

study concluded that the ethanol industry contributed \$8.4 billion to the Federal Treasury in 2009, \$3.4 billion more than the ethanol incentive. Today, the industry supports 400,000 U.S. jobs. That is why I support a homegrown, renewable fuels industry, as I know the Obama administration does as well.

I would encourage anyone who is unclear on the administration's position to contact Agriculture Secretary Vilsack.

I would like to conclude by asking my colleagues, if we allow the tax incentive to lapse, from where should we import an additional 10 percent of our oil? Should we rely on Middle East oil sheiks or Hugo Chavez? I would prefer we support our renewable fuel producers based right here at home rather than send them a pink slip. I would prefer to decrease our dependence on Hugo Chavez not increase it.

I certainly do not support raising the tax on gasoline during a recession. I would respectfully ask my colleagues to reconsider their support for this job-killing gas tax increase.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I support the comments from my colleague from Iowa on the importance of ethanol and the tax incentives and the ability to try to make us less dependent on foreign oil and produce more renewable energy in our country. So I appreciate the statement he has just made.

I want to talk about the START treaty and the importance of it. But I cannot help but respond, at least a bit, to some of the discussion that occurred as I walked on the Senate floor about the so-called tax cuts or the extension of the tax cuts.

You know, what is going to confound a lot of people who look back on history, perhaps historians who, in a rear-view mirror, look back 100 or 50 years—what is going to confound them about this time, this place, and these people, all of us, is what we did that seemed so irrational because, particularly economic models, if you are talking about economic historians, economic models are based on rational expectations. Then they create a model based on what would you do rationally.

Now here is what they are going to see at this moment. They will see a country that is at war halfway around the world. They will see a country with a \$13 trillion national debt and a \$1.3 trillion annual deficit. And what is the debate? Tax cuts that existed in 2001, through legislation I voted against, tax cuts that were extended and were set to expire this year would cost \$4 trillion in the coming 10 years to extend.

With a \$13 trillion debt, we have people coming to the floor of the Senate and saying they want to deal with this debt. Then, on the other side of the ledger, they say: And we want to extend all of the tax cuts.

That is another way of saying they want to take the \$13 trillion Federal debt to a \$17 trillion Federal debt. And, you know, historians are going to say: I thought there was some notion of rational expectations. What is rational about a country up to its neck in debt deciding: We are going to extend tax cuts even to the wealthiest Americans; those who make \$1 million a year shall be given a \$104,000-a-year tax cut?

Why? Because the minority is insisting upon it. Even though, just that piece of it, above \$250,000 a year in income, even though just that one piece will add \$1 trillion, that is the cost plus the interest to the Federal debt.

It is unbelievable. And the so-called little guy, the people out there who are working for a living and struggling—some of them lost their jobs, some lost their homes, some have lost hope—they are asking: Well, what about me? Why is it there is such energy to stand up for those who are making millions of dollars?

A guy named Barney Smith from Marion, Indiana stood up at the Democratic National Convention in Denver in 2008 and he asked this question. Barney Smith had lost his job, a job, that he said, is now being performed by someone overseas. Barney Smith said: When are you all going to treat Barney Smith like you treat Smith Barney? That is a pretty decent question. Who is on the floor standing for the interests of the Barney Smiths? I hope, perhaps in the coming days, there will be some rational expectations coming from this deliberative body, and that rational expectation should not include cutting taxes for the wealthiest Americans at a time when America is at war.

This morning, perhaps at 6 a.m., our soldiers were called out of bed halfway around the world, strapped on their ceramic body armor, took up their weapons, and went out on patrol. They will be shot at today halfway around the world. We are told our responsibility is to provide tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans.

I wish to read a comment from Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I don't see a notion in this country about self-sacrifice in order to meet common goals and reach the common purpose of our destiny.

Here is what Franklin Delano Roosevelt said when we were at war then:

"Not all of us can have the privilege of fighting our enemies in distant parts of the world. Not all of us can have the privilege of working in a munitions factory or a ship yard, or on the farms or in the oil fields or mines, producing the weapons or raw materials that are needed by our armed forces. But there is one front and one battle where everyone in the United States—every man, woman and child—is in action. . . . That front is right here at home, in our daily lives, and in our daily tasks. Here at home everyone will have the privilege of making whatever self-denial is necessary, not only to supply our fighting men, but to keep the economic structure of our country fortified and secure. . . ."

