United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 12, 2008 No. 77

Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JIM WEBB, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty and Eternal God, help us to find ourselves that we may find You and discover one another. Lord, lead us to become part of Your family, part of one another, bound together by ties of Your love.

Unite our lawmakers. Their tasks require strength beyond their individual abilities. Lord, they need Your wisdom and might for this time of challenge. Show them the road on which they can make bipartisan progress and give them the courage to do Your will. Remind them that those who sow sparingly shall reap sparingly and those who sow bountifully shall reap bountifully. Help them to see the unfinished work that is theirs to complete.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JIM WEBB led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2008.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JIM WEBB, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WEBB thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader time, the Senate will proceed to a period of morning business, with the time until 5:30 this evening equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. As has been previously announced, there will be no rollcall votes today. There will be votes, though, tomorrow, as early as 11 a.m.—probably about 11:10 a.m.—and we will begin voting in relation to the following items: McConnell amendment on energy, with a 60-vote threshold; the Reid amendment on energy, with a 60-vote threshold—of course, my name is on the amendment because I offered it as part of my leadership responsibilities, but that is an amendment that has been worked on very hard by Senator DORGAN of North Dakota—and passage of the flood insurance legislation. I say, Mr. President, it will be a good day for America when we pass that. That will affect millions of Americans. The Banking Committee did an outstanding job of getting it here ready for passage. Senators DODD and SHELBY did a wonderful job in completing that legislation. And we will also have, tomorrow, a cloture vote on the motion to proceed to H.R. 980, first responders collective bargaining. With that being the case, we will probably complete our last vote—let's see, we have four votes an hour—maybe about 12:15, something like that, we will start the last vote, give or take a few minutes.

So between now and the Memorial Day recess, we have a tremendous amount of work to do. There is so much unfinished business. But let me mention a few of the things we are going to complete or give it our very best.

The first responders collective bargaining bill: We will be on that tomorrow. The farm bill conference report: We expect the House to consider the conference report as early as Wednesday. We need to complete it before we leave this week, which brings me to the point: We are going to do everything we can to see that we can complete our business by noon on Friday. But that is no guarantee. There will have to be some cooperation among Senators; otherwise, we are going to have to work—I know this is difficult because people have responsibilities other places outside Washington, but we very likely could have some work Friday afternoon, hopefully not very late in the day. But I do not know. Everyone should be prepared and arrange their schedules accordingly.

We have this week and next week. One of the things we need to do is appoint conferees to the budget resolution. The House is expected to appoint conferees this week. There is a statutory 10-hour limitation on debate to go to conference. As Senators know, motions to instruct are in order. I will work with the Republican leader on an agreement to move the process forward in an orderly fashion; otherwise, we will do it in a disorderly fashion, and we will have only 10 hours to be disorderly.

We also have a statutory direction to complete a resolution of disapproval, either yes or no, regarding FCC media ownership rulemaking. The reason we are able to do this, Senator Don Nickles of Oklahoma and I worked in the early 1990s to pass—and we did—a piece

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

of legislation that says if the administration or an agency promulgates a regulation, and we do not like it, we can overturn it. We have done that in the past, and that is what this is all about. It is a nondebatable motion to proceed to the resolution, and there are 10 hours of debate with no amendments in order.

We also have—even though we can say it quickly, it is going to take some time—the emergency supplemental, which will be on the floor next Wednesday. We need to complete this before the recess. We are not going to be panicked into completing this. We know there is enough money to fund the troops for a considerable period after the Memorial Day recess. We want to get it done, and we will do our best to get that done, but we are not going to be pushed into doing something we do not think is appropriate.

On judges, I committed to Senator MCCONNELL that I would use my best efforts to have the Senate consider three court of appeals nominees before the Memorial Day recess. I have been working with Senator LEAHY to meet that pledge. The nomination of Steven Agee to be a Fourth Circuit judge should be available for debate late this week or early next week.

We are also trying to move forward on two court of appeals nominees from Michigan. The problem we have had with that is Republicans on the Judiciary Committee complained that Chairman LEAHY is moving these too quickly. So, Mr. President, they cannot have it both ways. If I am going to do what I said I would do, we need some cooperation from the Republicans. I cannot push the committee to take up nominees they do not want. It is my understanding these two appeals court nominees from Michigan have been worked out over a period of 6 years. It has taken a long time to get to where we are now. So I would hope the Republicans would back off their slow-walking this. Otherwise, we are not going to be able to complete these nominations before the Memorial Day recess.

Finally, we are going to do our utmost to get a vote on an energy package before we leave for the Memorial Day recess. I repeat, we will likely have to have votes on this Friday. We will do them as quickly as we can. There will be no votes on Monday. We have had a number of requests over many months for people who have things to do in their home States on that day. There will be no votes on Monday. So that is going to make everything very difficult next week because I have outlined the many different things we have to do.

