

problem. We can't instantly create a refinery out of nothing. As the refineries were shut down as a result of Katrina, the price of gas spiked as people anticipated that there would not be enough supply. As the refineries came back on line more rapidly than anybody anticipated, the price of gasoline dropped.

Now refinery capacity is being shut down again. Why? Because we here in this Congress mandated the replacement of MTBE with ethanol, and the refineries have to gear up to make that shift. When they do that, they shut down in order to retool. When they shut down, there is a lack of gasoline, and you have prices going back up again. Once they have made the shift over, we will find those prices will start to come down, unless there is some other unsettling situation somewhere in the world.

The bottom line, to repeat a refrain I have stated ever since I have been in the Senate, is that we cannot repeal the law of supply and demand. We engrave Latin phrases around here—and they are wonderful—to remind us of our history and our background, but if I could control what we carve in marble and see every day, it would be that statement: You cannot repeal the law of supply and demand. If we had built the facilities in ANWR in 2001 when there were sufficient votes in the House but was killed in the Senate, it is likely that oil would be coming on line now, because at the time people said: Don't get excited about ANWR; it is going to take at least 5 years. Well, 2001 was 5 years ago. If we had done that, we would start to see that oil. Would it lower the price? Of course it would because it would change the equation of expectations of people who are involved in this whole situation.

One last comment. I have talked about ethanol, and I have talked about MTBE. These are additives to lower the emissions that come out of gasoline, and they are good things. They are, however, expensive, and we cannot say on one hand: OK, let's get the price of gasoline as low as possible, and by the way, while we are doing it, let's put new burdens on the refineries that require this additive, that additive, and the other additive, that will require the creation of what are called boutique fuels, so that the refinery, instead of just putting out gasoline in regular or super high test, are putting out a boutique fuel for this part of the country and a boutique fuel for that part of the country and a boutique fuel for the other part of the country. That means constantly retooling, shutting down, starting up, changing, and all of that adds to the cost.

We have added to the cost here in the Congress in the name of environmental protection. I am not saying environmental protection is bad, but I am saying it costs money. We should pay attention to that so when the time comes for us to say what can we do about the high gasoline prices, the answer is we

can pay attention and be a little more humble before the power of market forces. If we think Government can intervene with market forces and produce long-term lower prices, all we need to do is dredge up memory of what happened the last time we panicked about this as a nation in the 1970s. Under the leadership of President Carter we created a synfuels corporation, created oil company windfall taxes, and ended up in lines on separate days. You could only get your gas tank filled on alternative days. Ultimately, we saw all of the effort collapse when market forces finally took hold and brought the prices back in line.

I know it is not a message people want to hear. I, like Senator BURNS and other Senators, have been out in my constituency during the break, and I heard people talking about: What are you going to do about gas prices? I had two choices. I could either tell them I will come back here and I will fight to lower the gas prices—and make them feel good—or I could tell them the truth. I chose to tell them the truth. This is a long-term problem, it is a serious problem, and it can only be solved by serious policies. The most intelligent serious policy that we can adopt is to do whatever we can to facilitate the kinds of competition and market forces that ultimately will bring supply up and prices down and deal with the demand side as best we can through conservation.

It is not a quick fix. We can't pass a resolution and say, gee, look what we did and see something happen at the pump the day after tomorrow. It is time we recognize that fact and told our constituents the truth.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

#### FTC INVESTIGATION

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about gas prices and the energy situation in our country. First, to agree with my distinguished colleague from Utah, in fact there are long-term issues we have to address. There is no question about that. Alternative fuels, the efforts to put forward very aggressive alternatives such as ethanol, soy-based biodiesel, and other alternatives that create real competition, are critical, but there are short-term actions we can take right now that will help the families who are being squeezed on all sides by outrageous prices, along with outrageously high profits of the oil companies.

Today our leader on the floor, our Republican leader, said there ought to be an investigation going on, and the President said today we ought to have an investigation going on as to possible price gouging. I come to the floor today, as the author of the amendment that successfully passed in the Energy bill last August, to say that we have an investigation going on. The Federal

Trade Commission was authorized and charged with doing an investigation, which they are doing as a criminal investigation, into possible price gouging. I was pleased to be joined by Senator DORGAN and Senator BOXER and others in that effort.

