the legislation did. It will cover more people. In some ways it will cover more people by putting more people into Medicaid which will pass on more mandates and more costs to our States.

We have already seen a lot of Governors across the country reacting to that, talking about that, how we are going to pay for that. But there is an additional 34 million people, additional people, who are supposed to be covered in this legislation; about 16 million of those are already going into the Medicaid Program which already under-reimburses providers and also imposes

huge new costs and new burdens on our State governments.

There is not a lot of good news to report about this. I think that is going to be the case. I think, regrettably, we could have gone a different direction. We should have gone a different direction. But that being said, we are where we are. I hope over time we will have an opportunity to revisit this issue. If we do not, it is going to have a dramatic impact on future generations, on our economy, both in the short term and long term, as a result of higher costs built into the cost structure for health insurance, higher taxes that will impact small businesses and families across this country, and higher deficits for which future generations are going to be assessed and have to pav.

With that, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

### BAILOUTS

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I know we are in morning business. But at the conclusion of morning business I will be offering an amendment which I understand is the next one in order. Since there is nobody taking the morning business time, I will take that time to begin the discussion of that amendment.

The amendment which I am proposing goes to this whole issue of who the taxpayers of America should bail out. I personally don't think they should bail out anybody, to be honest with you. They certainly should not be bailing out financial institutions that have gotten too big. They should not be bailing out automobile companies that have overextended themselves and are doing a poor job. They should not be bailing out other countries. They certainly should not be bailing out States and local governments that are about to default on their debt.

It is very hard to explain to a citizen of New Hampshire or Illinois, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, why their tax dollars should go to bail out a State which is about to default on the debt it has run up because it has been irresponsible in its spending. The obvious State that comes to mind is the State of California, which has very serious problems. But they are self-inflicted problems. These are not problems which were created as a result of some general problems across the country, and they were not problems created, for example, by an event—an environmental event or emergency such as Katrina.

They were totally self-inflicted problems. The question is, Should the American taxpayer, all the rest of us in this country, be put in a position where we have to bail out that State? I do not think we should. That is what my amendment is going to go to.

But I see now the Senator from Florida has arrived. He has the morning business time we are in.

I reserve the remainder of my time and yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

## GULF OILSPILL

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. President, I wish to thank my friend and colleague from New Hampshire for allowing me to take some time on the floor this morning. If I may, I wish to speak about an issue that is of great impact to Florida; that is, this oilspill. This is not the first time I have come to the floor to speak about the potential impact this gulf oilspill may have upon the coast of Florida.

I have called upon British Petroleum to set up a \$1 billion fund, a replenishing or evergreen fund, if you will, so we can get to work to get ready to prepare, if this oil is to come ashore, to mitigate its effect, to prevent, as much as possible, the oil from coming ashore.

So far, there has been \$25 million given to Florida and other Gulf States, another \$25 million is coming for advertising purposes. The good news is, we believe the oil is not ashore yet. But there is some disturbing new information.

This morning, I had the opportunity RADMspeak to William Baumgartner of the Coast Guard. Reports yesterday afternoon tell us some tar balls have washed ashore in Key West, FL. That is far ahead of any projections of oil from this spill being put onto the Loop Current in the southern part of the Gulf of Mexico and coming in contact with the southernmost point of Florida. It was not expected that that would happen for several days. But it could be that the oil is far more spread out than we anticipated. It is not unusual for there to be oil to come upon the shore of Florida or any other Gulf States. In fact, it naturally occurs. We know from the Florida Department of Environmental Protection that there were at least 600 reports in the past 2 years of tar balls and things such as that because, as we have come to find out, this is a naturally occurring phenomenon as well, that oil will seep from the ocean floor and potentially come upon our shores in the form of tar balls and other small things.

But the concern is, these 20 tar balls that came upon the shore yesterday in Key West are from the gulf oilspill. If that is the case, the oilspill is far larger and has spread far more quickly than we could have anticipated.

Right now those samples of those tar balls are being sent for research and evaluation to determine whether they are, in fact, from the oilspill that happened now almost 1 month ago. Whether those tar balls are from the disaster or whether they are naturally occurring, we know this oil slick is spreading. We know it is going to get into the Loop Current, the Loop Current which will then bring that oil down close to the Keys, potentially all the way up the Atlantic side of Florida.

We cannot wait to find out what is going to happen. We cannot wait to pay claims after damages have already been incurred by the people of Florida. Florida is reliant upon the beauty of its State for its economy. We have actually more than 80 million tourists who come to Florida each year, more than a \$65 billion tourism industry. Recreational saltwater fishing has a \$5 billion impact on Florida and is responsible for more than 50,000 jobs. Recreational boating has an \$18 billion impact. We have more registered boaters in Florida than any other State in the Union. Some 90 percent of Florida's population lives within 10 miles of its coast. We are the State, besides Alaska, with the largest coastline and more beaches than any other State.

There have been a lot of problems here. One, why did this spill happen; the failure of regulation by the Department of the Interior, the lack of a quick response by this administration, and a lack of a quick response by British Petroleum, mistakes being made at the scene; why did the blowout preventers fail, all the other things we have read about and heard about. We are having hearings in Congress on what caused this tragic incident to happen in the first place.

