

who really will be able to keep their health care plans. In the analysis that has come out from the administration, over 100 pages—I had it on the Senate floor last week—what they have shown is, over the next few years more and more Americans who have health care right now through their jobs that they like, they understand, they know how to use—and as a doctor I have worked with these patients. I know what it means to them to have a health care plan they are comfortable with, that they understand, that they use, that all of the work has been done with the doctor's office, hospital, and the patient, they understand the whole thing. To have that change is very distressing for people. It is unsettling. But yet this government report out from the administration says within the next couple of years, for people who have their insurance through small business plans, almost four out of five of them may lose the coverage they have.

Mr. MCCAIN. May I ask, is that because of a minor change in the insurance policy they now have that then forces them out of the policy, even though there is a minor change? Maybe Dr. BARRASSO can give us some of those examples of how minor they are, how they basically force them out of the policy they have into the "exchanges." Is that what happens?

Mr. BARRASSO. I agree with my colleague completely. What is happening is any sort of a change to a policy, whether they change the deductible, change the copay or any of those things, then that policy is disallowed as something you can keep.

Mr. MCCAIN. Some of those changes would simply be driven by pure economics and the escalating cost of health care on which clearly this legislation has no effect.

Mr. BARRASSO. Let's say you change your job. Let's say you move from one employment situation to another. You may change your insurance. Most people do because most people get their insurance through their work. We will have a situation where over the next couple of years, a promise that the President made to the American people—another promise that the President made to the American people will be broken.

We have not just seen it with regular insurance. My colleague from Arizona is in a State with many people who are seniors, a number of them on Medicare Advantage, a special program that speaks specifically to preventive care, coordinated care. People signed up for Medicare Advantage because there are advantages to being on Medicare Advantage. Yet this health care law that was crammed through this Senate is going to cut massively from Medicare Advantage.

One out of four people on Medicare is on Medicare Advantage, and they know why they have signed up for it. It is because of the advantages to them.

Mr. MCCAIN. May I ask one more question of my friend? This is kind of a

hometown issue, but 330,000 Arizona citizens who are enrolled in Medicare, who paid into Medicare all their working lives and have enrolled in this Medicare Advantage program which gives them choices are now going to have that severely impaired or eliminated. How does that happen? How is it when a program is offered to people who have paid into the system all their lives and they have chosen that Medicare Advantage program, and now it is going to be taken away from them. How does that work?

Mr. BARRASSO. It works when a Senate and a House of Representatives and a President think they know more than the American people. They say: We know what is best for you. We don't care what you think. That is what has happened.

Mr. MCCAIN. They have pledged basically to dismantle the Medicare Advantage program?

Mr. BARRASSO. Cut the funding so people on Medicare Advantage—who like it, who like the preventive medicine activities of it—are going to lose those opportunities.

Just since 2003, the number of seniors on Medicare Advantage grew from a little over 4 million to 11 million. That is because the seniors talk to one another, and they know what the best deal is for them, for their money, and for their health.

The seniors I know in Wyoming who signed up for this program said they want to make sure they have a number of these preventive services. Once they lose this, they are going to lose preventive services. They will have to pay more. The cost for people will go up, in spite of the promise made by the President that he was going to get down the cost of care.

Experts who have looked at this said: No, I am sorry, it is not going to work that way.

Mr. MCCAIN. May I ask the Senator one more question. Did he have a chance to examine the \$14 million—I believe it was \$14 million, \$18 million—

Mr. BARRASSO. The mailer.

Mr. MCCAIN. The mailer. I was trying to find a polite word—the mailer that was sent out to all Medicare enrollees and what conclusions he drew from that infomercial?

Mr. BARRASSO. To my colleague from Arizona, I did. I had a chance to look at that mailer sent out by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. I found it very misleading. Some have described it even as being a piece of propaganda.

The sad part is, it was paid for by the American taxpayers. The estimates for the cost have been \$16 to \$20 million of taxpayers' money to send out this piece of mail that essentially misleads, or tries to mislead—as my colleague from Arizona knows, the American people are too smart to be misled by this—it tries to mislead them into saying that this whole health care law is actually going to strengthen Medicare.

