

We now have 64 years of experience since Hiroshima. It's striking and against all historical precedent that for that substantial period, there has not been any war among nuclear states.

Importantly, the administration's planned further diminishment of our nuclear stockpile—further diminishing it from these numbers—and President Obama's hostility to the utility of nuclear weapons generally has caused a great deal of unease among our non-nuclear allies. These nations are not so open about their concerns, but the problem is a very real one.

The American nuclear umbrella, our extended deterrence, has allowed our allies, free democratic nations, to remain nuclear free, without having nuclear weapons. But if the Obama policy continues, the Perry-Schlesinger report concludes real dangers may await:

If we are unsuccessful in dealing with current challenges, we may find ourselves at a tipping point, where many additional states conclude that they require nuclear deterrents of their own. If this tipping point is itself mishandled, we may well find ourselves faced with a cascade of proliferation.

The nuclear commission—President Obama appointed a number of the Members on the Democratic side—said that if our allies who feel they have been protected by our nuclear umbrella become uncertain, we could be faced with a cascade of proliferation. Is that what we want? I know the President wants nonproliferation. I know that is what he wants. I am not attacking his goal. Throughout my remarks, I am raising the question of whether these goals will be furthered by the actions of this treaty and these policies or whether they will not.

One final concern. The administration has made it clear that this treaty's nuclear reductions are just the first step in a long march to a nuclear-free world. Assistant Secretary Rose Gottemoeller, who negotiated the treaty, said in April:

We will also seek to include non-strategic, non-deployed weapons in future reductions.

Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs and former Ambassador Alexander Vershbow a few weeks ago said that the administration, in follow-on talks, will seek further reductions in strategic, nondeployed, and nonstrategic weapons. And the President has said that repeatedly.

We Senators, in the end, only have our judgment. My best judgment tells me that if our weapons fall too low in numbers, such an event could inspire rogue and dangerous lesser nuclear powers to seek to become peer nuclear competitors to the United States—a dangerous event for the entire world. Thus, I must conclude that the Obama plan is to diminish the power and leadership of the United States. Carefully read, this is what the goal does. I think this conclusion cannot be disputed. The leader of the one nation that has been the greatest force for freedom and stability in the world, with our large nu-

clear arsenal, is displaying a naivete beyond imagining.

Since this treaty is a calculated step in the President's plan to achieve dangerous and unacceptable policies, this treaty must not be ratified. The treaty and the policy behind it must be rejected.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. We are shortly going to propound a unanimous consent request. I have been saying that a couple of times now, but we really are shortly going to do it. There are several Senators who wish to speak. I would like to see if we could set up an order for them.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington proceed for 10 minutes, then the Senator from Texas for up to 10 minutes, then the Senator from North Dakota for 5 minutes. I ask unanimous consent also that each of those Senators would allow the interruption for the propounding of the unanimous consent request if it comes during the time they are speaking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

DEFENSE LEVEL PLAYING FIELD ACT

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I rise this afternoon to call on the Senate to move and pass H.R. 6540, which is the Defense Level Playing Field Act, a bill which was passed overwhelmingly by the House of Representatives yesterday.

This is a bill that is identical to a bipartisan provision I have introduced here in the Senate with Senators BROWNBACK, CANTWELL, and others from States that know the value of American aerospace. It is a bill that will require the Pentagon to take into account illegal subsidies to foreign companies in our country, and that will finally deliver an even playing field in our procurement process.

But above all, this is a jobs bill. It is about protecting skilled, family-wage jobs, manufacturing jobs, and engineering jobs—jobs with technical skills and expertise that are passed down from one generation to the next; jobs that not only support our families during a very difficult economic time but are also helping to keep our communities above water. These are jobs in communities in Kansas, in Connecticut, in California, and in my home State of Washington. They are jobs that support small businesses, they pay people's mortgages, and they create economic opportunity. These jobs right now are at risk. Why? Because of illegal subsidies that undercut our workers and create an uneven playing field for America's aerospace workers.

This is a commonsense, straightforward way to protect American aerospace jobs from unfairly subsidized Eu-

ropean competition. It is a bill that specifically targets a major job-creating project—the Air Force's aerial refueling tanker contract—as a place where we can begin to restore fairness for our aerospace workers. This bill says that in awarding that critical tanker contract, the Pentagon must consider any unfair competitive advantage aerospace companies have, and there is no bigger unfair advantage right now in the world of international aerospace than launch aid.

As my colleagues may know, launch aid is direct funding that has been provided to the European aerospace company Airbus from the treasuries of European governments. It is what supports their factories and their workers and their airplanes. It is what allows them to price their airplanes far below those that are made here in the United States and still turn a profit. It is what allows them to literally role the dice and lose on a product and what separates them from American aerospace companies, such as Boeing, that bet the company on each new airplane line they produce. In short, it is what allows them to stack the decks against American workers.

In July of this year, the World Trade Organization handed down a ruling in a case that the United States brought against the European Union that finally called launch aid what it really is: a trade-distorting, job-killing, unfair advantage. That is what the WTO said. It is one of our Nation's most important trade cases to date. The WTO ruled very clearly that launch aid is illegal, it creates an uneven playing field, it has harmed American workers and companies, and it needs to end.

