

Russian Road-Mobile Launchers' "Break-in." Russia has failed to declare certain road-mobile launchers of ICBMs when they first leave their production facility, as required by the Treaty. Russia has moved some of these launchers to an undeclared "break-in" area located over 60 miles from the production facility without declaring that they have left the production facility and are accountable under the Treaty.

Pursuant to paragraph 6(b) of Article III of the Treaty, a mobile launcher of ICBMs becomes subject to the Treaty limitations when it first leaves a production facility. Not later than five days following the first exit of such a newly produced non-deployed road-mobile launcher, and its entry into Treaty accountability, Section I of the Notification Protocol requires the Party producing the new Treaty-accountable item to provide a notification of this change in data. Except for transits, Parties are proscribed from locating non-deployed mobile launchers outside the boundaries of the START-declared facilities identified in subparagraph 9(b) of Article IV of the Treaty.

FINDING. Russia continues to violate START provisions relevant to these obligations.

Deployed SS-25 Road-Mobile Launchers Based Outside Their Designated Restricted Areas. Russia based some deployed SS-25 road-mobile launchers outside their declared restricted areas (RAs) at two road-mobile ICBM bases while these RAs were under construction. The United States and Russia concluded a temporary, interim policy arrangement regarding the conduct of inspections and cooperative measures at the facilities where the launchers were housed during the period of construction. This arrangement permitted U.S. inspectors to conduct data update inspections and RVOSIs that they had not previously been able to perform, and allowed Russia to cooperate fully with providing cooperative measures access for the launchers that were previously unavailable. All of these road-mobile ICBMs and their launchers have since been transferred from their bases, and their declared RAs have been eliminated as START facilities.

FINDING. Notwithstanding the interim policy arrangement, Russia's practice of locating deployed SS-25 road-mobile launchers outside their declared RAs for long periods of time constituted basing in a manner that violated the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 9 of Article VI of the Treaty. This practice has ceased and the United States considers this issue closed.

Denial of the Right to Measure Certain Deployed ICBM Launch Canisters on Mobile Launchers. U.S. inspectors have been prevented from exercising the Treaty right to measure certain ICBM launch canisters on mobile launchers, both deployed and non-deployed, that are encountered during data update inspections to confirm data regarding the type of item of inspection. Russia, for instance, has prevented U.S. inspectors from measuring launch canisters for SS-24 ICBMs contained in rail-mobile launchers that are located within the boundaries of an inspection site. Similar concerns have arisen with regard to launch canisters for SS-25 and SS-27 mobile ICBMs located on road-mobile launchers. With regard to launch canisters for these latter types, Russia and the United States have agreed upon a policy arrangement to address this issue, though it has not yet been implemented for the SS-27 ICBM.

Subparagraph 20(a) of Section VI of the Inspection Protocol identifies ICBM launch canisters as one of the items of inspection for data update inspections. In accordance with the procedures in Annex 1 to the Inspection Protocol, inspectors have the right to confirm the number and, if applicable, the

types of items of inspection that are specified for the facility to be inspected and declared for the inspection site, and the right to confirm the absence of any other item of inspection at the inspection site. Pursuant to paragraph 6 of Annex 1, inspectors may view and measure the dimensions of a launch canister declared to contain an item of inspection to confirm it is of the declared type.

FINDING. Russia prevented U.S. inspectors from exercising their Treaty right to measure launch canisters for SS-24 ICBMs contained in rail-mobile launchers that are located within the boundaries of an inspection site, in contravention of paragraphs 1 and 6 of Annex 1 to the Inspection Protocol. With regard to launch canisters for SS-25 and SS-27 ICBMs located on road-mobile launchers, the Parties have agreed upon a policy arrangement to address this issue, but it has not yet been implemented for the SS-27 ICBM.

TELEMETRY ISSUES

As part of the START verification regime, the Parties are obligated to notify each other of missile flight tests and to exchange telemetry tapes, tape summaries, interpretive data, and acceleration profiles for each flight test of a START-accountable ICBM or SLBM. The United States has raised several concerns regarding Russia's failure to provide all Treaty-required telemetry materials for some START-accountable flight tests in violation of paragraphs 4 and 5 of Article X of the Treaty, and paragraph 1 of Section I and paragraphs 1 and 2 of Section II of the Telemetry Protocol.