Since that time, because they began to move extremely slowly last year, I was pleased to coauthor an increase of \$1 million in the budget in order to fund that investigation. We passed that last fall. There have been bipartisan letters that have gone to the Chairman of the FTC saying let's get going. That occurred last fall, last September. Now we are seeing from the Federal Trade Commission that they intend to have this report done, this investigation done by May 21.

It is about time. First I would say: Mr. President, it is your FTC. You appoint the majority of the members on the Federal Trade Commission. You should know that this is going on.

I encourage the President to be engaged with what his Federal Trade Commission is doing at this very moment. Hopefully, we are going to get the right kind of investigation with tough recommendations that will tell it like it is. This is already occurring. Right now the investigation, as I said, is structured as a law enforcement case. They are working with the CFTC, with the States Attorneys General right now. I encourage everyone interested in this issue to give their input to the Federal Trade Commission that is already doing an investigation.

In fact, one of the things they found doing this investigation, as they sent out 200 investigation demands which are roughly the same as subpoenas, ExxonMobil, back in January-February, filed a petition to quash the FTC subpoena for tax information. Fortunately, the Commission denied the appeal and ExxonMobil had to subsequently comply. But now they are looking at manipulation and gouging, whether or not that is happening. They are confident, they say, that they found enough information for a solid determination in their final report, which is expected on May 21.

I say, first to my Republican colleagues, to the leadership, to the President, this investigation is already going on. I am glad you now think there ought to be an investigation. But we would appreciate it if you would be involved in making sure what the FTC does is tough and smart and tells it like it is in terms of what is really going on.

Gasoline is not a luxury for the families of Michigan or the families anywhere across the country. It is a necessity. Families are caught in a bind because, on the one hand, this is not a regulated utility like electricity, and there is not enough competition with basically five different companies. We all know there is not enough competition because of the consolidations that have gone on. So what happens? American consumers are stuck in the middle, squeezed on all sides.

Now in Michigan it costs about \$42 to fill up a tank. That is \$4 more than last month; \$150 more than last year. We are told by the Energy Information Administration there is going to be an average 25-cent increase this summer. We already know that numbers are topping \$3, in some cases around the country \$4 a gallon.

What this means on average to Michigan families is about \$500 more in the cost of gas for this year—about \$500. For the average family that is a mortgage payment. That is the rent. That is a car payment. It is paying for food. It is the difference between helping your kids buy books when they need to go to college. This is a big deal. Yet we see comments coming from the head of ExxonMobil, Mr. Raymond, who dismissed the concerns between Exxon's record profits and out-of-control gas prices when he said on CNN that a single quarter or single year's profits is not all that significant.

Mr. Raymond, it may not be significant to you. It is significant to the people in Michigan. Five hundred dollars more is significant. It is a big deal.

We also know that according to our businesses—for instance, General Motors executives say that every time there is a \$1 increase in the price of a barrel of oil it adds \$4 million to GM's logistical costs. So this is an issue of jobs. Petroleum costs equate with what is happening on jobs. So this is a big deal.

It is also a big deal for the oil companies. As we all know, we have all been seeing the numbers, the total combined profit for the big five oil companies last year was \$111 billion. For 2005, ExxonMobil reported the highest profits ever recorded in U.S. corporate history.

What adds insult to injury is when we look at the things like the CEO compensation. He is being paid a total compensation package of \$69.7 million. That is about \$110,000 a day, by the way. Most people in Michigan don't make \$110,000 a year, and we have the head of the largest oil company making \$110,000 a day, with a \$400 million retirement package. Then we are to expect that this is just the global marketplace happening, that there is nothing we can do? I don't accept that.

In the short run we can do one thing and that is go back to the drawing board on a bill that is in conference committee right now on tax cuts. That has over \$5 billion in new tax cuts, tax breaks for oil companies, some of it based on their businesses overseas. We can say no. This industry does not need taxpayers to subsidize \$5 billion-plus, plus another \$2 billion in the Energy bill that passed last year. We are looking at \$7 billion in increased tax breaks that American taxpayers are subsidizing while we are paying the higher prices? No.