TRAGEDY IN BURMA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, over the past several days, we have seen a terrible tragedy unfold in Burma. The official death toll from that cyclone is unknown. But we know the number is in the tens of thousands. We have tens of thousands missing.

International aid organizations fear we are still in the beginning stages of this catastrophe. It is estimated that more than a million and a half people remain in desperate need of help. They are becoming more desperate every day.

Without international aid and expertise, many of these men, women, and children will likely lose their lives to starvation, dehydration, and disease—cholera, typhoid are two among them.

The relationship between the Burmese regime and the global community is complicated, and that is an understatement. In this hour of staggering desperation, the junta must put politics aside and accept the outstretched hand the world is extending to them.

Burma is a government run by dictators. They are nondemocratic. We have had problems with them for years. Senator MCCONNELL has spoken on this floor over the years focusing attention on the nondemocratic process in Burma and how the international community should join the United States in doing something about this.

Today, finally, one American plane was allowed to land in the country—one. This is a start, but it is far few too many loads of supplies. Not only are the supplies having difficulty getting in, but the military folks in Burma are not allowing the international community to help, and they are the ones who have the expertise.

Each day that goes by is a sad day in that country. We have seen the pictures over the weekend of the children lying dead, having died from typhoid.

The junta must allow more supplies, provide visas to aid workers from around the world, and allow those workers access to regions and communities that are suffering very much.

Senator MCCONNELL and I join together to say to the junta: Let the world in. Let us help.

CONSUMER FIRST ENERGY ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on Friday, oil hit yet another record high. I do not know what it is today. It dropped 50 cents last night to more than $125 a barrel. But on Friday it was above $126 a barrel. If it drops—which we hope it does—to $110, $105, $100, $90, $95, it should not be a day of celebration. Oil is a difficult problem for our country.

The average price of a gallon of gasoline in America today is now above $3.60 a gallon. That is the average. In Nevada, it is more than $3.80 a gallon. Diesel—the fuel that moves the goods we buy—has hit $4.15, on an average, around the country.

Seven years ago, when President Bush took office, the average price for a gallon of gasoline was about $1.50. Now it is 2½ times more than that.

At first, the steady rise of gas prices was a nuisance. Then it became a burden. Now it is a full-blown crisis. More than 7 in 10 Americans now say gas prices have created financial hardships in their lives. Nevadans are paying, on average, $3,000 more per year for gasoline than they did 7 years ago.

Millions of working people all across America are now spending the first few hours of their workday earning back what they paid for their commute. It costs more than ever to heat and cool our homes. Everything costs more. We have a problem with these people who are paying—in Nevada, $3,000—more than they did 7 years ago for gasoline. It affects their house payments, car payments, their medicine, whether they can send their kids to college. It is very difficult—what kind of groceries they buy. It wipes out most vacations.

School districts in Nevada and around the country are forced to make cutbacks in the classroom because the cost of school buses has never been higher. I met with the officials of commercial airlines in the United States a short time ago in my office across the hall. They said almost 50 percent of the cost of flying an airplane in America today is fuel. It is not that way in Europe because the dollar is so weak they get it much cheaper than we do.

Small businesses are struggling under the burden of record-high shipping costs. The $60, $80 or more Americans are paying at the pump means less money for other necessities—I have mentioned some of them—but the gas pump is just the tip of the iceberg. Almost every part of the economy is weighed down by the price of oil and gas.

The American people deserve both short-term and long-term ends to this crisis. Last year, Congress took the first step by passing new energy legislation that raised fuel economy standards for the first time in almost 30 years and required the Bush administration to investigate market price manipulation. But Republicans blocked our efforts to include a mandate for clean, renewable electricity, and we have seen very little action from the White House on market manipulation.

It is clearly time to take the next step by passing the Consumer First Energy Act, which will help lower prices in the short term and continues to curb our addiction and invest in renewable energy to avoid an even greater crisis in the long term.

First, this legislation includes a provision that ends the billions of dollars in tax breaks for oil companies whose executives have been hauling record profits while we pay record prices. Oil executives are making fortunes. The oil companies—these international cartels is what I call them—are making more money than any companies in the history of the world. Seven years ago, Vice President CHENEY invited oil executives to the White House to write our national energy policy. Is it any surprise that 7 years later the only ones who have benefited from that policy are the oil companies?

The second piece of our legislation forces the oil companies to do their part by investing some of their profits

in clean and affordable alternative energy. If we aggressively promote innovation in solar, wind, biofuels, and geothermal energies, we can help lower energy costs, create hundreds of thousands of new jobs right here in America, and strengthen our national security by reducing our dependence on oil-producing nations.