FINDING. Russia has in some instances failed to comply with Treaty requirements regarding the provision of telemetry information on missile flight testing pursuant to Article X of the START Treaty and Sections I and II of the Telemetry Protocol.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arizona for his courtesy. I enjoyed hearing his remarks. No Senator on either side of the aisle has been a more consistent spokesman on military preparedness than Senator KYL has been over the years. His concern about our nuclear stockpile is well known and very important. I hope all Americans will pay close attention to what he had to say.

I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHECKS AND BALANCES

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, our job in the Senate is to debate. We are said to be the greatest deliberative body in the world. The great conflicts in our country come here so that we can resolve them. After 6 months of President Obama's administration, Americans admire him, like him, like his family, and appreciate his seriousness of purpose. But Americans are beginning to see some significant differences of opinion between the kind of country the Democrats are imagining for our Nation and the kind of country Republicans and many independents are imagining. There is concern in Tennessee, as well as around the country, about the lack of checks and balances

on too much debt and too many Washington takeovers.

In terms of debt, we see the President's proposals for debt for the next 10 years are nearly three times as much as all of the money the United States spent in World War II. As far as Washington takeovers, it seems to be a weekly running reality show. First the banks; then the insurance companies; then the student loans; then the car companies even, according to recent legislation; your farm pond, according to some Federal legislation; and now maybe even health care.

But people have a right to say to us on this side of the aisle: What would you Republicans do? You can't just point with alarm—although that is part of our job. What would Republicans do?

I wanted to mention three areas where Republicans have a different opinion than the current administration and where we hope we might persuade the American people and many Democrats and even the President to join us on a different path for the country. The first has to do with the Government's ownership of General Motors. We want to give the stock back to the people who paid for it, the taxpayers. The second has to do with health care. We want to begin at the other end of the discussion. We want to start with the 250 million Americans who already have health care and make sure they can afford it. After we are through making sure of that, that they can afford their government, because they can't afford these trillion-dollar additions to health care we keep hearing about.

Third, on clean energy, we want clean energy as well as the President does. But we also want energy that Americans can afford. We know cheap energy is key to our economic success. We want jobs to be made. We want cars to be made in Michigan and Ohio and Tennessee and not Mexico or Japan. We have a plan for clean energy that is low cost, that will reduce utility bills and keep jobs here which would compare with the Waxman-Markey climate change bill passed by the House and headed our way.

I would like to talk about each of those three very briefly. First, General Motors. I congratulate the new GM for emerging from bankruptcy today. General Motors has meant a great deal to our country and a great deal to our State, Tennessee. When General Motors decided nearly 25 years ago to put the Saturn plant in Tennessee, we had very few auto jobs. Nissan had already made a decision to come to our State. That was a pioneering decision because most auto plants were in the Midwest. Today there are a dozen such auto plants, including the General Motors plant in Spring Hill. In Tennessee, instead of having a few auto jobs, a third of our manufacturing jobs are auto jobs.

So we are grateful to General Motors for its decision 24 years ago, and we

want it to succeed. We want that Spring Hill plant to be making some GM products soon and believe that it will be because of all the natural advantages it has.

What are the best ways we in Washington can help General Motors succeed? That was the question asked of me last week in Tennessee. The answer is to get the General Motors stock that is owned by the government out of Washington, DC, and into the hands of the taxpayers. I have legislation I have introduced, and I am looking for the opportunity to amend an appropriate bill on the Senate floor that is cosponsored by the Republican leader and Senator KYL and a variety of others. It would take the 60 percent of General Motors the U.S. Government owns and give it to the 120 million Americans who pay taxes on April 15.

What is the reason for doing that? They paid for it. They should own it. What is the second reason for doing that? If the stock stays here, we find that Washington bureaucrats and those of us in Congress can't keep our hands off the car company.