The seniors of this country clearly understand, as I know they do in Wyoming and Arizona, if you cut \$500 billion—a $\frac{1}{2}$ trillion—out of Medicare, not to save Medicare, not to save the program that is there for our seniors but to start a whole new government program, that is not going to improve Medicare. That is money seniors planned for, know it is in their system, and it is being taken from Medicare to start a whole new government program. It is not for them. It is not going to improve Medicare. It is not going to strengthen Medicare.

That is why from the beginning, to my colleague from Arizona, I said this bill, now the law for 90 days, is bad for patients, bad for payers—the American taxpayers who are going to end up stuck with the bill—and bad for the providers—the nurses and doctors who are trying to take care of these people.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank Dr. BARRASSO for his leadership on this issue. Those who are interested in his Web site, which is titled "Second Opinion," might be interested in gaining more information from that Web site. My colleagues might be interested in that.

I thank Dr. BARRASSO for his leadership on this issue, for his in depth knowledge of it. I noted the luncheon we had with the President of the United States. I applaud Dr. BARRASSO's attempts to inform the President on this issue. I am not sure how receptive the audience was to it, but what he had to say made a lot of sense to me.

I know Dr. BARRASSO shares my view that we are not going to quit on this issue. We are not going to quit on this issue. It is going to be repealed and replaced because we are not going to do this to the American people.

Still the overwhelming majority of the American people disapprove of this proposal. As the Speaker of the House said, we have to pass the bill so we can find out what is in it. As they are finding out what is in it, more and more Americans dislike it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to engage in a colloquy with my colleague from Arizona.

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

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, there has been a lot of conversation about the issue of illegal immigration and the results of different meetings. I

know my colleague from Arizona wishes to discuss that aspect of the issue, but I take to the floor with my friend and leader from Arizona to discuss the overall issue of immigration in light of a meeting and a trip he and I had to the border on Saturday, where we visited with ranchers, with citizens, with Border Patrol, and where we had a thorough trip throughout the area. So we come to the floor to share our conclusions and concerns with our colleagues.

Let me begin by saying that unfortunately—or fortunately—the head of the Customs and Border Protection recently said that parts of Arizona were like a “third country.” You know, in some respects—in some respects—he may have been correct. Let me quote him. This is David Aguilar, the Acting Deputy Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection. He was quoted in the Arizona Republic as saying:

the border is not a fence or a line in the dirt but a broadly complex corridor. It is . . . a third country that joins Mexico and the United States.

A third country that joins Mexico and the United States is obviously not as secure as the United States of America. If my colleagues will look at this map here and see this area here, this is the sign that is posted as far away as 50 miles from the Arizona-Mexico border.

Danger. Public Warning. Travel Not Recommended. Active Drug and Human Smuggling Area. Visitors May Encounter Armed Criminals and Smuggling Vehicles Traveling at High Rates of Speed. Stay Away From Trash, Clothing, Backpacks and Abandoned Vehicles. If You See Suspicious Activity, Do Not Confront. Move Away and Call 911. BLM Encourages Visitors to Use Public Lands North of Interstate 8.

North of Interstate 8 is the area north of this shaded area. In other words, visitors are encouraged not to go south of the interstate, which is a huge part of the State of Arizona. That is the posted sign put up by the Federal Government.

Then the Secretary of Homeland Security says, “The border is secure as ever.” If the border is as secure as ever, then you have to draw the conclusion that it isn’t secure, because otherwise you wouldn’t have to be posting signs such as this 50 miles north of the border, if the border was secure. Our whole point is that we need to get the border secure. We don’t see the necessity in the United States of America placing a sign such as that.

If we are doing fine on border security, why would it be necessary to put up a sign such as that all the way up to the interstate?

Here is another sign from our Park Service in the Coronado National Forest. This is in our national forest, from the Park Service.