Specifically, the WTO found that European governments have provided Airbus with more than 15 billion Euros in launch aid, subsidizing every model of aircraft ever produced by Airbus in the last 40 years, including, by the way, the A330—the very model they are now putting forward in the tanker competition. The WTO ruled that France and Germany and Spain provided more than 1 billion Euros in infrastructure and infrastructure-related grants between 1989 and 2001, as well as another billion in share transfers and equity infusions into Airbus. They ruled that European governments provided over 1 billion in Euros in funding between 1986 and 2005 for research and development directed specifically to the development of Airbus aircraft. In fact, the Lexington Institute states that launch aid represents over \$200 billion in today's dollars in total subsidies to Airbus.

Launch aid has very real consequences. It has created an uphill battle for our American workers and American aerospace as a whole. Because of launch aid, our workers are now not only competing against rival companies, they are competing against the treasuries of European governments. At the end of the day, that has

meant lost jobs at our American aerospace companies and suppliers and the communities that support them.

I have been speaking out against Europe's market-distorting actions for many years because I understand that these subsidies are not only illegal, they are deeply unfair and anti-competitive.

My home State of Washington is, of course, home to much of our country's aerospace industry, and I know our workers are the best in the world. On a level playing field, they can compete and win against absolutely anybody. But, unfortunately, Airbus and the European Union have refused to allow fair competition. Instead, they use their aerospace industry as a government-funded jobs program, and they use billions in illegal launch aid to fund it.

So let me be clear about one thing. The objective of this bill that was passed overwhelmingly by the House of Representatives yesterday is not to limit competition; it is to make sure everyone can compete on a level playing field. Airbus has made it clear they will go to any lengths to hurt our country's aerospace industry. We need to make it clear we will take every action to stop them because this is not only about the future of aerospace; it is about jobs right now that will help our economy recover. In fact, as we look at ways to stimulate job growth and keep American companies innovating and growing, we shouldn't look any further than this bill.

This bill is a commonsense policy. It makes sure U.S. Government policy translates to Pentagon policy because the fact is that the U.S. Government, through our Trade Representative, has taken the position that Airbus subsidies are illegal and unfair. Yet, on the other hand, the U.S. Department of Defense is ignoring that position as we look to purchase a new tanker fleet, and that does not make any sense—not for our country, not for our military, and certainly not for our workers. The WTO made a fair decision. Airbus subsidies are illegal and anti-competitive. Now the Department of Defense needs to take that ruling into account.

When I go home and talk to our aerospace workers in Washington State, I want to be able to tell them we have evened the stakes. I want them to know their government is not looking the other way as policies continue to undercut their jobs and their opportunities. I want them to know that while they are working to secure our country by producing the best airplane in the world, their government is doing everything it can to make sure fair opportunities are there that will keep them on the job.

It is time to take these job-killing subsidies into account. It is the right thing to do for our workers, for our economy, and the future of our aerospace industry.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 6540

So I ask, as if in legislative session and as if in morning business, unani-

mous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 6540, which was received from the House and is at the desk; that the bill be read three times and passed; the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; and any statements relating to the matter be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SESSIONS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I appreciate the loyalty of my colleague from Washington for the Boeing facility that is there. I just want to say that other workers are involved, including 48,000 new jobs that would be created if the plant in Alabama were to be the one selected in this competition.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I would note that we voted a number of years ago unanimously to have a competition. There are only two companies in the world that can make this kind of aircraft. It is a commercial aircraft, not a highly sophisticated defense system such as a fighter. The EADS team committed to build that in America—bringing jobs not just to Alabama but jobs all over the Nation, far more around the Nation than just in Alabama—and to create a third major world aircraft facility. Congress asked that the bids be competitively let and that these two competitors be given a chance to submit the best proposal.

I am highly convinced that the EADS aircraft is superior—is larger, it is newer—and more effective in the role it is asked to fulfill.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I would just ask what the order is at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator sought recognition after he objected.

Mrs. MURRAY. The unanimous consent agreement was that the Senator from Texas would proceed after I had yielded the floor, which I had not yielded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At this time, the Senator from Alabama was the only person who sought recognition.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I believe there was an agreement that the Senator from Texas follow my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was an order, but there was no objection. There was no one who sought recognition.

Mr. SESSIONS. I will wrap up, briefly, if I could.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. If the Senator from Alabama wants to finish his objection—

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: My understanding

is that the Senator from Washington had 10 minutes. My understanding is she had completed that 10 minutes; am I incorrect on that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Her time has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. I didn't hear the Chair say that. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I ask the Senator from Alabama, I thought he was objecting on Senator MURRAY's time, and I was next in the unanimous consent. My question is, is he finished with his objection?

Mr. SESSIONS. I wish 1 additional minute to wrap up, if I could, and then I will yield the floor.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, then I ask unanimous consent for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I have the floor, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, after this competition has been going on for quite a number of years, and both parties have been very seriously competing for this contract, it is expected to be awarded in March of next year. The Defense Department has considered every one of these issues, including the WTO issue. The lawyers talked about it and we have talked about it in the Senate and the House.

At this very last minute, on the eve of awarding the competition, a House bill was passed without any debate. We have not discussed it or had a hearing on it. It should not be approved. I object.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, we are asking for a level playing field with a bill that passed the House. This is a discussion we have had many times. It says that illegal subsidies from any company should be taken into account on a deal in front of the Pentagon.

I will stand anytime and fight for fairness and competition. I am sorry this has been objected to, because it meant our country would have a fair competition.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I rise to speak on the START treaty. I spoke on the floor Saturday stating my concerns about this treaty and the need to address a number of very important issues. I had hoped that amendments that had been offered would be able to clarify the position—the United States position—on this treaty.

I have listened to the debate. I have watched many amendments go down. The treaty supporters have said that these amendments are deal killers,