

policy professor at Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York City.

If Bush's proposal were enacted, it could provide a high-profile benefit for industries that are reliable donors to Republican candidates and committees. The Center for Responsive Politics said that for the past two elections combined, pharmaceutical manufacturers gave \$30 million to Republicans and \$8 million to Democrats.

Health service companies and HMOs, a leading form of managed care, donated \$10 million to Republicans and \$5 million to Democrats over the past two elections, according to the center's figures.

This should be a deep concern of every American, as well as my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and on the other side of this building about how this issue is being framed because of the realities it points out what is really going on with this issue.

I will make one more point. The article continues, quoting President Bush yesterday:

Bush, promising to bring more free enterprise to medicine, denounced "government-run health care ideas."

I have been saying for a long time that those who want to privatize Medicare believe that Medicare is a big Government-run program, and there is a major philosophical difference that has gone on since 1965 when only 12 colleagues from the other side of the aisle joined in passing Medicare. There is a huge chasm of difference as to whether we ought to even have Medicare.

Fundamentally, that is what this debate is about. It is not about what the premiums should be, what the copay should be. It is about who runs the system as to whether there should be a guarantee so that every person who turns 65 and gets that Medicare card knows they can choose their doctor, that they can get the medicine they need, that they know what the copay is, what the premium is, regardless of where they live in the country.

In a State such as Michigan, where we have the major metropolitan area of Detroit all the way up to Ironwood, MI, in the western part of the UP, people today know that under Medicare they can get the health care they need. That was a promise made by the United States of America in 1965, and now under a lot of different pretty words, a lot of different connotations of reform, we see an effort clearly outlined—and even in the President's own words—to put more free enterprise into the health care system. That is privatizing the health care system. That is privatizing Medicare.

In general, I do believe there is an important partnership between the public and the private sector. We have an employer model of health care in this country that has worked for workers and their families. I appreciate there is a benefit in having partnerships.

We have said as a country that once an American citizen reaches the age of 65 or they are disabled, we think it is important that whether one has private plans in their community, wheth-

er they can find them and/or whether they can afford them, they should be able to have health care. The reason Medicare came into being was that over half the seniors could not find or afford private insurance. That is why Medicare was created.

I, for one, will not quietly stand by to see a promise of some 38 years eroded by this administration or in this Congress. I know there are colleagues of mine on both sides of the aisle who have concerns. I am hopeful we can come together under Medicare.

What is very clear is—and in this article the outside analysts, independent voices, are saying—the fight is about how we administer the prescription drug benefit. The companies want to keep it disbursed in the private sector because they know if the some 40 million beneficiaries of Medicare today are in one insurance plan, they will be able to negotiate a group discount for the first time. They will not be paying retail. They will not be paying the highest prices in the world in order to get their medicine. They will be able to get a group discount.

The fight is on to make sure that seniors in this country do not have the collective power to be able to get that discount through Medicare. That is what this is about. It is one of the most fundamental fights we will have in this Congress and on the floor of the Senate, and I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will come together and be willing to stand up and say Medicare works, Medicare is a great American success story, and we continue to promise that the Medicare plan will be there for every single senior and the disabled in our country.

This is a fundamental fight, and I hope my colleagues will join me in making sure this plan that is passed is not a boon for the drug companies or for the HMOs but is a boon for the seniors of America.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS

Ms. STABENOW. I move now to another very important topic, and that is the question of stimulating this economy. We know that to get out of the massive debt that is being accumulated, we have got to stimulate the economy. We have to reverse the trend right now. We have seen over 2 million private sector jobs lost in the last 2 years. We have to go back to the Eisenhower Presidency to find those kinds of numbers, those kinds of huge private sector losses and this massive debt. We know that has to be turned around.

Part of what needs to happen to begin to get us back to the balanced budget and out of this massive debt, so we can protect Social Security and Medicare, is to stimulate the economy and create jobs. I am very proud to be a part of an effort to do that.