We have the President calling up the mayor of Detroit saying: Yes, I think the headquarters ought to be in Detroit instead of Warren, MI. We have the Congressman from Massachusetts calling up the president of General Motors saying: Don't close the warehouse in my district. And you have the delegation from Tennessee and from Indiana and Michigan saying: Put a car plant here. And you have 60 committees in Congress authorized to summon the executives here—we own the company, after all; let's hear what they have to say—and tell them what to do. Paint it this color. Get your battery from this district. Make it this way.

What are the poor executives going to do? Drive in their congressionally approved hybrid cars from Detroit to Washington to testify before 60 subcommittees while Toyota is busy making cars?

GM will never succeed if we keep this incestuous political meddling alive.

There are a variety of ways to get the stock out of the government and back in the hands of the people. The President has said he would like to do it. He has also said he wants to keep his hands off it. But that has not been the practice so far.

Senator BENNETT of Utah and I have introduced this legislation that would give the stock to the taxpayers who paid for it. That is the best way to do it, in my opinion. That would happen within a year. It would be a fairly common occurrence in the American corporate world. It is what Procter & Gamble did with Clorox a few years ago. It is what PepsiCo did with its restaurant businesses a few years ago. The company decided it had a subsidiary that did not fit the role of the major company, and so it spun it off—a stock distribution, a corporate spinoff.

I think we can all agree—at least 90 percent of the American people agree,

according to surveys—that the government in Washington has no business whatsoever trying to run a car company. What do we know about it? So the best way to get rid of it is to give it to the people who paid for it.

There are other ways to do it, and several Senators—Senator CORKER, for example, has suggested an ownership trust to try to make sure that while it is here, the government keeps its hands off the day-to-day operations. Senator JOHANNIS and Senator THUNE also have bills of this kind, as does Senator NELSON of Nebraska.

But my point is, now that General Motors has emerged from bankruptcy, let's celebrate that by taking the 60 percent of the stock the American taxpayers paid \$50 billion for and giving it to those same taxpayers and getting our hands off the company and cheer them on.

There is another reason this would be a good idea. Most of us know the Green Bay Packers are a popular team, especially in their home area. Why is that? Because the fans own the team. That would be the same thing we would have with the General Motors stock distribution. Just as Green Bay Packer fans have a special interest in who the quarterback might be because they own the team, if 120 million Americans had a little bit of GM stock, they might be a little more interested in the next Chevrolet, and that might create a nice fan investor base for the new GM as it seeks to move ahead.

So that is the first idea we Republicans have: get the government stock ownership of the car companies out of Washington and back in the hands of the marketplace where it belongs.

Here is the second idea we have. It has to do with health care. We would start at the other end of the debate. We would start with the 250 million Americans who already have health care and say to them: We want to make sure you can afford your health care, that you can choose your health care, and that when we are done fixing it in this health care reform—that we would like to do this year along with our Democratic friends—we want to make sure you can afford your government as well. That is our message.

Our friends on the other side—the Democrats—have more votes than we do, so they have set the agenda and they are writing the bill. In the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, on which I serve, they are being very polite and collegial and nice to us, but they are taking almost none of our ideas and recommendations, and they are starting at the other end. And their other end is not going very well.

It is not going very well in terms of costs and debt because the Congressional Budget Office has begun to tell us how much some of these proposals will cost; and we are talking about \$2 trillion in addition to all the trillions we have been spending this year.

This Nation cannot afford that. Even though we are adding \$1 trillion or \$2

trillion to the debt in order to have this sort of health care reform that is being proposed, it does not begin to cover the uninsured people in America.

We would like to cover the uninsured people, too, but we think we ought to do that after we make sure we keep the costs down for the 250 million who already have health insurance, including the small businesses of this country. That is our main goal: to lower costs. And we do not want to end up with a health care plan that adds debt to the government either.

That is why we have introduced a number of plans. Senator COBURN and Senator BURR have introduced one. Senator GREGG of New Hampshire has introduced one. Senator HATCH has introduced a health care plan that gives the States more responsibility in figuring out exactly how to provide health care, especially to low-income Americans.

The essential differences between our approaches and the Democratic approaches that are being presented is that, one, ours do not add to the debt; and, two, the government does not run ours.