That isn't only for soldiers who sacrifice for country. It is for all of us. It

is distressing to me to see that the serious is treated so lightly and the light is treated too seriously in this Chamber. We know better. This country is loaded with debt. It is at war. We owe it to the American people and to the future to do better and try to steer this country toward better times.

START TREATY

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I rise to speak about the START treaty. This issue, while on the front pages in the last few days, is not front-page news generally, but it is so unbelievably important.

First, I compliment Senator KERRY, chairman of the committee. I compliment Senator LUGAR and others who have worked on this. I was part of the national security working group. We had many briefings during the negotiations with the Russians. I chair the appropriations subcommittee that funds our nuclear weapons, and I have stood next to nuclear weapons, know a lot about them, know about the horror of these weapons, as do almost all Americans. Let me describe how many nuclear warheads we have in the world.

This data is the Union of Concerned Scientists' that made an estimate in 2010. They said Russia has about 15,000 nuclear weapons; the United States about 9,400; China, 240; France, 300; Britain, 200. We can see Israel at 80. These are the expected number of nuclear weapons on the planet. That is somewhere around 25 to 28,000 nuclear weapons on this planet, the loss of one of which or the explosion of one of which in a major city by a terrorist group will change life on this planet forever.

The question is, What are we doing now to stop the spread of nuclear weapons, prevent terrorists and rogue nations from acquiring nuclear weapons, and then reducing the number of nuclear weapons? What are we doing?

I have told the story of the CIA agent called Dragonfire who, 1 month to the day, October 11, 2001, reported to his superiors there was evidence that a Russian 10 kiloton nuclear weapon had been stolen and smuggled into New York City by a terrorist group. That was exactly 1 month after 9/11 when Dragonfire provided that piece of information to the intelligence community. For a month or 2 months, there was an apoplectic seizure in the intelligence community, with the administration trying to figure out how to deal with this. No one from New York was informed, not even the mayor. It was later discovered this was not a credible piece of intelligence, and everyone breathed easier. But as they did the postmortem, they understood, it would have been possible, perhaps, to have believed a terrorist group could have stolen a low-yield Russian nuclear weapon. It would have been possible for them to have stolen it and to have smuggled it into a major city, New York or Washington, and it would have

been possible for a terrorist group to have detonated it. That is one nuclear weapon. There are 25,000 on this planet.

This morning on the way to work I heard a description on the radio of the nuclear weapons possessed by Pakistan. The question by some people who know a lot about this is whether there is an impossibility of someone from al-Qaida or the Taliban infiltrating the structure by which there is security for the nuclear weapons in Pakistan. That is an open question.

Earlier this year I was in Moscow, about an hour and a half outside Moscow, at a training facility we have helped fund in Russia to train for the security of Russian nuclear weapons. It is in all our interests—it is in the interest of the future of mankind—to understand the urgency to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and to stop rogue nations and terrorists from acquiring nuclear weapons and, finally, at least to begin substantially reducing the number of nuclear weapons. That is what brings us to the issue of the START treaty.

I don't denigrate anyone or suggest that anyone who raises questions about this is uninformed. That is not the case. All of us want what is best for this country and for the world. We want to have arms reduction treaties and weapons reductions in a way that is verifiable and will strengthen the world's security. There have been a lot of questions asked. A lot of them have been answered. It is my hope that all of us who have been interested in this—and that is both Republicans and Democrats—will find ways to come together and pass this START treaty.

If I might, I will describe the unbelievable success we know occurs from this kind of activity. We don't have to test this. We know it works. Through the Nunn-Lugar program, which has been around for some while, we actually fund the activities to destroy weapons that previously were aimed at the United States. Albania is now chemical weapons free; the Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belarus have no nuclear weapons any longer; 7,500 warheads have been deactivated; 32 ballistic missile submarines; 1,400 long-range nuclear missiles; 155 bombers.

I know it is repetitive, but I wish to again say that I have in my desk a piece of wing from a Soviet Backfire bomber. We didn't shoot this down. I ask unanimous consent to show it.