Smuggling and/or Illegal Entry Is Common in This Area Due to the Proximity of the International Border.

If we had a secure border, why would we have to put up signs such as that? If we had made such great progress at that time the Secretary of Homeland

Security was trumpeting this, why in the world would we have to put up signs such as that? That is the question.

I will let my colleague discuss the results of our visit, but I can tell you that the citizens residing in the southern part of our State do not feel secure. When you have 241,000 illegal immigrants apprehended last year, that means that, depending on who you talk to, it is nearly a million people apprehended in just that part of the border. When you have 1.2 million pounds of marijuana intercepted in the Tucson sector, it is not a secure border. When you have the violence—the incredible violence—that continues to rise on the other side of the border, you know it is just a matter of time before it spills onto our side of the border.

Unfortunately, just south of the Arizona-Sonora border resides the most vicious of all the drug cartels—the Sinaloa cartel—headed by Juan “El Chapo” Guzman, who walked out of a Mexican prison a few years ago and, unfortunately, this cartel has corrupted officials at very high levels.

I report to my colleagues that the people living in the southern part of the State of Arizona do not feel secure. They see signs such as this one, which I mentioned; and they see the destruction of our wildlife preserves; they see the in-home invasions. And, yes, our Border Patrol and the men and women who are serving in it are doing a magnificent job. We are proud of the job they are doing. But they do not have the assets in order to complete the job of securing our border.

Senator KYL and I have a 10-point plan that, if implemented, will do the job.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, the stories we heard were human tragedies, and statistics don’t tell the story adequately. Let me cite a few of the statistics and then ask my colleague to recount some of the heartrending stories that we heard from families in the area. When we talk about that, he can point to the extreme southeast corner of the State of Arizona, where we were, primarily, on Saturday, and where most of these folks live on ranches—places that used to be very safe. Today, these folks do not feel they can sleep at night or move around without carrying weapons. They need to travel in pairs. This is the area in which an extraordinarily difficult tragedy occurred when a long-time resident of the area was slain, it is believed by one of the drug cartels or other smugglers who frequent the area.

The human tragedy is the real heart of this, but let me cite some statistics, because when the Secretary of Homeland Security says we are secure as we have ever been, I think these statistics would at least belie part of that claim.

About 50 percent of all illegal immigrants enter through Arizona. In fact, they enter through essentially the eastern one-third of that particular map. The number of illegal immigrants

living in Arizona increased over the last decade about twice, up to over 600,000 people. It is estimated that about 12 percent of Arizona’s workers are illegal immigrants. According to the Maricopa County Attorney’s office, about 12 percent of the county’s population and about 22 percent of felony crimes committed are committed by illegal immigrants.

My colleague has talked frequently about the fact that Phoenix, AZ, our hometown, is the second largest kidnapping capital of the world, and the largest in the United States—second in the world only to Mexico City.

We can go on and on about the statistics. We have the highest rate of property crime among the 50 States in the last year for which the FBI reported the statistics in 2008. Our sheriffs and other law enforcement tell us that between 15 and 20 percent of the individuals apprehended at the border have criminal records or are wanted for crimes in the United States.

Phoenix is a primary originating city, where drugs are brought from the border and held in Phoenix and then transported to other cities. We lead the Nation in marijuana seizures—50 percent. Heroin is increasingly found in Arizona, and on and on and on.

The statistics don’t lie, of course. But the real tragedy is the human tragedy—the fear that people have; people who are fourth or fifth generation ranch families in the area; people in town, who are increasingly the subject of break-ins and property crimes and the like.

But none of this even begins to talk about what happens when the people who are smuggled into the country, are held in drop houses—generally in the Phoenix area—for transport either west to Los Angeles or anywhere east in the country. They are essentially victimized by the very people who smuggle them in and who demand ransom from their families in Mexico, El Salvador, or Guatemala, or wherever they might have come from. And until they pay that ransom, they are brutalized and assaulted and become victims of crime themselves. And, of course, they rarely report that crime.