The essential nature of the Democratic proposals is to expand one failed government program for low-income people that is called the Medicaid Program and to create another, which we believe will tend to drive out your choices and your competition and not do very much to reduce your costs, while adding heavily to the national debt we already have.

That is a major difference we have. And we have our proposals on the table. The discussion is not going very well because it is one-sided. I suggested, 3 weeks ago, when we began to discuss the Kennedy bill, we ought to start over and suggested they might want to take some of our ideas.

There is a Wyden-Bennett piece of legislation I did not even mention. Mr. President, 14 of us—8 Democrats and 6 Republicans—are cosponsors of that legislation. It has a zero addition to the national debt, according to the Congressional Budget Office. The principle of it is basically to take the dollars we have available and give them to Americans and let them buy their health care insurance, so instead of expanding government programs, including for low-income Americans, you get the dollars, you get the health care, and that takes care of virtually everybody.

All the plans from this side of the aisle, like those on the other side, say everybody needs to be insured. You are not disqualified for a preexisting condition. And the cost has to be affordable. All of us agree on that. The difference is whether it is going to be government programs or whether you are going to have dollars you can choose. That is the big difference, and we hope the American people will pay attention to the differences we are offering. We believe they will because, as you look at the Democratic plans, the costs are becoming alarming.

The first cost we saw was to the national debt, which was to expand between \$1 trillion and \$2 trillion, at least in the bill we have been considering in the HELP Committee. But then in the new versions of it, the sponsors began to shift the costs. Well, where do they shift it? The first place they shift it is to employers. It is a bad idea.

We have a 10-percent unemployment rate in the country today. People work for employers, and all the evidence shows, if we add costs to employers, one of a couple things happens. One is, the wages of the employees are reduced because the employer has to pay higher taxes. The second thing is, you add costs to employers and some of those employers go overseas.

I was in Tennessee last week talking to a lot of auto suppliers, air-conditioning manufacturers. They watch their costs every day. They are in discussions with their companies about that if costs of electricity or health care or anything else go up too much, they begin to go overseas and look for lower costs. We have already seen what has happened to the automobile industry in the Midwest because of high health care costs. So why is it such a good idea to begin to shift the costs and have every employer pay at least a \$750-per-employee tax as a way of reducing the cost of health care?

Then the other place these plans begin to shift the costs is to the States. That is a convenient place to shift it. I used to see that as Governor. The Acting President pro tempore was speaker of the house in his State. We are familiar with Members of Congress who hold big press conferences and announce a good idea and take credit for it, and then they send the bill to the Governor or the speaker of the house or the legislature or the mayor and say: Here, you pay for it. It is called an unfunded Federal mandate.

The unfunded Federal mandate in this case is to the Medicaid Program. The Medicaid Program, in my view, is a terrible choice for a way to expand coverage for low-income families. Already, 60 million Americans get their health care through their State Medicaid Program, which is usually funded about 60 percent by the Federal Government. But the problem is, it is so poorly run and so underfunded the way it is managed that 40 percent of doctors will not see Medicaid patients.

So when you expand the Medicaid Program and dump more low-income Americans into it, you are giving people a bus ticket to a company that does not have very many buses. So they do not get good health care service. That is not the way we should be doing this. But that is the way we are trying to do it.

Then there is another person who is going to be affected by that expansion of Medicaid, the government program, and that is the taxpayer. The costs of the expansions that are being discussed when you expand the program to 150

percent of the Federal poverty level—and when you, in addition to that, try to attract more doctors and hospitals to serve Medicaid patients, and you require States to pay more to doctors and more to hospitals than they are today—the numbers are staggering.

The Congressional Budget Office has said: It is a \$500 billion figure over 10 years, or maybe it is \$700 billion if you go to the fourth year and go for 10 years after that, or maybe it is more than that, depending on the various formulas you come up with. And we will assume all that at the Federal level? Maybe we will to start with, but after a few years, it will go back to the States. We say that easily here because we have a printing press, and we have suddenly gotten used to talking about trillions of dollars. But States cannot do that. States do not have printing presses. They have to balance their budgets.