The third provision: We protect the American people from price gougers and greedy oil traders who manipulate the market. Part of the reason for the record-high prices of oil is that market traders are bidding prices up for their own amusement and profit. If you go buy a share of General Motors stock, you pay a margin of 50 percent. If you buy 100,000 gallons of fuel or barrels of oil, you pay a 3- to 5-percent margin. They have pushed these prices up remarkably with their speculation. They make out like bandits, but the rest of us have to face the real-life consequences of their recklessness.

Now, we also have a provision to temporarily stop filling the national Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which is already 97 percent full, to increase supply and lower prices. We are told it increases prices by as much as 5 cents a gallon. When oil prices come down significantly from their current levels, we can continue filling the Reserve. For now, 97 percent capacity is sufficient.

Tomorrow for our vote, we are going to take this fourth provision out of our energy package and we are going to vote on that. That will be our second vote. It is important that everyone vote for this. This should be bipartisan. The Republicans wrote a letter to the President—some Republican Senators—saying: Mr. President, stop pumping that oil into the Reserve. I hope they will join with us tomorrow so we can get past the 60-vote margin that is required here to pass legislation.

Finally, our plan stands up to OPEC and countries that are colluding together to keep oil prices sky high. This is a provision that has been pushed by Senator HERB KOHL of Wisconsin for a long time, and that is in our legislation. Global commerce requires global leadership. Oil-producing nations are earning billions of dollars from American consumers. For most of these countries, the oil trade is their overwhelming source of income. It is time to use some diplomatic pressure to increase production and lower prices.

Our legislation does exactly what it promises: It ends more than 7 years of Bush-Cheney energy policy that has lined the pockets of modern-day oil barons and left the American people to pay the bill. Is it a silver bullet? Of course not. Is it a bill that will solve all of our energy problems? Of course not. But it is a good piece of legislation.

The United States has less than 3 percent of the oil reserves in the world. That counts ANWR and offshore. So we can't produce our way out of it. Should we produce more out of the 3 percent we have? Of course. We are going to continue to work on that. But we consume 25 to 30 percent of all of the oil in the world, even though our population probably doesn't justify that.

This legislation is an important step, one that will make a difference in the short term and in the long term. It offers new thinking, new investment, and a new direction, not more of the same. So I urge my Republican colleagues to join us in passing this important piece of legislation starting tomorrow by passing a law that will tell the President: No, you can no longer pay $125 a barrel to put oil into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Save that for later.

Finally, Mr. President, we are going to vote tomorrow on an important piece of legislation. Woven deep within our collective memory of every major American disaster is the image of first responders who risk their lives to save others. September 11 is graphically illustrative of that fact. The firefighter who goes back into a burning building saving an elderly man or woman, the medic who tends to victims as ambulances race to the scene, the police officer who cordons off an area and redirects those in danger to safety—every one of those first responders is a hero. Yet far too often their heroism is overlooked. This week, we are going to have an opportunity to honor their service with legislation that will keep them safe and will save lives and will also allow them to receive the fair pay and benefits they deserve.

Senator KENNEDY and Senator GREGG have done an outstanding job writing this bipartisan bill. Their work is a model for what we can accomplish when we abandon partisanship and embrace the common good.

This legislation is a bill all Senators can and should support. This legislation provides first responders the dignity and respect they have greatly earned by guaranteeing them the right to collectively bargain. That is a right most private sector employees and public sector employees in 29 States plus the District of Columbia already have. It will mean better wages, hours, working conditions, and benefits for those we count on in a time of crisis. We may never be able to put a fair price on heroism, but this legislation is certainly a start.

Firefighters—not just those from New York but from surrounding areas—suffered the greatest losses on September 11. The recent tragedies such as the fire last summer in Charleston, SC, that took the lives of nine firefighters or the senseless loss of two firefighters in Roxbury, MA, last September serve as a reminder of the dangers these men and women face every time they go to work.

Last Friday, I was in Philadelphia, and I was going to a place called the Free Library. It was a rainy day. Of course, that cut the crowd down a little bit. But the thing that cut the crowd down more than anything else, that brought traffic to a standstill was the funeral of a police officer. He stopped some people who had robbed a bank, and one of them stepped out of the car with an assault rifle, an automatic weapon—not a semiautomatic weapon but an automatic weapon—and he was shot many times and killed.

Police officers put their lives on the line all the time. They do it for us. There is not much we can do usually to put a fair price on that heroism, but tomorrow we can do that. This legislation is the start of that.

This right to collectively bargain respects States rights. The 29 States already providing the right to collective bargaining for public safety officers would not be affected. The 21 States that don't provide for collective bargaining would have the opportunity to establish their own systems or they may ask the Federal Labor Relations Authority to assist in the process.

