

They always come back and say: We have to ensure public safety. Of course they have to ensure public safety, but there are various ways to do that. They do not have to put up physical barriers across the dam. So they are on a path to take \$2.6 million, during a time of sequester, that is needed for other projects to build these monstrosities across the river below these 10 dams.

Up to now it has been mostly those of us in Congress who registered the complaints of the men and women who like to fish. I went to a rally at Old Hickory Lake about a month ago. There were a lot of people there. They were not of any particular party, I would say. They were tea party, environmentalist, outdoors men and women, retired Corps of Engineers people, a lot of grandparents—people were mad because they fished there with their grandchildren and wanted to keep doing it. Then I went up to Kentucky to Lake Barkley a week ago with Senator McCONNELL, Senator PAUL, and Congressman WHITFIELD and found the same sort of thing there.

The argument is that it is unsafe. Of course it is unsafe when the water is spilling through the dam. That is about 20 percent of the time. The rest of the time it is safe. Restricting fishing below the dams 100 percent of the time when it is only dangerous 20 percent of the time is like keeping the crossing gate down over the railroad track 100 percent of the time. We could do that. I think we have nearly 130,000 railroad crossings, but if we had a gate down on them all the time we could never go anywhere. People expect drivers to have enough sense to stay off the track when the train is coming. The track is not dangerous when the train is not coming and the water is not dangerous for fishing when it is not spilling through the dam.

One reason we are outdoorsmen in this country—and the great American outdoors is a part of the American character and our ethic—is we want to go outside and evaluate the risk. We want to be on our own. We want to be able to make decisions. We don't want a government that is so all powerful and all knowing that it makes it risk free when we go into the great American outdoors.

Now we have an additional voice that comes from the Democratic side of the aisle, and more important from the legal side. The Corps of Engineers, in talking with me, said: You know, we have legal liability. Here is an article that was in the Tennessean yesterday about the comments of Jerry Martin, the U.S. attorney for the Middle District of Tennessee, who retired last week. He was appointed by President Obama as a leading Democrat in the area. This is the U.S. attorney position that was first held by Andrew Jackson at one time. This is what the article said:

Responding to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' proposal to limit fishing on dams along the Cumberland River and its tribu-

taries in Kentucky, former U.S. Attorney Jerry Martin said that the Corps' plan is not worth the effort.

Martin, who just weeks ago would have been responsible with carrying out the Corps' wishes, said the Tennessee Valley Authority's siren system, which goes off when water is released from the dams, is enough to ensure public safety.

The Corps has proposed barriers along the river that would limit fishing access, citing safety concerns. Detractors say the move could cost millions of tourism dollars every year.

"These waters belong to the citizens," Martin, who was appointed by President Barack Obama in 2010, said in a prepared statement. "In light of the tremendous protection from liability enjoyed by the Corps, I don't think it's reasonable for the Corps to ban everyone at all times from these public places.

I am concluding my remarks because I see the Senator from Wyoming has arrived.

Let's stop and think about this a minute. The Corps of Engineers now already has everybody in Tennessee of any political stripe saying: You are taking an unreasonable step. They have the wildlife agencies of Tennessee and Kentucky saying: We would like to work with you to help you do a better job of ensuring safety below the dams when the water is spilling through the dams, which is 20 percent of the time. We have the Tennessee Valley Authority with dams on the Tennessee River, which makes the Cumberland look like a stream, and the TVA allows fishing below the dams. It has sirens, it has signs, it has whistles. It assumes people are wise enough not to roll up just below the dam when the water is spilling through it. Just like we assume we are wise enough, if we put on a siren and put on the red lights, not to sit on the railroad tracks when a train is coming.

Now the former lawyer who would have been responsible for defending the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in a liability case says:

These waters belong to the citizens. In light of the tremendous protection from liability enjoyed by the Corps, I do not believe it is reasonable for the Corps to ban everyone at all times from these public places.