I did a little calculation. If we expanded the Medicaid Program by 150 percent of the Federal poverty level and required States to put everyone in there, and if we increased the payments to doctors and to hospitals to 110 percent of Medicare levels, which is still significantly below what private plans pay, it would add about \$1.2 billion every year to the budget just for the State's share of Medicaid. That is about a 10-percent new State income tax in our State to pay.

So that is the shifting of a cost. That is not just a little cost shift. That is an impossible cost shift. That is not even in the area of reality. I think as employers begin to discover what they are going to be taxed and when States discover what they are going to be taxed and Medicaid recipients realize if they get into this program that 40 percent of the doctors will not see them, this is not going to be a very popular alternative.

Then, last week, we heard about Medicare cuts. Some of the Democrats in the Senate have made an agreement with the hospitals to cut Medicare. That is not so bad, they say. But what is even worse—even worse—is they are going to take the savings from Medicare cuts and spend it on a different program. We all know that the biggest problem we have with the Federal budget is the rising cost of Medicare, and we have to bring that under some control—control the growth of Medicare.

But if we are going to take any money out of the Medicare Program, it ought to be spent on the Medicare Program for the seniors who are in it. We ought not to take money from the Medicare Program and use it to pay for some new program we are talking about passing.

So all these plans that are being talked about are shifting the costs. First, they are adding to the Federal deficit by maybe \$1 trillion. And then they are shifting the rest of the cost to employers who are struggling, to States who are broke, to taxpayers in

the States, 10 percent of whom are unemployed. Then they are taking money out of Medicare and spending it instead of spending it on Medicare.

I do not think this is going to work. So I suggest my advice at the beginning of this discussion 3 weeks ago is still good: Start over. Start over with one of the Republican plans or with a bipartisan Wyden-Bennett plan. Fourteen Senators are already there: 8 Democrats and 6 Republicans. And let's begin with the 250 million Americans who are already covered and make sure their costs are appropriate, that they can afford their health care, and that when we get through with this health care fix, that Americans can afford their government.

One other area of an idea that I hope—and we hope—our friends on the Democratic side will agree with and the President eventually will agree with and the American people will agree with has to do with how we go about having clean energy.

On Monday, I will be making a speech at the National Press Club at 11 a.m. about a blueprint for 100 new nuclear powerplants. This is a part of the Republican clean energy strategy which has four provisions to it. The first is 100 new nuclear powerplants in the next 20 years. The second is: electrify our cars and trucks. I believe we can electrify half of them in 20 years. The third is: explore offshore for natural gas and oil. And fourth is: double research and development of energy. I would call it mini-Manhattan projects to help make alternative energy, such as solar, cost competitive with fossil fuels, so the use can be more widespread or for carbon recapture so our coal plants can be cleaner or for advanced biofuels from crops we do not eat to make that fuel more competitive with gasoline or even with fusion and green buildings. These are the kinds of things we should be doing.

The Republican energy plan, which is based on 100 nuclear powerplants, is a cheap energy plan. It is cheap and clean energy. The Waxman-Markey bill, the so-called climate change energy bill that is coming from the House, the Democratic plan, is a high-cost clean energy bill.

Let's stop and think about the kind of America we would like to have. We want an America in which we have good jobs, and that is going to take plenty of energy. We use 25 percent of all of the energy in the world. We want an America in which we don't create excessive carbon so we can reduce global warming. We want clean air—that kind of an America. We want one, too, in which we are not creating a renewable energy sprawl where these gigantic machines are spreading across landscapes we have spent a century preserving. Of course, we want the hundreds of thousands of green jobs that can come from renewable energy, but we don't want to do it in a way that kills the tens of millions of red, white, and blue jobs that most of us work in.

We don't want to run our manufacturing and technology, high-tech companies overseas looking for cheap electricity because of the strategy we take for clean energy.

The strategy that is coming toward us from the House, the Democratic proposal, is a high-cost strategy. It is a \$100 billion a year burden on the economy which is unnecessary. It is high taxes, and it is more mandates, and it is a new utility bill for every American family.

What Republicans want to say is there is a different approach that will get us to about the same place. I actually think it will get us there faster. This approach starts with 100 new nuclear powerplants. That means we will have electricity that is cheap enough so that cars can be built in Michigan and Ohio, as well as Tennessee, instead of Mexico and Japan. It means we would be producing more of our energy at home. It means our air will be cleaner. Nuclear power is 70 percent of our pollution-free, carbon-free electricity today, while solar and wind, for example, is 6 percent. And it will do what we need to do to reduce global warming. In fact, our plan should put us within the Kyoto limits by 2030, because nuclear power produces 70 percent of the carbon-free electricity, and carbon is the principal greenhouse gas that contributes to global warming.

So my question would be: Why would we adopt this contraption headed this way from the House—\$100 billion of taxes on the economy, giveaways, pay-offs, surprises, complications, cow taxes—why would we do that? Why would we raise our prices deliberately when we can deliberately lower our prices with the technology we already have?

We haven't built a new nuclear plant in 30 years, but France has. They are 80 percent nuclear. So European plants are moving to Spain. France has among the lowest electric rates in the European Union and among the lowest carbon emissions in the European Union. India and China are building nuclear plants, with our help, our technology, and we are helping them do it. Japan is building a nuclear powerplant about every year, and the President has even said Iran can do it. Then why don't we get in the game? We know how to do it and we should, and we should be doing it.

On Monday, I will be suggesting at the National Press Club on behalf of Republicans—but I want to recognize right at the outset that we are not trying to make this a Republican—it is a Republican initiative, but we don't want to end up there. We know that several of our friends on the other side are strong supporters of nuclear power. We would like for more of them to be. We would like for the President to be. I would like for him to be half as interested in 100 new nuclear powerplants as he already is in windmills. I think he would get a lot farther with a plan that includes 100 new nuclear powerplants.

All this needs is Presidential leadership. It doesn't need a lot of money. The financing systems we need to help get the first six or eight nuclear plants up and going are designed so the taxpayer doesn't lose a cent. The first 100 nuclear powerplants which were built in about 20 years were built by the utilities with ratepayer money, not government money.

As far as safety, as far as what we do with the waste, we have come a long way in the last 30 years. Our plants are safely operated. Dr. Chu, the distinguished scientist who is the Energy Secretary, said that to me at a hearing this week. We have operated safely our nuclear reactors and our nuclear submarines since the 1950s. We sometimes forget about that. France and Japan and Germany and India and China all know that if they want clean air and cheap energy for good jobs, they will have to use nuclear power. So we need to do that as well. And the waste? Let's call it used nuclear fuel. Scientists assure us that used nuclear fuel can be safely stored on site—and there is not very much of it in mass—safely stored on site for the next 40 or 60 years. That is step one. Step two is a mini-Manhattan Project of the kind we had during World War II to explore all of the most important ways to safely recycle the nuclear fuel so we can use it again and never create plutonium in the process. Scientists believe we can do that, figure that out in 8, 10, 12 years. We already have acceptable ways to do it. France is doing it that way now. But while we store it, we can figure that out. The United States is smart enough to do it.

So that would be our proposal on Monday. All 40 Republican Senators are united on it. We are looking for support on the other side. I think more support will come, because as Americans look at this \$100 billion economy-wide cap and trade, they are going to say, Whoa, I hope that is not the answer to this problem.

Let me give you one example. The economy-wide cap and trade applies to fuel. That is the gasoline in your car or your truck. One thing we know for sure: It will raise the price of your gasoline at the pump. You will be paying 10 or 20 or 30 cents more. You might be paying 50 cents more, but it probably won't reduce the carbon that comes out of it. Gasoline fuel produces a third of the carbon we are worried about, but they have adopted in the House a device called the economy-wide cap and trade that won't do anything about it. We have had plenty of testimony on that, because if it goes up 10 or 20 or 30 cents, that is not enough to change the behavior of Americans.