We have in front of us a Democratic plan that has been introduced by our leader and Members in our caucus. It will provide immediate relief for fami-

lies through a broad-based tax cut that is on the front end, a tax cut to the middle class and to those in our country who we know will turn around and buy those school clothes or a new car—and coming from Michigan, I am always hopeful it is a new American-made car—and purchasing that new home and all of those things that stimulate the economy, rather than giving the tax relief to somebody who has three homes or has five cars and is not likely to buy another one.

What we want is to put that tax cut in the hands of middle-class people, working people, who will spend it now, so that our businesses will see the demand. Right now, newspaper headlines this week in Michigan relate to the auto industry cutting back on the building of new cars because the demand is not there.

We have a proposal that relates to demand, not trickle-down economics from the top but demand, to put money in the pockets of people who will spend it. That is exactly what our proposal would do. It would provide about a \$1,200 tax cut this year for a family of four. It would also provide tax incentives to encourage businesses to invest and create jobs, and it would increase the current multiyear bonus depreciation so if one invested now, they would get a bonus depreciation, which is very important.

It would triple the amount of investments small businesses can write off immediately, and this is very important because the majority of new jobs are coming from small business. We need to be focusing on tax policies that will help and support job creation in small business.

It would provide a 50-percent tax credit in 2003 to help small businesses pay for their share of health insurance premiums. This relates very much to the broader question of health care and where we are going.

Later today, we are going to be introducing legislation to cut the price on prescription drugs so we can bring that health insurance premium down for small businesses. It would provide a 20-percent tax credit in 2003 for businesses investing in broadband, high-speed Internet infrastructure, focusing on rural areas, underserved areas. This is very important. We are in a high-tech new economy, and broadband access is critical as we move forward to be able to compete in the new world of high technology and helping small businesses invest, particularly in our rural areas, the hard-to-reach areas. It is an important part of our economic development structure.

Another important piece we believe must be addressed now is to provide \$5 billion for hometown security that would make sure that as we are investing in the economy, we are also making sure we are safe at home. When people have an emergency, they call 9-1-1. We want to make sure people on the other end of that line have the communications equipment, the technology, the training, and the personnel

to respond in a way that will keep us safe.

We also know that part of what is happening economically across the country now is that we are seeing a ripple effect because the majority of States are in a financial crisis because of the downturn in the economy and other factors, so that as they lay off, and people are spending less because they are laid off from State or local governments, there is this ripple effect throughout the economy.

In addition to putting money directly into people's pockets, we also propose putting money into the pockets of the small business owner. We propose providing dollars in immediate aid to State and local governments so that we are not seeing that ripple effect in terms of people losing their jobs, losing purchase power in the economy. We all know common sense says if we can provide money to State, local, and municipal governments and they can focus on immediate infrastructure such as rebuilding roads, water systems, sewer systems, we create good-paying jobs by doing that, such as construction jobs. We take burdens off local property taxes, which helps individuals and businesses, and we can again stop the bleeding that is occurring right now in the States with more and more people losing their jobs and thus losing purchasing power in the economy. This is of great urgency.

We come to the floor each day to ask that we immediately go to an economic stimulus package that will get America back to work, will put money in the pockets of individuals and businesses that can get the job done, that can stimulate this economy, to help our hometown security, and to make sure that we are helping to rebuild America, which also rebuilds jobs.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—
S. 414

Ms. STABENOW. With all sense of great urgency, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 21, S. 414, a bill to provide an economic stimulus package.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as the Senator from South Carolina, I object to the unanimous consent request.

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

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

THE TREATY ON STRATEGIC
OFFENSIVE REDUCTIONS

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I understand that the remaining time is Re-

publican time. I am going to go ahead and start making some comments. We are doing some checking. Maybe I will ask unanimous consent to get some time for my colleague from Oregon. In the meantime, I will go ahead and start my comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ALLARD. I thank the Chair. I appreciate the opportunity to add my thoughts to this body's consideration of the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions, otherwise known as the Moscow Treaty. My understanding is that this afternoon it will be brought before the Senate. We are at a pivotal moment in our country's history. In many ways, the Senate's advise and consent to this treaty will mark the end of an era of hostility and the beginning of an age of cooperation.