I call on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to recognize the voices of the people of our country—all over the country—who fish below these dams and accept the offer of the two States, Kentucky and Tennessee, to work with the corps to develop a reasonable attitude, a reasonable way of ensuring public safety for fishing below the dams. That is our opinion. We will pass a law to make it happen if we have to, but given the statement, especially of the retired U.S. attorney, Jerry Martin, who would have been the corps's lawyer in defending lawsuits about this, the corps needs to change its mind, act reasonably, and spend that \$2.6 million on some more needed project.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The Senator from Wyoming.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, recently the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Kathleen Sebelius, gave a speech in which she said she didn't realize how complicated it would be to implement the President's health care law. She didn't attribute this to all of the flaws that all of us know are in the law. The only problems she could see were because, she said, of Republican opposition.

Here is how one newspaper, Investor's Business Daily, described it: "Blaming GOP for ObamaCare."

The article goes through a list of problems with the law saying it is and it continues to be "unpopular," "expensive," "ill-conceived" and "poorly written."

Democrats in Congress and the administration do not seem to be interested in admitting that there are flaws in their law. They are only interested in trying to make sure someone else takes the blame for their huge mistake. The question is, Are Republicans opposed to this law? Of course we are because it is a terrible law. Democrats know how much of a mess this law is too. Some of them are even finally willing to admit it.

Last week the Senate Finance Committee held a hearing on President Obama's budget for the next fiscal year. Secretary Sebelius testified at that hearing. I wish to read from an article in The Hill newspaper about what happened. The article is entitled: "Baucus warns of 'huge train wreck' in enacting ObamaCare provisions." A huge train wreck. The article identifies Senator BAUCUS as "a key architect of the President's health care law" and quotes him telling Secretary Sebelius: "I just see a huge train wreck coming down." He added: "You and I have discussed this many times, and I don't see any results yet."

It also quotes the Senator saying: "Small businesses have no idea what to do, what to expect."

I agree with Senator BAUCUS. Businesses do have no idea what to expect, and this health care law is a train wreck.

So what does this mean in the real world? It is causing businesses to avoid hiring or to cut back hours. There are new headlines on this every day. Here is what one said last week: "Nation's biggest movie theater chain cuts work-week, blaming ObamaCare."

Regal entertainment has more than 500 movie theaters in 38 different States. Last month it began cutting shifts for employees to 30 hours a week. That is the cutoff under the health care law where an employer has to provide health insurance. The company sent out a memo to its employees explaining why it had to cut shifts. It said:

To comply with the Affordable Care Act, Regal had to increase our health care budget to cover those newly deemed eligible based on the law's definition of a full time employee.

One theater manager said they have had a wave of resignations from managers who have seen their hours cut by 25 percent.

He said:

In the last couple of weeks, managers have been quitting on a daily basis from various locations to try and find full-time work. Mandating businesses to offer health care under threat of debilitating fines doesn't fix the problem, it creates one.

We already had 22 million people in this country who either can't find a job or can't find the full-time work they want. Now we have even more hard-working Americans whose hours are being cut because of the unreasonable burdens of the President's health care law. That is what this law does to jobs in America. That is what the coming health care train wreck looks like.

Here is another headline, this one from the New York Times over the weekend. It is on page 1. At the top of the page is the news about the capture of the second bomber. At the bottom of page 1: "Part-Time Work Becomes Full-Time Waits for Better Job." Part-time work is a full-time wait for a better job. The article talks about exactly this problem of people who want full-time work but can only find part-time work.

The article specifically cites the health care law as a reason why so many people are having trouble. It quotes one economist saying:

There is another reason to believe that part-time employment will stay higher for longer, namely, the incentives to employ part-time workers created by Obama's health care reforms.

The article goes on to add: "Confusion about the law and its requirements abounds."

That is the same point Senator BAUCUS made. Businesses don't know what to expect, people don't know what is going to happen and it is hurting families and it is holding down our economy. Again, that is what the health care train wreck looks like.

The train wreck also means the health care law is going to be very hard on family finances. It is going to increase how much people have to spend for insurance and care. A study by the Society of Actuaries says costs for health claims will go up an average of 32 percent—a 32-percent average increase across the country. Those higher costs are going to be passed along to consumers. That means more money out of the pockets of hard-working people, and that is going to be money they can't afford to lose right now.

