SENATOR-ELECT SCOTT BROWN

Mr. REID. Madam President, I had a good conversation with Senator-elect SCOTT BROWN yesterday. He is coming to Washington today. I look forward to visiting with him. We have a time set for him to come by my office.

In my conversation with him, he seemed very pleasant and excited about coming to Washington, which I am sure he is. We talked about his daughter going to Syracuse and the fact that JOE BIDEN graduated from Syracuse, and he knew that. I look forward to our meeting with him.

THE NIGERIAN TERRORIST

Mr. REID. Madam President, I will speak briefly on the statement of my friend, the senior Senator from Kentucky, about the Nigerian terrorist.

The one thing we need not do is politicize the fight against terrorism. John Brennan did testify yesterday in our classified briefing. It was classified. The things that took place there should be classified. People should not be talking about it. The reason that is the case is that we want people who come to classified briefings to be able to speak freely.

We have had a long history in our country of people who commit crimes on our territory in the United States being tried in the United States, including Richard Reid, the shoe bomber. It isn't as if this is the first time something like this happened. Even though they are proceeding under civil courts, they can always drop back and fall into the category of war criminals if, in fact, that choice is made. Just because they are going forward in this manner today doesn't mean they cannot drop back in some other manner at a subsequent time.

Even though I don't like to discuss what went on in a closed briefing, in a classified setting, I was there from the very beginning to the very end of Mr. Brennan's presentation. I never heard him refuse to answer. In fact, he answered the question that was asked in a number of different ways by my friend, the Republican leader, and another Republican Senator. So if there are any questions about anything that Mr. Brennan had to say, I hope that those questions will be asked directly to him. We have had some open hearings.

My point is that there is a war on terror taking place now. I tried to be as supportive of President Bush during his years as President when this was going on after 9/11. I hope my Republican colleagues will be supportive of President Obama. This is not a partisan issue.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, this morning, following leader remarks, the Senate will proceed to a period of morning business for an hour, with Senators allowed to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each. That time will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. The Republicans will control the first half; the majority will control the final half. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 45, a joint resolution increasing the statutory limit on the public debt. Currently, we have three amendments pending. We hope we can reach short time agreements so we can schedule votes on these amendments.

MEASURE PLACED ON CALENDAR—S. 2939

Mr. REID. Madam President, I understand that S. 2939, which was introduced by Senator DEMINT, is at the desk and is due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the title of the bill for a second time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2939) to amend title 31, United States Code to require an audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I object to any further proceedings on this bill at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard, and the bill will be placed on the calendar under rule XIV.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period of morning business for 1 hour, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half.

The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, during our recent health care debate I heard a number of times from our friends on the other side of the aisle this question: What are Republicans for?

Well, they will wait a long time if they are waiting for the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, to roll into the Senate a wheelbarrow filled with a 2,700-page Republican comprehensive health care bill or, for that matter, a 1,200-page climate change bill or a 900-page immigration bill.

If you have been listening carefully to the Senate debate, you will know that on health care, as well as on clean energy, debt reduction, and immigration, for example, Republicans have been offering the following alternative to 1,000-page bills: going step by step in the right direction to solve problems in a way that re-earns the trust of the American people.

Comprehensive immigration, comprehensive climate change, and comprehensive health care bills have been well intended, but the first two fell of their own weight, and health care, if enacted, would be a historic mistake for our country and a political kamikaze mission for Democrats.

What has united most Republicans against these three bills has not only been ideology but also that they were comprehensive. As George Will might write: ''The Congress. Does. Not. Do. Comprehensive. Well.''

Two recent articles help explain the difference between the Democratic comprehensive approach and the Republican step-by-step approach.

The first, which appeared in the new journal, National Affairs, and was written by William Schambra of the Hudson Institute, explains the ''sheer ambition'' of President Obama's legislative agenda as the approach of what Mr. Schambra calls a ''policy President.''

Mr. Schambra says the President and most of his advisers have been trained at elite universities to govern by launching ''a host of enormous initiatives all at once . . . formulating comprehensive policies aimed at giving large social systems—and indeed society itself—more rational and coherent forms of functions.''

This is governing by taking big bites of several big apples and trying to swallow them all at once. In addition, according to Mr. Schambra, the most prominent organizational feature of the Obama administration is its reliance on ''czars''—more than the Romanovs, said one blogger—to manage broad areas of policy. In this view, systemic problems of health care, of energy, of education, and of the environment simply can't be solved in pieces.

Analyzing the article, David Broder of the Washington Post wrote this:

Historically, that approach has not worked. The progressives failed to gain more than a brief ascendency and the Carter and Clinton presidencies were marked by striking policy failures.

The reason for these failures, as Broder paraphrased Schambra, is that ''this highly rational comprehensive approach fits uncomfortably with the Constitution, which apportions power among so many different players.'' Broder then adds this:

Democracy and representative government are a lot messier than the progressives and their heirs, including Obama, want to admit.

James Q. Wilson, a scholar, writing in a memorial essay honoring Irving Kristol in the Wall Street Journal a few months ago, says the law of unintended consequences is what causes the failure of such comprehensive legislative schemes. Explains Wilson: