

There is a program called the Nunn-Lugar Program, which is named after former Senator Sam Nunn and our current distinguished colleague, Senator LUGAR. It is a program that I very strongly support. It makes a great deal of sense. That program actually destroys nuclear warheads and delivery systems that are made excess through the various arms control treaties.

For example, in my desk I have a piece of metal which I would like to show by unanimous consent.

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

Mr. DORGAN. This piece of metal belonged to a Soviet bomber. This was part of a wing strut on a Soviet bomber. Presumably, this bomber, belonging to the Soviet Union, carried nuclear weapons that could have been dropped on a target here in the United States of America.

How is it that a Senator on the floor of the Senate has a metal piece from a Soviet bomber? Well, simple. This bomber had its wings sawed off and its fuselage destroyed. How? The U.S. paid for it. We did not shoot the bomber down. This was not the result of hostilities. This was the result of an agreement between our country and the old Soviet Union, now Russia, to actually reduce delivery vehicles, bombers, missiles, submarines, and to actually reduce the number of nuclear weapons.

So that is how I come to hold in my hand a piece of metal that belonged to a Soviet bomber, and then Russian bomber, that would carry nuclear weapons that would have threatened this country.

Mr. President, I show you this little tube of ground copper. This used to be in a submarine that carried nuclear weapons on behalf of the old Soviet Union and then Russia. Those nuclear weapons were all aimed at this country, thousands of them. Well, this submarine does not carry nuclear weapons anymore. It was dismantled and destroyed. And I have here, on the floor of the Senate, a piece of ground up copper from the wiring of an old Soviet submarine.

That makes a lot of sense to me. We are actually reducing the threat by reducing the number of delivery vehicles, bombers, submarines, missiles, and dismantling the number of warheads.

We have been engaged in that for the last 10 years or so. And I would like to especially say my colleagues, Senator LUGAR and Senator Nunn, proposed a program by which we did not have to sink a Soviet submarine and we did not have to shoot down a Soviet bomber in order to destroy weapons of mass destruction and their delivery vehicles. We paid for their destruction with large circular saws and with devices in shipyards that destroyed their submarine by agreement.

By contrast, the agreement that comes to the floor of the Senate this week is kind of a marshmallow. It does not do anything. It is full of air. It says: Oh, let's have each side put more

of their nuclear weapons in storage and then pretend we have reduced the number of nuclear weapons. Well, I thought pretend was all about children's books; it is not about the serious business of nuclear arms control.

There was a rumor, some long while ago, that a terrorist organization had stolen a nuclear weapon and was set to detonate it in a U.S. city. The interesting thing about that rumor was that the intelligence community did not view it as incredible that a nuclear weapon could have been stolen. After all, there were thousands and thousands and thousands in the world, most possessed by two countries—ours and also now Russia.

So our intelligence community did not believe it was an incredible threat. They believed it was entirely possible someone could have stolen a weapon, particularly from the Russian arsenal that does not have great command and control, I have heard and I have been told. And secondly, it was not something beyond the bounds of reality that, having stolen a nuclear weapon, a terrorist organization would know how to detonate it or could detonate it.

If ever there needed to be a sober moment, that was it.

For us to think that the potential stealing of one nuclear weapon, and put in the wrong hands—the hands of terrorists—would threaten this country, or any city in this country, ought to lead us to understand that if we are worried about one nuclear weapon, we ought to be worried about thousands and thousands and thousands of nuclear weapons.

With both strategic and theater nuclear weapons, there are perhaps as many as 25,000 to 30,000 nuclear weapons in this world. And what are we going to do this week? We are going to come and talk about how we shuffle the inventory of nuclear weapons from one place to another, destroying none of them, and then saying: We have an agreement. What a great agreement. By the year 2012, we will have moved nuclear weapons into storage facilities. And the world is safer.

Oh, really? How?

At the same time all of this is occurring, there is a fundamental shift occurring, in addition, with respect to the discussion about nuclear weapons. This administration says: We do not want to continue the antiballistic missile treaty—which has been the center pole of the tent of arms control.

Instead, this administration says: We want to talk about and consider the possibility of developing new designer nuclear weapons; for example, bunker buster nuclear weapons.

This administration, and many in this Congress—too many in this Senate—said: We do not support the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty—despite the fact that we have not tested a nuclear weapon for well over a decade.