It is more than a document; it is a signal to the world that the United States and Russia have moved beyond a relationship of conflict and brinkmanship to a relationship of mutual respect and shared values.

We all remember the super-power rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union, which lasted over 45 years. I believe it is important for this debate to recall the tension and hostility that accompanies that time so that we may fully appreciate what this treaty symbolizes for the future of U.S.-Russian relations.

In 1947, a little-known foreign service officer named George Kennan under the pseudonym 'X' wrote an essay that was published in *Foreign Affairs* journal that was to define our approach to the Soviet Union for the next fifty years. In his essay, he described the Soviet ideology as the belief in the "basic badness of capitalism, in the inevitability of its destruction, in the obligation of the proletariat to assist in that destruction and to take power into its own hands."

This ideological bent would manifest itself, Mr. Kennan predicted, in an "innate antagonism" between the Soviet Union and Western world. He said that we should expect secretiveness, a lack of frankness, duplicity, a wary suspiciousness, and the basic unfriendliness of purpose. Mr. Kennan warned us that the Soviet government might sign documents that might indicate a deviation from this ideology, but that we should regard such actions as a "tactical maneuver permissible in dealing with the enemy (who is without honor) and should be taken in the spirit of caveat emptor". As we discovered in the decades following, Mr. Kennan was right.

The Soviet Union did indeed devote itself to exporting its ideology around the world. Its foreign policy was marked by antagonistic rhetoric and provocative actions. It signed arms control agreements and then violated them. The Soviet Union invaded its neighbors, launched proxy wars, and encouraged revolution and instability. It repeatedly proved capable of exploit-

ing weakness and political divisions. And it was successful at taking advantage of geopolitical realities. As a result, Angola, Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Cuba, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Honduras, Granada, Vietnam, Korea, Somalia, Yemen, Greece, and Turkey all become Cold War battlegrounds.

For the most part, the United States followed Mr. Kennan's advice. We strove to contain Soviet expansionist tendencies. We forced back Soviet advances. We were firm. We were patient. And, in 1991, with the fall of the Soviet Union, our patience paid off.

It is important that we recognize that the Russia of today is nothing like the Soviet Union of yesterday. Under the leadership of President Putin, economic and political reforms are being enacted. Russia is no longer bound by a defunct ideology. The country has stepped away from its past and has worked with sincerity to help resolve many of the challenges facing the international community.

Russia has also sought to improve its relationship with the Western world. It went eventually along with inclusion of the Baltic states into the NATO Alliance, despite harboring deep concerns. Russia accepted our withdrawal from the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty. After September 11, Russia assisted the United States in the war against terrorism by sharing intelligence information and raising no objection to the stationing of U.S. troops in the former Soviet states in Central Asia. Once inconceivable, it is now possible to imagine Russia joining the World Trade Organization and even NATO in the near future.

Another sign of improved relations between the U.S. and Russia is the treaty currently before us. The Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions is much different from arms control treaties agreed to during the Cold War. The text of treaty epitomizes this new relationship. Both parties pledge to:

Embark upon the path of new relations for a new century and committed the goal of strengthening their relationship through cooperation and friendship.

Believe that new global challenges and threats require the building of a qualitatively new foundation for strategic relations between the Parties.

Desire to establish a genuine partnership based on the principles of mutual security, cooperation, trust, openness, and predictability.

The Joint Declaration by Presidents Bush and Putin that accompanied the treaty further expounds upon this new relationship. Let me read a couple of pertinent sections from that declaration:

We are achieving a new strategic relationship. The era in which the United States and Russia saw each other as an enemy or strategic threat has ended. We are partners and we will cooperate to advance stability, security, and economic integration, and to jointly global challenges and to help resolve regional conflicts.

We will respect the essential values of democracy, human rights, free speech and free media, tolerance, the rule of law, and economic opportunity.