So the human tragedy here is the real story. But it is important for us to at least cite the statistics and show our colleagues the signs that the U.S. Government itself feels constrained to post in order to warn people to stay out of an area which encompasses probably about 20 percent of the State of Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. And may I also make the comment that my colleague from Arizona points to about the terrible and unspeakable treatment that is inflicted upon these individuals who are brought in by human smugglers. Almost all are brought up by human smugglers. Where are the human rights advocates and activists? Shouldn’t they be standing up and saying: You have to have a secure border so that these unspeakable indignities—the

rape and ransom and all these things—will be stopped?

Secondly, I want to point out very quickly to my colleagues that in recent years, 80 percent of the wildfires in our Coronado National Forest have been human caused—75 percent of those are attributed to undocumented aliens who fail to properly extinguish fires started to signal for rides, cook food, or dry clothing. The Coronado National Forest now has to send armed officers to clear wildland fire areas and to provide security for firefighters. The Forest Service has reported accounts of armed smugglers walking through the middle of active firefighting operations. And now, in its fourth week today, as we speak, the human-caused Horseshoe fire is burning in the Chiricahua Mountains in the Coronado National Forest, 5 miles from the town of Portal, AZ. It is the site of very heavy drug trafficking and border-crossing activity.

With the few minutes we have remaining, I want to engage Senator KYL in a conversation about what we need to do and why we need to secure the border first. There has been a lot of publicity in the last 24 hours about a conversation that Senator KYL had with the President of the United States. I was not there, but I was there a few weeks ago when the President of the United States came and had lunch with Republican Senators and gave a list of the issues that he was concerned about, with immigration being one of the items he mentioned. So Senator KYL and I responded to the President of the United States.

It was made very clear to me in the conversation we had—and I am sure our 39 other colleagues who were there will recall—that the President basically conditioned his support for border security to overall comprehensive immigration reform. We went back and forth. I tried to explain to the President that we gave amnesty back in the 1980s. Somewhere around 3 million illegal immigrants were given amnesty, but the promise was that we would secure the border. Obviously, we didn't secure the border and we now have 12 million people in the country. As Senator KYL mentioned, there are some hundreds of thousands in the State of Arizona illegally.

So our point is that even if we went through comprehensive immigration reform, if we don't have a secure border, then some time from now we will have another group of illegal immigrants we will have to address, and so the issue argues for getting the border secured first. It can be done in 1 or 2 years. It isn't that expensive, when you look at the costs of a wildfire and all of the things, drugs and everything else associated with it, not to mention a violation of human rights.

There is a big stir about the conversation the President and Senator KYL had. It was clear to me in the conversation, in front of 39 Republican Senators, that the President of the United States said yes, he would secure

the border, but we had to have "comprehensive immigration reform." This is the difference between our position and that of the President. We say secure the border, have the Governors of the border States certify it is secure, and then we can certainly move on. But the American people have to have the assurance that we are not going to revisit this issue time after time. Every nation has the obligation to secure its borders.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, when Senator MCCAIN and I asked the acting head of the Border Patrol in the area where we were on Saturday, what do you need, he basically said, "More of everything." He talked about the need for 800 more Border Patrol agents. He talked about the need for more surveillance—something Senator MCCAIN has talked about a lot, surveillance to cover a very big area where you are probably never going to have enough personnel even if we bring in National Guard troops. He welcomed the National Guard troops to the area. He said we are going to have to have consequences for people crossing. I talked to him about Operation Streamline. In the Yuma sector of the border, which is on the western part of the Arizona border, the Yuma sector is very close to being operationally clear of illegal immigration issues because they have enough agents, they have enough fencing. By the way, he talked about the need to repair and replace a lot of the fencing in his sector. But they also have a policy that, instead of catch and release, where the people are simply put on a bus and sent back to Mexico, they actually are prosecuted and have to spend at least 2 weeks in jail.