I have introduced a bill called the Oil Company Accountability Act that says no to more tax breaks for oil companies and puts that money back into a

\$500 rebate per taxpayer in this country to pay the cost of higher gas prices for the coming year. The average taxpayer is going to pay \$500 more. I think that is a better use of those dollars than putting it into more tax breaks for an industry that is already the most profitable, with the most outrageous salaries, and that continues to price gasoline at a level that is out of control.

I am hopeful my colleagues will be offering this in various capacities. It would be terrific to get this passed right away because families could have their checks in the mailbox before Labor Day to help them pay the outrageously high gas increases that we are seeing: \$500 tax rebate checks for families, no to the oil companies on more tax breaks, and that at least gets us on the right track while other long-term efforts needed take place.

Mr. President, I yield.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I want to take 5 minutes to talk a little about the energy issues that are affecting us and challenging us as a nation and the high price of gasoline more specifically. I am persuaded that most of the increase in the price of gasoline that we are seeing at the pump is a result of the increase in the price of oil and that most of that increase in the price of oil is a result of supply and demand factors. Not all of it, necessarily, but the majority of the cause is with supply and demand.

So the question comes down to what can we be doing to come to grips with this supply and demand situation? To the extent that there is manipulation of the price, what can we do to deal with that?

Let me talk about the manipulation first. I strongly support putting in place a Federal statute that prohibits price gouging. Many States have similar statutes, and they have had some success in the enforcement of those statutes. But we have no Federal statute to that effect. We had a hearing. That was a joint hearing between the Energy Committee and the Commerce Committee a couple of months ago. It was in November, so it has been more than a couple of months ago. We had the head of the Federal Trade Commission, Deborah Platt Majoras, there testifying. The Federal Trade Commission is the Federal agency that would be the natural agency to have responsibility for enforcement of a Federal anti-price-gouging statute. She testified:

A Federal statute that makes it illegal to charge prices that are considered to be too high as long as companies set those prices independently would be a mistake. The omission of a Federal price gouging law is not inadvertent. It reflects sound policy choices.

The clear position of the Federal Trade Commission, as articulated by the Chairwoman of the Federal Trade Commission of this administration, is that they do not want a Federal anti-price-gouging statute, they do not be-

lieve it would be good policy to have such a statute. They would find it difficult to enforce and therefore they urge Congress not to proceed.

I think that is a mistake. I think we should bring an anti-price-gouging statute to the floor, and we should proceed to pass it as soon as possible. So that is on the manipulation issue.

What about supply and demand and the effect that is having on the price of gasoline? Clearly, the supply is not what it needs to be to meet demand today. Trying to increase simply over the short term is very difficult. The most likely prospect we have for increasing supply in the next few years is legislation that I have cosponsored along with Senator DOMENICI to try to open up an area in the gulf coast for drilling. That is lease sale 181. That legislation would open up for development an area that is estimated to contain 6 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, an area that is estimated to contain 1 billion barrels of oil. That would help. That is not an immediate fix, but over the next few years that could begin to help with the supply situation.

What about demand? Frankly, that is the area where we could do the most good. In the Energy bill we passed last year, we did some things to try to reduce demand, to try to encourage additional efficiency, to try to encourage additional conservation, but we did too little, in my view.

There is more that can be done, particularly in the transportation sector. This is legislation that I am joining with others on in a bipartisan group to introduce this week which is called the Enhanced Energy Efficiency Act of 2006. This legislation would try to set targets and goals and requirements for the various Federal agencies to adopt, policies to save oil over the next several years—and it would put specific amounts of savings that we would work toward. They could do that through a variety of initiatives, a variety of policy changes and regulatory changes to encourage more fuel-efficient vehicles, to encourage fleet conservation requirements, assistance to State programs to retire fuel-inefficient vehicles, assistance to States to reduce schoolbus idling.