The better way to do it is a low carbon fuel standard that gradually reduces the amount of carbon as people shift to other fuels. That is why we are for electric cars, because we have so much unused electricity at night that we can plug in our cars and trucks at night until we have electrified half of

them without building one new powerplant. So why in the world would they go to the trouble of creating this 1,400-page contraption of mandates and taxes and rules that raises prices and doesn't reduce the carbon they are aiming at? Of course, on the coal plants, they are 40 percent of the carbon. If we can begin to build nuclear powerplants, then the utilities will probably close some of the dirtiest coal plants.

Our vision is, as we look ahead 20 years, we can see 40 percent of our electricity from nuclear; maybe 25 percent from natural gas—that is a little more than we have today; maybe 8 or 10 percent from solar and wind and geothermal and biomass and some of these renewable energies; another 10 percent from hydroelectric; the rest from coal—a significant amount, still. Hopefully, along that way one of these mini-Manhattan projects will have found an even better way to capture carbon from coal plants.

This is the real clean energy policy. That would get us to the Kyoto protocol. What is more important is that we want to reindustrialize this country with cheap energy, cheap electricity. We don't want to run jobs overseas.

Then the final part of this for the dream of energy is that it is cheap. People around the world are poor, and the single thing that would help them most is to have low-cost or no-cost energy. We are on the verge of doing that with nuclear power. We should be pursuing that instead of deliberately raising the price of energy in an ineffective way toward a goal—in this case combating global warming—that seems to be completely lost—completely lost—in the manufacturing of this contraption that came from the House of Representatives that is going to give you a new utility bill every month.

So those are three Republican ideas that we have and that we hope our Democratic colleagues will be interested in. We hope the President will see them as constructive suggestions. We hope they will provide a check and a balance on the excessive debt and the number of Washington takeovers we are beginning to see in Washington.

First, we congratulate General Motors on its coming out of bankruptcy, and a good way to celebrate would be to give all of the stocks to the taxpayers who paid taxes on April 15, stop the incestuous political meddling in the car companies, give them an investor fan base to cheer on the new Chevy.

Second, let's start over on health care costs. Let's start at the right end. Let's start with the 250 million Americans who already have health care and make sure it is good health care, and that they can afford it, and that when we are through with our reforms, they can afford the government that they are left with and they don't have trillions more dollars in debt. To do that, we have four or five proposals on the table which fundamentally say: Take the dollars we have and give them to

Americans and let them buy their own insurance rather than stuff them into government programs.

Finally, we want clean energy, but we want low-cost clean energy. We want clean air. We want global warming dealt with. We want American independence, but we want energy at a cost that will keep our manufacturing jobs and our high-tech jobs right here at home and not overseas looking for cheap energy. We have a way to do it: 100 new nuclear powerplants, electric cars, offshore exploration for natural gas—that is low-carbon oil. We are still going to need it, so we might as well use our own, although we will use less. Finally, several mini-Manhattan projects for research and development on solar and fusion and other areas that will help us change the energy picture, maybe after 20 years.

These are exciting times. We are glad to be able to contribute our ideas to the debate, and we hope the American people will listen and, eventually, we hope our friends on the other side will join us, and that even the President will take some of our ideas and make them a part of his agenda.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEGICH). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

INDONESIAN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a very recent event that is important to the United States and which should have received a lot greater publicity than it did. I know the occupant of the chair, who is from Alaska, understands the importance of Southeast Asia to our economy and to security for the world. This is where the event took place. On July 8, the people of Indonesia elected democratically their second democratically elected president, Susilo Bambang Yudoyono. For obvious reasons, he is known by the initials SBY. He enjoyed a victory, according to preliminary results by the national election commission, of 62 percent of the vote, based on more than 18.7 million ballots counted. He needed 50 percent of the ballots to win in one round.

His challengers, former President Megawati Sukarnoputri, came in second, with 28 percent, and his previous vice president, Jusuf Kalla, finished third with 10 percent. We will have an official result released by the election commission by July 27.

I think it is very clear that SBY won an overwhelming election. This would put Mr. Yudhoyono well over the 50-percent threshold to avoid a second-round runoff. Those who watch South-

east Asia believe that such an emphatic election victory for a man who became the democratically elected President 5 years ago will cement his position, quicken the pace of reform, and strengthen the country that is very important to that region and, thus, to the United States.