That is a huge deterrent. Because if you are a criminal, obviously you don't want to be caught and go to jail, and if you are here to work and send money back to your family, you are obviously not doing that if you spend time in jail. He said there have to be consequences. We believe the expenditure of somewhere between \$1 billion and \$3 billion over the next couple of years could provide adequate resources—this is our 10-point plan—adequate personnel, the fencing that is required, the surveillance, the technology, and also the extra prosecutors, courtroom, and detention spaces that would be necessary to provide the deterrent or the consequences, as he put it. There is no doubt the border can be secured. What we need is the will to do it.

Mr. MCCAIN. What Senator KYL and I are trying to report to our colleagues is, No. 1, the border is not secure. The border is not secure. No. 2, it can be secure. How could someone claim our border is more secure than ever if the Federal Government has to put up that kind of warning to American citizens on American soil? If nothing would convince my colleagues that we need to do a lot more, it is the actions of the Federal Government. That is not a private landowner who put up that sign. That is the Bureau of Land Manage-

ment. So have the Department of Interior and other agencies.

The point is, we are trying to tell our colleagues it is not secure. We can secure it. Our citizens deserve that.

But the second point we want to make as forcefully as possible is: Let's get this border secure, which we can do, and then we can move forward with comprehensive immigration reform and work together with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. But for us to go back to our constituents and to the American people, and say: Hey, we moved forward with this legislation, yet we still are having to put up signs such as this, that people should avoid being in an active drug and human smuggling area, in the United States of America, is not a convincing argument that they are "as secure" as ever.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, might I inquire how much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remains 6 minutes 18 seconds.

Mr. KYL. That is the time remaining on our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, what I wish to do is take about 3 more minutes and then my colleague can close.

As he said, if you need a different kind of reason to want to secure the border, then look at what is happening to our environment. I know the Presiding Officer—and his father before him—is keen on protecting the great national treasures of our country, our environment. Coming from adjoining States, we share a lot of the same kind of country. The area in the extreme southwestern part of his State and the extreme southeastern part of our State is known for some of the best birding in the world. The part of northern Mexico that borders our States provides a sanctuary for birds that are not found anywhere else in the world. This fire my colleague mentioned is burning right up to the creek which is one of the watersheds that represents the prime area for these birds to exist. Their habitat will be destroyed if we continue to have fires set by illegal immigrants in the area that destroy the habitat.

If you look at the environment of the area from the air, you see that there are thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of paths that are worn in parts of the desert that are basically off limits to American citizens and even to our law enforcement officials, but the smugglers use these trails and they deposit their trash. Everybody knows that once you have cut the desert, it takes hundreds—hundreds—of years for that desert to respond. That is just one reason.

Obviously the human tragedy is the one that is of most concern. If my colleagues would hear this one plaintive cry, we were told on numerous occasions on Saturday: Please, go back to Washington and tell your colleagues what it is like. Tell them how we are

suffering. Tell them what we have to go through just to live here. Can't our Government at least provide basic protection from crime? These are members of the family of Robert Krantz, who was brutally gunned down, and fellow ranchers in the area and other citizens who live in the small communities there. They believe their government has abandoned them. They look right into our eyes and say: What are you going to do about it?

The best we can do is to tell you the fear they have, the suffering they have gone through, the difficulty they have continuing to live in an area, as I said, in which some of their families have lived for four and five generations, to pass that message on to my colleagues and say: OK, if it is the environment you care about, there is a reason to be there; if it is crime, there is a huge reason to be there; if it is the cost to the Federal and State government, we need to get hold of this problem. But if you just care about the people who are there, we have an obligation as their representatives to assure their protection, and that is the message we are coming to the floor today to convey to our colleagues. Please listen, if not to us, to our constituents, and remember we all work for all of the people of the United States of America. We are all Senators. So every one of us here has an obligation to the folks—yes, in your State but also to the folks in our State—to at least provide them the basic protection and give them a sense that they do not live in a Third World country between the United States and Mexico; that they are American citizens deserving of the protection of the U.S. Government.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, there is no way I can elaborate on that very strong statement, so I yield the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

HOMELESS WOMEN VETERANS AND HOMELESS VETERANS WITH CHILDREN ACT

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. 1237, the Homeless Veterans and Other Veterans Health Care Authorities Act of 2010.