There are a variety of provisions in this bill. These are provisions which were included in a bill that Senators BAYH, BROWNBACK, COLEMAN, and various other Senators introduced earlier in this Congress. I think it was S. 2025. But these are provisions that would be under the jurisdiction of the Energy Committee. These are provisions that I believe would begin the process of looking more seriously at ways we can reduce demand.

We could encourage efficiency in our use of energy, and particularly in our use of oil. These are steps that could be taken—that need to be taken.

I think we should pass a Federal anti-price-gouging law. We could do that quickly. We can get that to the President for his signature.

We can also pass this other legislation. We can pass the legislation that opens lease sale 181 for development. That, again, would help somewhat with the supply situation. Unfortunately, it is very difficult to affect the price of gasoline through legislation in the short term. I think we all need to acknowledge that. But I believe there are steps we can take. I believe there are policies we can adopt. I hope we can work in a bipartisan way to do that.

I hope we can come to the aid of the American consumers who are having to pay these very high prices for gasoline at this time.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this morning the President of the United States held a press conference and announced the following: Prices at the pumps reflect our addiction to oil.

So it turns out it is our fault. It turns out it is the fault of the consumers. It is the fault of families and businesses and farmers that the prices have gone so high. I don't think so. I think the prices at the pump reflect the oil companies' addiction to greed.

Let me give you a case to consider. Lee Raymond, CEO of Exxon, recently retired. Did he get a gold watch for his service to Exxon? No. Mr. Raymond was given a severance package of \$400 million. And the prices at the pumps reflect the consumers' shortcoming?

ExxonMobil recorded the highest corporate profits in the history of the United States of America. Money went straight from the credit cards of American families into the board rooms of ExxonMobil. They realized billions of dollars in profit, and they turned around and gave Mr. Raymond, as a farewell gift for his fine tutelage over their company, \$400 million as a going-away gift. And the President says the price at the pumps reflects the consumers' addiction to oil? What choice do consumers have?

You go shop around in your hometown, as I did in Springfield and Chicago. There is some variation from pump to pump, from gas station to gas station. By and large, consumers have nowhere to turn.

What is happening is the price of gasoline is going up so fast, so high, that it is creating a hardship—not just for farmers and individuals but for America's economy—for the farmers I represent who are trying to put a crop in the field, for businesses that depend on the cost of energy as one of their input costs. That is a reality.

Let me say to the President that the prices at the pumps don't reflect our addiction to oil; they reflect a failure in leadership by this White House.

It hasn't even been 1 year—not 12 months—since the President ceremoniously signed the Energy bill for America's energy policy last August. What a great bill that has been. Since that bill was signed, what has happened to the price of energy and heat-

ing, and energy and gasoline? It has gone up dramatically across America. That bill was a failure. It was a failure because this administration believes the price at the pump is the fault of the consumers. It isn't. The consumers have nowhere to turn. That bill that was passed was an outrage. There were some provisions in it that I supported—expanding the use of alcohol fuels, alternative fuels—but the bill also contained multibillion-dollar subsidies to the oil industry at a time when they are enjoying record-breaking profits.

We are going to take money away from taxpayers and give it to industry? What in the world could we be thinking?

The bill also has had no meaningful conservation effort. How can we be serious about an energy policy in America if we aren't moving toward more fuel-efficient cars and trucks? We continue to import oil from overseas with abandon.

Why hasn't this administration set as a goal for America what the Democrats argued for on the floor; that is, that we would reduce our dependence on foreign oil by more than 50 percent over the next 10 years? We can do it with the vision and leadership of a White House that is not wedded to the oil industry but wedded, rather, to an economy that is being at this point seriously disadvantaged by the terrible increases in gasoline prices.

When the President wants to blame the consumer pulling up to the pump for his addiction to oil, I have to ask the President: What have you done? What has Congress done? What should we do?