There is a fundamental shift going on. This administration has said: We

have not ruled out the use of nuclear weapons in certain circumstances. I will not go into them, but they have been in the newspapers.

I think our responsibility—of all countries in the world—is to be a leader in trying to reduce the number of nuclear weapons in this world, and to try to convince everyone and anyone that no one shall ever again explode a nuclear weapon in anger.

Pakistan and India both have nuclear weapons. They do not like each other. They have been exchanging weapons fire across the border with respect to Kashmir. Both have nuclear weapons. Do we want, in any way, to signal that the use of nuclear weapons, in any circumstance, is appropriate? Do we want to signal that we actually have a desire to begin producing new types of nuclear weapons, such as bunker buster nuclear weapons?

I think this country has chosen the wrong path with respect to these policies. We ought to be debating on the floor of the Senate something that has grip to it, something that says: Look, as a world leader, it is our determination to stop the spread of nuclear weapons, and to stop the spread now. And we are going to do that.

We ought to be saying: It is our judgment that we want to reduce the stockpile of nuclear weapons in this world. And we want to be a leader in doing that. We just have to assume that leadership responsibility.

#### A PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT FOR SENIORS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, having said that, I want to mention two additional quick items.

We have had a discussion, and will have a discussion, about the subject of Medicare. It will be a significant issue in this Congress, and should be. We have been talking, for a long while, about the health needs of senior citizens who do not have access to prescription drugs because they are too expensive. Too many senior citizens are told: You must take prescription drugs for these ailments you have; and they discover: Well, I can't take prescription drugs. I don't have the money.

Republicans and Democrats have been debating how to add a prescription drug benefit to the Medicare plan. Today I see the President is going to send us a proposal that says we would like to give everybody a discount card who would qualify under Medicare, and then say to others, if they want to get some real help for real prescription drug coverage, they have to join an HMO or a managed care organization. That doesn't make any sense to me as a matter of public policy. We need to put downward pressure on prescription drug prices first and foremost.

Second, I believe we ought to provide a prescription drug benefit in the Medicare Program. If we were writing that program today, we would do that. I

don't think we ought to hinge that on the requirement that someone join an HMO.

I have been in the Chamber telling stories for 3, 4 years about what is happening to HMOs. Some of them are wonderful. But the construct of an HMO says to a senior citizen: By the way, here is your doctor. We will choose your doctor. You don't get to go to the doctor of your choice. Here is the doctor available for you. By the way, in too many circumstances, we have seen that in many of those organizations, major health care is a function of profit and loss.

I told the story, when we debated a Patients' Bill of Rights, about an HMO. A woman fell off a cliff in the Shenandoah Mountains. She was injured badly, had a long fall, broke many bones, had internal injuries. She was taken to a hospital in a coma. As she was wheeled into the hospital room on a gurney, there was a question whether she would survive. She did survive. It took a long while. Month after month, she finally convalesced and survived.

Her HMO told her: We will not pay for your emergency room treatment because you didn't have prior approval for emergency room use.

This is a woman hauled into the emergency room in a coma and was told: You don't get paid for the emergency room because you didn't get prior approval. Is that nuts? Of course it is. That is exactly what happened to this woman because somebody was looking at her in terms of profit and loss. That is not the way someone's person or body should be presented in the medical system. This is not profit and loss. It is about saving lives.

To say to senior citizens we will help them with the cost of prescription drugs but only if they go into an HMO or a managed care organization does not make much sense to me. This Congress can do better than that. We must do better.

#### TRADE DEFICIT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I also want to mention something I talked about yesterday. That is on the subject of the trade deficit. My colleagues know that we face a fiscal policy budget deficit of well over \$400 billion this year, and we also face at the same time the largest trade deficit in American history, \$470 billion; over \$400 billion in our budget deficit and \$470 billion in our merchandise trade deficit in the past year. That is nearing \$1 trillion in combined deficits for our country.

I don't know. I thought that we were about to enter a period of fiscal responsibility. Two years ago we had what was alleged to be surpluses as far as the eye could see. It was good times; following the 1990s, budget surpluses nearly forever. The fact is, now we see budget deficits that exhaust all of our patience as far as the eye can see; spending money we don't have, in some cases on things we don't need, year

after year after year. It won't go away because we ignore it. We ignore it at our peril. We ought to deal with both.