We got another sign of the coming health care train wreck when President Obama finally released his budget for the next fiscal year. Of course, it came in over 2 months late. That is later than any other President who was already in office at the beginning of the year.

Why did it take so long? President Obama certainly didn't use the extra time to come up with any sort of a plan to stabilize the Nation's finances. In-

stead, he continues to add to the debt burden of America's children and makes it harder for Americans of all ages to achieve their dreams. Deficits continue far into the future. The President also offered no real entitlement reform and no plan to grow America's stagnant economy. President Obama is truly budgeting from behind.

What is interesting about his budget, though, is not just how late it is; it isn't just what that says about the lack of leadership from the White House. What is also very interesting is what this budget says about the coming train wreck of the President's own health care law.

The train wreck is coming not just because the President's health care law is unaffordable for families; it is also unaffordable for the taxpayers of this country. The President's budget fails to slow down Washington spending, but it is also dishonest about how much of a budget buster his health care law will be.

In fact, the administration has used a lot of smoke and mirrors to try to hide the true costs of the health care law. Here is how the Associated Press put it. They ran an article entitled "Tracking Obama's health law in budget isn't easy." The article points out that the President's budget includes no chapter, no table, not even a mention of what all the health care spending adds up to.

This Associated Press article quotes Bill Hoagland, who is a senior vice president at the Bipartisan Policy Center. He says: "I'm sure somebody has a spreadsheet somewhere, but clearly they are not publishing it in this budget."

The Obama administration knows that if they spelled out exactly how much this law is costing, the American people would be outraged.

So what do we know about the cost of the health care law? We know the President wants almost \$975 billion for the Department of Health and Human Services next year. It is a budget increase of over \$100 billion since just last year—an 11.5-percent increase. The health care law was supposed to help slow down the growth in spending. Instead, it is using taxpayer dollars to fuel the fire, and it is powering us toward the coming train wreck faster than ever.

Part of the money would go to pay for 3,000 more Washington bureaucrats at Health and Human Services. That kind of increase in Washington spending is not something the American people need, and it is not anywhere close to what we as a nation can afford.

In another part of the budget, it says Washington needs \$32 billion to pay for what the administration calls premium assistance credits. Those are the subsidies to help people pay for the new insurance they are going to have to get under the President's health care law. That is taking \$32 billion from taxpayers to help hide how unaffordable this health care law is for families. The President says that 10 years from now

this \$32 billion will grow to \$118 billion a year. That is a train wreck.

What else does the President want? He wants \$772 million for administrative costs at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. That is going to pay for more than 4,600 bureaucrats.

When I talk to people about their health care concerns, nobody has ever told me—and I am a doctor; I have practiced for over two decades in Wyoming and I was home this weekend at a health care fair—nobody has ever told me the problem is we don't have enough Washington bureaucrats. I have never heard that, not even once.

Still, that is exactly what we are going to get under the President's budget and under this health care law: costs going up instead of down; debt going up, not down; the Washington bureaucracy getting bigger and bigger. That is a train wreck.

The President's budget also asks for \$440 million for the IRS to administer the health care law. That is \$440 million the IRS would not need if Democrats had not forced this law on the American people. The Internal Revenue Service is going to need 1,954 more employees just to implement the health care law, not more doctors, not more nurses—1,954 more IRS employees. That is just the beginning of what the agency is going to be asking for in the next few years. We are going to see an army of new IRS agents and auditors to investigate the health insurance choices of Americans and their families.

The Obama administration isn't worried about all that power in the hands of those IRS agents. It is not worried about how unaffordable the health care law is for taxpayers. The only thing this administration seems to worry about is who is going to take the blame for the train wreck we all know is coming right around the corner.

The President's health care law is bad for our economy, it is bad for consumers, it is bad for patients, and it is bad for the health care providers of our Nation.

Now the President's budget makes clear his health care law is also very bad for hard-working American taxpayers. The people wanted real health care reform, but Washington Democrats instead gave them a train wreck.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.