Let me say this: Despite my serious misgivings about the energy policy of this administration which believes the answer to our prayers is to drill for oil in a wildlife refuge in Alaska that we have protected for 50 years, a refuge which at best will start producing oil in 10 years, and over its lifespan produce 6 months of energy for America, as if this is the answer to our prayers, that is very shortsighted. We need to come together. We need to understand that when the Republican leaders in Congress and the President of the United States are saying we had better call the Federal Trade Commission because something is going wrong with gasoline stations—America, excuse me; the Federal Trade Commission is part of this administration. Why are they waiting until this moment in time when all the bells and whistles and alarms are sounding to finally realize that we have to move on price gouging and price fixing?

I think it is time to have a windfall profits tax. I introduced that bill. When ExxonMobil can realize billions of dollars of profit at the expense of American businesses and families, it is time for us to step in and say that money is coming back to the Treasury and back to the consumers. We have talked for a long time about tax cuts for average families. How about a tax

rebate from the windfall profits of these oil companies going right back to the families who are being flailed by these high gasoline prices. That would send a message to the oil companies that their price gouging is not going to go without penalty. They will pay a price for it. Those who would benefit from the windfall profits tax are the very consumers who are paying these high energy prices.

I think that is what we need to do. We need to understand that if we are going to have an energy policy in America which keeps our economy moving forward, we need to acknowledge the obvious. It is not the consumers' fault. The consumer has nowhere to turn at this point but to pay these high gasoline prices. It is the fault of leadership—the leadership at the oil companies that will take every last penny out of every working family they can at the pump, and it is the fault of an administration which comes from the oil patch and has been afraid to confront their old friends when it comes to these rising gasoline prices.

It is time to start anew. It is time to start on a bipartisan basis to understand that this isn't just a temporary inconvenience. It is something which can seriously handicap this economy for a long time to come.

I just returned from Illinois. I spent 2 weeks traveling all over the State, the city of Chicago, and suburban areas. I tell you that I expected to hear a lot about the Iraqi war, a lot about immigration, health care, education, and I did hear about those, but the thing that is focusing the attention of the people in Illinois is the price at the gasoline stations.

These families understand that this is a hardship they never counted on. It is bad enough in this country when these families struggle to try to make a living, to put their kids through school, make that mortgage payment, but then to have these oil companies and their rapacious greed charging higher and higher prices for their product and taking \$400 million so Mr. Raymond can have a sweet retirement from ExxonMobil, that is unconscionable.

It is time for the President to speak out. It is not a question of whether our addiction to oil has caused this problem. It is not the consumers' fault. No. It is the fault of the oil company executives and this administration which needs to show real leadership so this economy doesn't stall.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would very much like to work on an energy policy in a bipartisan way. I think we all understand that the only way to get anything important done in Washington, DC, is to work in a bipartisan way. Unfortunately, the same Bush administration that so tragically bungled the response to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita has now bungled its way to \$3-a-

gallon gasoline. And in particular, I am concerned that all of the evidence showed that this spring we would have these problems.

The administration, for example, has given Congress a variety of reports about how post-Katrina we would have evidence of a supply problem. With respect to the changeover from MTBE to ethanol, all the evidence was available many months ago. The Wall Street Journal was warning about it—that there would be huge logistical problems for service stations and others to make that changeover.

We know that ethanol—and the Senator from Illinois has been one of the leaders in this effort—is going to play an important role in America's gasoline future. Given that, this should have been an all-hands-on-deck approach at the administration trying to watchdog the transition from MTBE to ethanol. This is an administration with enormous expertise in the oil area. For all practical purposes, this is an administration that is almost marinated in oil. One official after another has a history and a background in this sector. Yet where was the Department of Energy? Where was the Environmental Protection Agency? Where was the Commodity Futures Trading Commission at a key time in our country's energy future?

With all the problems overseas—Nigeria, Venezuela, and Iraq producing a tiny fraction of what they were able to produce before the war—we knew that this was going to be a difficult time this spring.

I talked to a gasoline station owner last night. I pulled up and was faced with the prospect of \$3.25 a gallon. That station owner said: Nobody gave us any information at all about how to proceed in this significant switchover from MTBE to ethanol.

They have to clean their tanks. There are tremendous logistical problems and a different role for transportation with respect to trucks and rails versus pipelines. Normally, you would have taken a much longer period of time to make this changeover. That wasn't done.