We are preparing for armed conflict. Our thoughts and prayers go with those who wear this country's uniform. We face severe and stiff challenges in foreign policy with North Korea, Iraq, the threat of terrorism against our homeland, and the war against terrorism abroad.

At the same time that exists, we have an economy that is stuttering and in trouble. Then we are told that on top of fiscal policy, budget deficits of over \$400 billion in this year, at a time when we increased defense spending by \$45 billion, increased homeland security spending by over \$30 billion, we are told at the same time by the President that he wants a tax cut of \$675 billion over the next 10 years on a permanent basis.

I don't understand how that adds up. Then, in addition to that fiscal policy dealing with the Federal budget, we have these abiding trade deficits. Those deficits at their root are about jobs.

It is about jobs that used to be here that are no longer. Millions of people are out of work and their jobs are elsewhere. We have a large trade deficit with China. Most people don't know that our trade deficit with China is now over \$100 billion a year. China sends us all their trinkets, trousers, shirts, shoes. They flood our market with Chinese goods. Then we try to get goods into China, and their markets are not very open to ours.

Our trade negotiators negotiated an agreement with China and everybody said we have a bilateral agreement with China. I don't know who negotiated it. I would love to get names and pictures so I could give them credit. They apparently, in a room with the Chinese, negotiated a circumstance that said, in the future, when we have trade with automobiles from the United States and China—and incidentally this is a country with 1.3 billion people who will need a lot of cars—when we have an agreement with China on the trade of automobiles, we will agree, our negotiators said, to allow China to have a tariff that is 10 times higher in China on automobiles than we will have on Chinese cars coming to the U.S.

Our Government said: We will agree to have a tariff on U.S. cars being sold in the country of China that is 10 times higher than the tariff that would be imposed on a Chinese car sold in the United States. Does that make sense? It doesn't.

My point is, the root of all of this is about jobs, about economic opportunity. Our economy is not going to get well unless it has some resurrection of strength in the manufacturing sector. We are, every day in every way, trading away manufacturing jobs.

The trade ambassador said: We are losing manufacturing jobs, but we have cable television.

I don't understand that at all. Where does a statement like that come from?

We lose some manufacturing plant and pick up some cable television signals? Good for cable television. But the fact is, it is not a replacement for manufacturing. No country will remain a strong international economic competitor if its sector dissipates. That has been happening.

I talked yesterday about the workers abroad with whom American workers are required to compete: Those who make 14 cents an hour—and, yes, they do—at age 14, working 14 hours a day—yes, they do employ those people in some parts of the world. Then the product of their labor is sent to Pittsburgh, Denver, Los Angeles, Fargo, Topeka. It goes on the store shelf, and it is all about profit.

People say: Isn't that wonderful for the consumer to have a lower priced product? It is not such a lower priced product. It is just that the people who used to have the income to buy it lost their job when the plant went overseas.

I also made a mistake yesterday. I mentioned the companies that renounced their American citizenship to save on taxes. They not only moved their plant overseas, but they renounced their American citizenship so they could save on taxes. I talked about them becoming Bahamian citizens. I should have said Bermuda. I guess some of them become citizens of the Bahamas, but it is more typical that they became citizens of Bermuda. The Bahamas has a navy with 26 people—I guess that is the Bermuda Navy. I want to correct that. The Bermuda Navy has 26 people.

So if an American company that wants to become a citizen in Bermuda and renounce its citizenship runs into trouble someplace, and some disparate country out there decides to expropriate the assets of this company that used to be American, but is now Bermudan, my feeling is, when they say let's call out the navy, I think they should call Bermuda and say call out your 26-member navy.

One of these companies actually had one ship grounded on a sand bar near Cuba. Would you please call out the navy to help? That is what we ought to tell them to do the next time they need assistance.

We have public policies both in fiscal policy dealing with the Federal budget and in trade policies that are in desperate need of attention. There is no attention paid to it at all at this moment, except for some of us in the Congress who want to see if we can do a U-turn on some of these policies and put us back on track towards more economic growth and more jobs for this country. The sooner we get to that real debate, the better.

This economy of ours can't run on paper. It can't run on promises. This economy needs a shot in the arm by a Congress that is willing to stand up to these issues and say: Our fiscal policy doesn't add up.

I come from a very small school. My senior class was 9; 40 kids in all four