

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding, through the Chair to my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Kentucky, that this is paid for out of stimulus money?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I believe most of the pay-fors are. I would say to my friend, having consulted with staff, it is some stimulus money but largely what we believe to be noncontroversial pay-fors.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, a 30-day extension doesn't solve the problems we have. A 30-day extension of unemployment, 30-day FMAP, 30-day doc fix, is just kicking them all down the road. We have to have a legitimate program to extend these benefits into the future, and 30 days does not do it. It just kicks the ball down the road.

I would also say, with money being taken from the recovery moneys—this is one of the job-creating things we have left going on in this government. It is a good program, it creates jobs.

I look forward to working with my Republican colleagues to have a more long-term fix of this difficult problem, and therefore I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

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

The Senator from New Mexico.

#### SUPPORTING DONALD BERWICK

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to urge quick confirmation of President Obama's nominee, Dr. Donald Berwick, to become the Administrator for the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, also known as CMS. He is highly qualified and capable. This is an extremely important position for which he has been nominated.

Unfortunately, according to recent press reports, it appears that some who oppose the new health reform law are hoping to use Dr. Berwick's confirmation process as a forum to debate the merits of this new health reform law which has now been enacted.

In my view, whether Senators favored or opposed the enactment of health care reform legislation, it is clearly in the interests of our country that we have a capable Administrator to implement the new law. Over the last year and a half, there has been an enormous focus in Congress on address-

ing the very serious problems facing our health care system. It is important the President's choice to head the CMS be confirmed so that he can take up the enormous challenge and the enormous opportunity that is presented by the enactment of this new legislation.

It is clear our Nation has urgent needs. This is not a time for the Senate to delay Dr. Berwick's nomination. I recently spent time with Dr. Berwick at the annual Health Policy Conference headed by the Commonwealth Fund this last January. I was impressed both with the depth of his understanding of the many issues facing the health care system as well as his passion for improving the quality of health care and his impressive successes in doing so.

Dr. Berwick has dedicated his career to finding ways to make our health care system work better for patients and cost less for taxpayers. These are core missions he will take on as our next CMS Administrator.

Don is the founder and CEO of the Institute for Health Care Improvement. He is a professor of health policy at the Harvard Medical School and the School of Public Health, and he is a practicing physician at some of our Nation's top hospitals. He has held numerous leadership roles at the institutions that ensure quality care in America, including service on the board of the American Hospital Association and as chair of the Advisory Council for the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

Don's vast experience with our health care system, his award-winning career as an expert in health care quality, make him the ideal candidate to lead CMS at this critical time. The historic health reform legislation that President Obama signed into law this year takes significant steps to strengthen Medicare, reduce waste, fraud, and abuse in the system, and makes critical improvements in the way care is delivered. Implementing those changes in the smartest and most effective way is going to require an Administrator who has seen firsthand what it takes to make meaningful improvements in health care quality and efficiency. It is also going to take an Administrator with a passion to get the job done right.

Don Berwick has both. That is why he was chosen by President Obama to be the next CMS Administrator. His nomination has won praise from across the political and professional spectrum, including former CMS Administrators who served Republican Presidents. For example, Thomas A. Scully, who was CMS Administrator under President George W. Bush between 2001 and 2003, said:

Dr. Berwick is about as noncontroversial and well liked as you can get. You are not going to do any better.

Mark McClellan, CMS Administrator under George W. Bush from 2004 to 2006 said the following:

What happens at CMS over the next couple of years will determine whether the new legislation actually improves quality and low-

ers costs. Don has a unique background both in improving quality care on the ground and thinking about how our Nation's health care policies need to be reformed to help make that happen.

Dr. Nancy H. Nielsen, M.D., immediate past president of the American Medical Association, said:

We welcome President Obama's nomination of Dr. Donald Berwick to be administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid services. He is widely known and well respected for his visionary leadership efforts that focus on optimizing the quality and safety of patient care in hospitals and across health care settings.

Dr. John Rather, the executive vice president of AARP, said:

Dr. Berwick's expertise on healthcare innovation and his dedication to quality improvement and patient safety would benefit the millions of low-income and older Americans served by Medicare and Medicaid. His appointment is welcome news to Medicare beneficiaries, as it signals that quality and safety will be at the top of the agenda.

Finally, our former colleague, Dave Durenberger, a Republican from Minnesota, said:

President Obama let us know he means business on "bending the medical cost curve" by nominating Dr. Don Berwick as head of the Center for Medicare and Medicaid services. . . . This appointment will be taken as an indication that health policy and health system reform is likely to be this President's top priority in his first term. We all know that Don Berwick has the ability to make both work.

There is broad consensus that the nomination of Dr. Berwick is an excellent choice by President Obama. Our country needs Dr. Berwick's remarkable talents now, and every day his confirmation stalls or is delayed is a missed opportunity to ensure his unparalleled leadership is directing our Nation's largest and most influential health care agency.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to swiftly approve his nomination.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I might note to my colleague from New Mexico that there is a different point of view about this particular nominee. I would venture to say that since his hearing has not been scheduled yet, it may be a while before we are able to take up that nomination. In any event, there are many on our side of the aisle who have significant concerns about whether he should be put in charge of the CMS. But I appreciate the comments of my colleague, and I will turn to a different subject at this point.

#### SPENDING

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, about the time I think Washington is beginning to get the message that the American people are fed up with runaway spending, my hopes are dashed by proposals to spend even more. I would like to refer to one here in just a moment.

First, there is no question that the American people are unhappy about

the spending binge and soaring debt that have occurred under this administration and this Congress. In the last year and a half, there has been trillions in new spending, program after program, bailout after bailout. We are about to see another one.

Every time I return home to Arizona from Washington, my constituents remind me of their frustration with Washington's lack of restraint. They know the reckless spending and borrowing cannot go on forever. They are worried about how their kids and their grandkids will pay for all of President Obama's spending priorities and associated debt.

Now, \$260 of new debt has been added to each household every week of the Obama administration. Let me repeat. For every week of this administration, every household has another \$260 of debt. Our national debt has now reached \$13 trillion, much of which is held by countries such as China. More than \$1 trillion has been added to the debt since the majority adopted legislation they called pay-go. These are so-called budget controls which require Congress to pay for what it spends. But, unfortunately for the taxpayers, the emergency designations and other budget gimmicks have been a convenient way for the majority to circumvent these pay-go rules.

Now the President is asking for some more money to spend for yet another bailout. This time it is \$23 billion for teachers' salaries and a total of \$50 billion to defray the cost of State employees' and local employees' salaries. No guarantee that the funding would be used in the case of the teachers necessarily to save jobs, or firefighters, the same. And this comes just 16 months after Congress poured \$100 billion for education into the so-called stimulus legislation, including \$48 billion in direct aid to the States. As for total Federal education spending, it has doubled since the year 2000 to 15 percent of the Federal budget now—not an inconsequential amount.

Besides more spending and debt, I see the continuation of two troubling patterns here. One is the refusal of this administration and the majority in this Congress to encourage State and local governments to economize to live within their means, just as families and private sector businesses must do. The President's latest proposal for this \$50 billion in so-called emergency funding simply bails the States out, the State and local governments that have obligations to their employees.

With regard to education, the Education Secretary, Arne Duncan, says the \$23 billion for teachers is an emergency. But, as George Will pointed out in a recent column, the private sector has lost 8.5 million jobs during the recession or 7.4 percent of workers, while local governments have only lost 141,000 workers or less than 1 percent of their workers. Will writes, "Now this supposed emergency, and states' dependency, may be becoming routine

and perpetual." In other words, the Federal Government just becomes the payor for the salaries of people who work for State and local governments.

Spending \$23 billion is not going to help unemployed private sector workers find jobs; it may actually hurt them. And spending billions of stimulus dollars on State and local governments hasn't helped them to solve their financial problems thus far. How will spending billions remedy their underlying budget problems? It is just a temporary reprieve. But if they don't do anything to address the underlying cause of the problem, we will not have helped them at all.

Education spending has not been neglected during the recession, and at some point local governments have to figure out a way to make do with what they have. The debt and out-of-control spending are the real emergencies we should be dealing with.

The second pattern I would like to note is the administration's habit of supporting legislation that designates winners and losers, especially when it comes to labor unions. They were the beneficiaries of \$85 billion in bailouts to the car companies and special tax treatment of the President's health spending law. Teachers unions are the winners if the President convinces Congress to spend another \$23 billion on teacher salaries. This is not the kind of change Americans had in mind when President Obama took office; that is, political allies getting special status and treatment.

President Obama pays lip service to fiscal responsibility but does so as long as his own priorities do not have to be put on hold; otherwise, he would not talk in the same breath about fiscal restraint on the one hand and another \$50 billion in Federal taxpayer money or borrowing from other countries in order to pay teachers' salaries, firefighters' salaries, and the like. At some point, I believe the President will have to match his rhetoric with action; otherwise, the United States will not be able to avoid unprecedented budgetary and economic crises. Is this really the legacy this administration and this Congress want to leave behind? I think not.

I think when I go home this week and I visit with constituents of mine, including another tea party group, I am going to hear an earful about how they thought Washington was beginning to get the message that we were not supposed to spend so much money we did not have; that they are tired of us going to borrow money from other countries such as China and putting it on the credit card for our kids and our grandkids to pay. I think I am going to have to tell them: Well, I thought folks were beginning to get the message, but now, with the President's new request, it appears we are going to have to deal with the problem again.

I hope that when the President's proposed legislation comes to the Congress, we are able to say to him: No,

not this time, just as we are with the legislation that is on the floor of the Senate this week, the so-called emergency that continues certain tax policies in force, extends certain benefits such as unemployment insurance, but does a lot of other things that are not paid for, that are not offset by cuts in other spending.

I don't think we can continue to just keep piling on more and more spending without finding a way to offset it with savings elsewhere. It is not as if those savings can't be found, but we will never get there if we decide to take on the obligations of State and local governments to pay for all of the governmental workers who are on their payrolls. We have to start looking at the private sector and how to encourage the private sector to begin to put more of their folks back to work instead of taking money out of the private sector in order to keep these government workers employed.

I hope my colleagues will take the message I have heard loudly and clearly from home to heart and begin to apply some fiscal discipline to the spending policies this administration is proposing and will for once say: No, we can't afford this, and so we are not going to spend the money.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak in morning business for such time as I consume.

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

#### CAP-AND-TRADE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, today I wish to speak on where I think this climate change debate is headed after last Thursday's vote on the Murkowski resolution. We got a very clear signal in today's Politico, which reported that President Obama, in his Oval Office address tomorrow night, will seek, as a part of the response to the BP oil spill, to "put a price on carbon."

Let's keep in mind what "a price on carbon" is. That is a tax, a carbon tax, or what we call cap and trade. Quite often people have said: Well, if those individuals really want to charge for carbon, want to stop this economy, why don't they just put a carbon tax on it? The reason they do not is then people would know how much it is costing them. As it is now, with cap and trade, they would not.

But again, he is going to have an Oval Office address. I think this will be