So the administration should have been there working with the service station owners and the oil companies and a variety of parties to try to minimize the problems when you are having this massive transition in the energy area. So we are going to see instances where people try to exploit the situation. I hope we can get the Federal Trade Commission off the dime and finally go out and take the steps to protect the public from this exploitation.

It was known a year ago that this was a time when we would have a perfect energy storm. We knew we were going to have the equivalent of what amounts to a level 5 hurricane in the gasoline market. Yet the folks in the administration sat on their hands. It did not have to be that way.

I want to work in a bipartisan way to turn this around. Unfortunately, the

same kind of bumbling and bungling approach that was taken in responding to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita has driven our gasoline prices over \$3 a gallon. We ought to come together. I recommended yesterday in a lengthy speech a variety of steps we could take in the short term—for example, helping the States to make this transition to ethanol easier. We can do it in a bipartisan way. If it were not for the bungling of this administration over the last year and its failure to take the steps that could have prevented much of what we have seen, we would not have to come to this point. That is unfortunate. The American people have been gratuitously hammered again. It didn't have to be.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I have been listening to the debate in the Senate. Senator CORNYN is going to respond in a little more detail. Honestly, it is very important we address the energy issue in a way that suggests what we can do. The people of America are not interested in Democratic charges against Republicans and Republican charges against Democrats. They want more resources so the price of gasoline at the pump will come down.

In my hometown of Dallas, there are shortages now in addition to the high prices. We need to do some things that diversify our resources so we depend on our own resources for oil and natural gas. That means drilling for oil in our country and trying to make sure we have conservation and alternative sources of energy, which is exactly what Congress has been trying to do. We have been held up in doing it.

I appreciate very much this opportunity. I am very pleased to work with my colleague, Senator CORNYN.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I will use a few minutes to respond to some of the voices that have been raised regarding the fuel prices. Of course, this is an issue that affects everyone. It is ironic that those who have railed the loudest against high gasoline prices are the ones who indeed are responsible for obstructing rational energy policy in this country that would bring down the price of gasoline itself.

For example, we all know that the global competition for oil and gas is greater with the industrialization and growth of countries such as China, with 1.3 billion people, with the growth and industrialization of countries such as India. But notwithstanding the need to diversify our energy sources to nuclear energy and use the 300 years of coal we have in this country in a clean and environmentally sensitive way, we have been met with nothing but obstruction when it comes to trying to both diversify our energy sources and to undertake policies that would literally bring down the price of gasoline at the pump.

It is no secret the single greatest factor in high gasoline prices is high oil prices. We have simply been denied

every opportunity we have tried to undertake to expand domestic production at home by exploring places such as the Arctic Wildlife Refuge in an environmentally responsible way and drilling offshore in America in a way that can preserve both the environment but also increase the supply of oil and help bring down the price of gas.

Congress can do a lot of things, but we cannot repeal the laws of supply and demand. Without additional supply, we know with additional demand, prices will continue to go up. Because of obstruction and unreasonable regulation we have not seen a new refinery built in this country in the last 30 years.

Our time would be used more productively if our colleagues across the aisle would work with us to diversify and expand the sources of domestic energy so we can help bring down the price at the pump. It would be much more constructively used if we work together rather than attempting to score political points and to place the blame in a political season.

I yield the floor.

---

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

---

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

---

#### NOMINATION OF GRAY HAMPTON MILLER TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session for consideration of Calendar No. 602, which the clerk will report.

Under the previous order, there will be 5 minutes for the Senator from Texas.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Gray Hampton Miller, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District Of Texas.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to talk about Gray Miller. Senator CORNYN and I are dividing this time because we are both responsible for nominating this incredible person to serve on the Federal district bench from the southern district of Texas in his hometown of Houston.

Senator CORNYN and I have a process. We have a committee made up of Republicans and Democrats, geographically diverse, lawyers respected in their fields, who interview all of the nominees for Federal benches. There were quite a few nominees, probably 15 to 20, for this particular bench. They rank them. Senator CORNYN and I then talked to the top 3 or 4 nominees. It has been a great system. We have gotten extremely qualified judges on the