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

Mr. DORGAN. As a result of Nunn-Lugar, we sawed the wings off. How is it that I stand on the floor with a piece of a wing from a bomber that used to carry nuclear weapons threatening to destroy this country? I do that because we know these work.

Ukraine is now nuclear free. This is a hinge from a silo that contained a nuclear-tipped missile aimed at the United States. This piece, from a silo containing an intercontinental bal-

listic missile aimed at America, is from a missile that no longer exists. The nuclear weapon is gone; the missile is gone. There are now sunflower seeds planted where there was previously a missile. I tell that to say: We understand what works. Arms negotiations, arms treaties with which we have tried to reduce delivery vehicles and nuclear weapons work.

I have just described the Nunn-Lugar program. Let me show a couple photographs of it. This is a Typhoon-class ballistic missile submarine that carried nuclear weapons. I have the copper wiring from this submarine in my desk, reminding all of us, again, that this works. We didn't have to destroy this submarine with a weapon under the sea in hostile action. We negotiated a treaty. It was taken apart.

This shows an SS-18 missile silo in Ukraine. We can see they planted dynamite and blew up the silo. Because we agreed with the Russians that we were going to reduce nuclear weapons, reduce delivery vehicles, that silo is now gone and sunflower seeds are planted where a missile previously had been.

Here is a photograph of a Blackjack bomber that the old Soviet Union and Russia had. We destroyed it, sawed off the wings. We know these kinds of treaties work.

The treaty negotiated is supported by so many people. ADM Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, says:

I, the Vice Chairman and the Joint Chiefs, as well as our combatant commanders, stand solidly behind this new treaty. This treaty represents our country's best interests, in my judgment.

There are many things to say in support of concluding an arms control agreement with the Russians. There are many questions that have been raised about the treaty and have been answered. When I described earlier the large number of people who say it is in this country's interest to support this treaty, I did not put up several of these, but let me say, Dr. Kissinger, said:

I recommend ratification of the treaty. It should be noted I come from the hawkish side of this debate so I'm not advocating these measures in the abstract. I try to build them into my perception of the national interest.

This morning George Shultz, James Baker, Lawrence Eagleburger, Colin Powell, and Dr. Kissinger wrote an op-ed piece in the Post making the case.

Those who have raised questions about this are as concerned about our national security as anybody else. They believe, as I do, in the same goals. Let's keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of terrorist organizations and rogue nations. Let's stop the spread of nuclear weapons and, ultimately, let's try to reduce the number of weapons on this planet. I think everybody here who is involved are people of good will. My fervent hope is that in the coming couple weeks, as we conclude this session of the Congress,

we will find a way to have on the floor this treaty which is so widely supported and be able to say, all of us of every persuasion, we did something that will have a lasting impact on the future of this country, the security of this country, and the security of the world. We did something that reduces nuclear weapons, the number of nuclear weapons among the two nations that have, by far, the most nuclear weapons. We did something that substantially reduces the number of delivery vehicles for nuclear weapons. This will provide for a much greater measure of security for us and the rest of the world.

Those who have spoken on this issue, giving different views, offering different views, I have great respect for them. Many of them and I were part of the national security working group. Along the line when the treaty was being negotiated, we had meetings in an area that is for top-secret presentations. All along the way we understood what was happening and how it was happening. I think this is a treaty that is mutually beneficial and represents not only the best interests of both countries that are parties to the treaty but especially the best interests of the world.

I started by saying the loss of one nuclear weapon exploded in one city on the planet would change everything about our lives. We have about 25,000 nuclear weapons on the planet. The security of those weapons, the ability to keep them out of the wrong hands, the ability to keep others from acquiring weapons, the ability to reduce weapons, all of that urgent and important. It doesn't always rise to the top in the debate in the Senate, but now we have that discussion around this treaty which is only a first step. I hope, by the end of this month, perhaps all of us could celebrate having a significant achievement for the security of the country and for the world.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak up to 15 minutes.

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

ENERGY

Mr. BOND. Madam President, as America's energy needs continue to grow, so does our need for common-sense approaches to meeting these needs. Unfortunately, the Obama administration's announcement yesterday dealt a death blow to one of our most important ways to expand our domestic energy supplies. My message to the Obama administration is that we need to drill it, not kill it. Yesterday, the administration announced the eastern Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic coast to be off-limits to any new offshore drilling for the next 5 years. In