We are going to get to the bottom of all those things. Right now we need dollars in the hands of our States in the gulf, to get together our volunteers, our businesses, our local governments, county, city, and State, to try to prevent this oil from coming ashore. We need a flotilla of Florida boaters out there trying to scoop up these tar balls before they come ashore.

We need a volunteer effort not unlike what we had in World War II in Europe, where the British came to Dunkirk and rescued the military and brought them ashore when they were fleeing. We need to get the Florida volunteers, senior citizens and others, on the beaches getting ready to help mitigate this damage that I think, unfortunately, is going to come ashore.

We need the funds to do that today. We do not need them a month from now. We do not need them 6 months from now. We do not need them a year from now to pay claims. We need to do everything possible to keep that oil from coming ashore. If we do that, we can keep our economy, our tourism economy strong. Right now, people need to know they should still be coming to Florida to fish, still be coming to Florida for a beach vacation because the oil has not washed upon the shore in west Florida, on the panhandle, and we only have these 20 tar balls in the Keys. Let's hope that is the end of it.

I did not want to miss this opportunity to come to the floor to make the point again that we need to make sure the money comes now. Senator VITTER and I and others have filed legislation to make sure oil companies are responsible well beyond the \$75 million cap for damages to communities that are impacted by these oilspills. It is fo-

cused on profits, more than it is focused on a \$10 billion cap, which is a proposal that my friends and colleagues have proposed.

Why does it make more sense? Well, based on profits, we know BP may be liable for up to as much as \$20 billion for this incident. That is more money to help pay for this. Second, if you just put it on \$10 billion, we are only going to have two or three oil companies in this country because no other oil company will be able to get into the business because they will not be able to afford the potential \$10 billion cap.

If you do not have enough money to pay for it, \$10 billion is pretty illusory anyway. What we need to be focused on is making sure those responsible can pay and pay enough to make sure we solve the problem. A lot needs to be done.

A lot of questions need to be asked. A lot of answers need to be forthcoming. But right now we need the dollars to protect our shorelines and our beaches.

I see my colleague and friend from New Hampshire is ready to speak again.

### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). Morning business is closed.

# RESTORING AMERICAN FINANCIAL STABILITY ACT OF 2010

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 3217, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative read as follows:

A bill (S. 3217) to promote the financial stability of the United States by improving accountability and transparency in the financial system, to end "too big to fail", to protect the American taxpayer by ending bailouts, to protect consumers from abusive financial services practices, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid (for Dodd-Lincoln) amendment No. 3739, in the nature of a substitute.

Brownback further modified amendment No. 3789 (to amendment No. 3739), to provide for an exclusion from the authority of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection for certain automobile manufacturers.

Brownback (for Snowe-Pryor) amendment No. 3883 (to amendment No. 3739), to ensure small business fairness and regulatory transparency.

Specter modified amendment No. 3776 (to amendment No. 3739), to amend section 20 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow for a private civil action against a person that provides substantial assistance in violation of such act.

Dodd (for Leahy) amendment No. 3823 (to amendment No. 3739), to restore the application of the Federal antitrust laws to the business of health insurance to protect competition and consumers.

Whitehouse modified amendment No. 3746 (to amendment No. 3739), to restore to the States the right to protect consumers from usurious lenders.

Dodd (for Cantwell) amendment No. 3884 (to amendment No. 3739), to improve appropriate limitations on affiliations with certain member banks.

Cardin amendment No. 4050 (to amendment No. 3739), to require the disclosure of payments by resource extraction issuers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 30 minutes of debate, equally divided and controlled between the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD, and the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. GREGG, or their designees, prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 4051.

The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4051

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I sort of did a trailer version of this bill a few minutes ago while we had some time in morning business. But let me discuss the amendment again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator call up his amendment.

Mr. GREGG. I call up amendment No. 4051 and ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside.

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

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Gregg] proposes an amendment numbered 4051 to amendment No. 3739.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit taxpayer bailouts of fiscally irresponsible State and local governments)

On page 18, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

# SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS TO PAY STATE OBLIGATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funds may be used to purchase or guarantee obligations of, issue lines of credit to or provide direct or indirect grants-and-aid to, any State government, municipal government, local government, or county government which has defaulted on its obligations, is at risk of defaulting, or is likely to default, absent such assistance from the United States Government.

(b) Limit on Use of Borrowed Funds.—
The Secretary shall not, directly or indirectly, use general fund revenues or funds borrowed pursuant to title 31, United States Code, to purchase or guarantee any asset or obligation of any State government, municipal government, local government, or county government or to otherwise assist such governments, in any instance in which the State government, municipal government, or county government has defaulted on its obligations, is at risk of defaulting, or is likely to default, absent such assistance from the United States Government.

(c) LIMIT ON FEDERAL RESERVE FUNDS.—The Board of Governors shall not, directly or indirectly, lend against, purchase, or guarantee any asset or obligation of any State government, municipal government, local government, or county government or to otherwise assist such governments, in any instance in which the State government, municipal government, local government, or