I just had the opportunity to meet with an amazing woman named Natalie and her two children who are actually here in Washington right now.

Natalie is currently living in Issaquah in my home State of Washington—but she has been through some tough times over the past few years.

She is a Navy veteran and a single mom. But she became homeless in 2007 when she couldn't find work and had to move out of the house she was staying in.

Like most moms, Natalie wanted nothing more than to provide her two children with the stable and loving home every family deserves—so she fought to secure transitional housing, and she was very fortunate to find a

program called Hopelink in Washington State that gave her the support she needed to get back on her feet.

Natalie is now back in stable housing, taking care of her children, and advancing in her nursing career—and she is here in Washington, DC, today to help make sure no other family has to face the challenges she overcame so bravely.

Unfortunately, not every family gets the support that Natalie's did.

Homeless women veterans and homeless veterans with children are two terribly vulnerable groups that are growing by the day.

Back in my home State of Washington, veterans service organizations and homeless providers have told me they are seeing more homeless veterans coming for help than ever before.

And, unfortunately, more and more of these veterans are women, have young children, or both.

In fact, female veterans are between two and four times as likely to be homeless than their civilian counterpart and they have unique needs and often require specialized services.

That is why I introduced the Homeless Women Veterans and Homeless Veterans with Children Act with Senator JACK REED and Senator TIM JOHN-SON.

This legislation would take three big steps forward toward tackling the serious problems facing this vulnerable group.

First of all, it would make more front-line homeless service providers eligible to receive special needs grants.

This would help organizations in Washington State and across the country help support families like Natalie's.

It would also expand special needs grants to cover homeless male veterans with children, as well as the dependents of homeless veterans themselves.

And it would extend the Department of Labor's Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program to provide workforce training, job counseling, child care services and placement services to homeless women veterans and homeless veterans with children.

It is so important that we not just provide immediate support—but that we also make sure our veterans have the resources and support they need to get back on their feet.

In addition to helping homeless veterans, S. 1237 also includes a number of other provisions aimed at supporting our nation's heroes.

It extends eligibility to health care for certain veterans with disabilities who served in the Persian Gulf war.

It would establish a medical center report card to allow veterans and their families access to transparent performance comparisons between VA facilities and between VA and non-VA sites.

And it would direct the VA to enable State veterans' homes to admit parents who had a child die while serving in the Armed Forces.

This is a very personal issue for me. Growing up, I saw firsthand the many ways military service can affect both veterans and their families.

My dad served in World War II and was among the first soldiers to land on Okinawa. He came home as a disabled veteran and was awarded the Purple Heart.

Like many soldiers of his generation, my father didn't talk about his experiences during the war. In fact, we only really learned about them by reading his journals after he passed away.

And I think that experience offers a larger lesson about veterans in general. They are reluctant to call attention to their service, and they are reluctant to ask for help.

That is why we have to publicly recognize their sacrifices and contributions.

It is up to us to make sure that they get the recognition they have earned.

And it is up to us to guarantee that they get the services and support they deserve.

This bill passed through the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee with strong bipartisan support, and that is how it should be, because supporting our veterans shouldn't be about politics—it should be about what kind of country we want the United States to be and about what our priorities are as a nation.

In his second inaugural address in 1865, President Lincoln said our Nation had an obligation to "care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow, and his orphan."

Now, in 2010, I believe we not only need to care for him—we need to care for her and for his and her families and for every man and woman coming home after serving our country so bravely.

That is why I am proud to stand here today for Natalie, her children, and families just like hers across the country—to urge my colleagues to support S. 1237, the Homeless Veterans and Other Veterans Health Care Authorities Act of 2010.

I hope we can pass this expeditiously off the floor and get these services out to the men and women who have served us all so well.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business.

METRO SAFETY

Ms. MIKULSKI. What morning business this is. For those of us in the National Capital region, this is indeed a very solemn day. One year ago today, nine people died on Washington's