Mr. Yudhoyono rose under the dictator Suharto, who was forced out 11 years ago after more than three decades in power, to a position in the army, where he was a general. But when he became President, he set aside his military uniform and took on civilian garb. He is a liberal who provided much needed stability. Despite the challenges of dismal infrastructure and 30 million Indonesians living below the poverty line, a country that extends through some 17,000 islands at low water, and 13,000 islands at high tide level, it is a country that is the largest Muslim country in the world. A population of 240 million people makes it the fifth largest country in the world. It has 90 percent of its population as Muslims. So this is the key to dealing with a Muslim nation.

Mr. Yudhoyono is credited with bringing economic prosperity with an economy set to grow even in the face of the global downturn, expected to grow by 4 percent this year. Independent observers declared that the Presidential election was largely free and fair, despite an accusation of fraud by his opponents. There is no evidence of that, and we believe it was a free election. It is key to our national interest because it is the keystone for Southeast Asia.

Southeast Asia includes a number of countries, perhaps better known to the United States—Thailand, Singapore, Malaysia, and many smaller countries. It is the fifth largest trading partner of the United States. On top of that, it controls the Strait of Malaka, through which about 50 percent of the world's oil supply travels. It is also an area which offers tremendous opportunity for economic growth for them and increased trade and economic benefits to the United States.

SBY was a general in the national army during the last decade of the Suharto years. During that time, fortunately, he attended the International Military Education Training Institute at Fort Leavenworth, KS. There, leaders of friendly countries come to learn from our military how a military should operate in the modern era where military is under civilian control, where human rights and individuals are respected, where the army does not control the political process, where the army is subordinate to and the protector of the population, rather than one which runs the population.

During his first tenure, as I said, he faced many challenges, and they were successful. He chose as his running mate Mr. Boediono, who we believe raises expectations of accelerating reform in the second term of SBY. Boediono is a technocrat with no party affiliation. He possesses an impeccable

track record for clean governance. He is an advocate, as is SBY, of market-led growth, with government acting as an impartial regulator rather than a state actor. The duo campaigned on a ticket of clean governance and reform to promote broad-based economic growth. This was a vote by the predominantly Muslim country for a moderate prodemocratic path that Indonesia has already taken. They still face many challenges—not just poverty—with the economic problems in the country. They face a long tradition of corruption that has to be dealt with. SBY has taken steps to deal with that and needs to take more steps.

They also face the challenge from radical Islamists who want to establish Sharia law, a government by theocracy rather than by a popularly elected, constitutionally governed government. I will speak more about that in a minute.

Let me give you a little taste of the rest of it. His closest rival, Megawati Sukarnoputri, was the daughter of Sukarno, Indonesia's founding father. Ms. Megawati failed to impress voters during her term as President from 2001 to 2004, and she partnered with a general who was indicted for human rights abuse and was a former son-in-law of a previous authoritarian dictator. They ran a nationalistic campaign that was rejected by the voters of Indonesia.

The third ticket, comprised of current Vice President Jusuf Kalla and a former chief of the army, Wiranto, championed a similar ideological platform, with the difference being that Jusuf Kalla was a link between big national businesses and the government, which we thought he would probably enhance. This sets up an opportunity for the United States.

We are dealing with a very important Islamic country. I believe that it is time for us to realize this is an area where we can make significant progress, if we learn how to work with and provide significant support to a democratically elected head of an Islamic country, who wants to move on the path toward greater economic ties, free from corruption, open to trade and business.

I happen to have laid all this out in a book called "The Next Front," coauthored with Lewis Simons, a Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter. It will be published by Wiley Books in October. We call it "The Next Front" because what people did not realize until recently was that, after 9/11, one of the indigenous terrorist groups in Indonesia, Jema Islamia, which we will call JI, was a close ally of al-Qaida, and still is. That is a terrorist organization that has spread from Indonesia into the Philippines, and potentially other parts of Asia. The leader of JI was tasked by al-Qaida with carrying out the second attack following 9/11, which was to be on Los Angeles. Fortunately, our CIA, by aggressive tactics and military tactics, prevented that attack.

There is still a real danger to not only peace and stability and progress