This legislation guarantees fairness in public safety by expressly outlawing strikes, lockouts, and all forms of work stoppage. That is why this is a good bipartisan bill. By guaranteeing collective bargaining and providing better wages and working conditions, this will improve public safety.

It is without any question that first responders who are paid fairly and treated with respect will keep their jobs longer and perform more efficiently and save the taxpayers money. Communities across America can rest more easily knowing their local police, firefighters, paramedics, and other first responders have long and sustained ties to the neighborhoods in which they work.

I met with police and firefighters from Nevada and around the country to discuss this legislation. They, along with their brothers and sisters across all of America, are just the same as those in Nevada to whom I have spoken. They want us to do everything we can to urge all Senators to take action. They welcome this opportunity to receive support to do their jobs more effectively and to help them provide for their families and protect our families. I urge my colleagues to stand with America's brave first responders by supporting the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to a period of morning business until 5:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order of speakers be the following: Senator HARKIN, myself, for 20 minutes; Senator SESSIONS for 15 minutes; Senator BINGAMAN, 30 minutes; Senator ALLARD, 10 minutes; Senator LEVIN, 20 minutes; Senator MURKOWSKI, 30 minutes; Senators BURR and DOLE, 15 minutes together; Senator DORGAN, 25 minutes; Senator KYL, 10 minutes; Senator CARDIN, 10 minutes; Senator CORNYN, 15 minutes; Senator MENENDEZ, 10 minutes; Senator BOND, 10 minutes; Senator KENNEDY, 10 minutes; Senator ALEXANDER, 20 minutes; Senator CANTWELL, 20 minutes; and Senator COLLINS, 7 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

FARM BILL CONFERENCE

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I understand I have 20 minutes, and I wish to cover two topics during that period of time.

First of all, the topic of this week and the topic for me for the last year and a half has been the molding, shaping, putting together, and finally passing, going to conference, and having in conference for about 3 months the farm bill, or what is presently called the farm bill. Later this week, hopefully on Wednesday, the Senate will take up and hopefully pass by a wide margin the final farm bill conference report, which we have called the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008. I wish to briefly go over why this bill is so critically important to farming families, to rural communities, and to the Nation as a whole.

This is a strong, bipartisan farm bill. It benefits every American from my hometown of Cumming, IA, population 162, to New York City, population 8 million. This bill provides a strong farm income safety net, so it is good for our farmers, ranchers, and producers. Consumers will like it because it will increase the number of farmers' markets and ensure a safe, dependable supply of high-quality, affordable food. It expands the initiative providing fresh fruits and vegetables to America's schoolchildren, while reforming and expanding other Federal nutrition programs. As production increases, the farm bill will ensure that our precious land and water resources are protected.

The final farm bill conference report significantly reforms traditional farm income support programs.

First, it eliminates the direct payments to producers with high adjusted gross farm incomes and it eliminates all payments to those with high nonfarming incomes.

On Wednesday, when we get to debating this bill, we will probably get into more, but I wish to point out that we have come a long way on this farm bill, although maybe not as far as some people want. In fact, I initially voted for the Grassley-Dorgan and Klobuchar amendments on the Senate floor, but they didn't win. These amendments would have cut the level of support to high-income farmers even more. So we had to work in a spirit of compromise with the House, and I believe we have come up with a good compromise.

Think of it this way: Prior to this farm bill, if you had $2.5 million in income, but 75 percent of that income was from farming, you would still qualify for farm programs. It was only after you had over $2.5 million that you wouldn't qualify. This bill reduces that to $500,000 of nonfarm income. That is a substantial cut, I would submit to anyone. In previous years, if you had farm income, there was no limit. You could have $5 million, $10 million, $20 million in farm income or whatever, and you would still get payments. This bill reduces that to $750,000. So if you get over $750,000 of farm income, you don't get any more direct payments. I submit that is significant, significant reform.

It also improves transparency and accountability. We directly attribute each farm program payment to an individual—direct attribution. That means no more hiding behind shields or any kind of partnerships, multiple entity rules, that type of thing. We have done away with the three-entity rule. No more three-entity rule, which has been in existence for 20 or 25 years. So again, direct attribution, plus we put some pretty tight payment caps in there.

The conference report also includes a new option for farmers, beginning with the 2009 crop year, to choose to participate in a State-level revenue protection system. This is a new option for farmers. If you want to get in it, participants will take a 20-percent cut in direct payments and a 30-percent cut in loan rates. In return, they will be eligible for a State-based revenue guarantee equal to 90 percent of the State average yield times the national average price. Now, this was an ingenious proposal that was first brought to us by the National Corn Growers Association. We worked it over in our committee in the Senate. We took it to conference. I believe we have a good option here for farmers. I also add that Senator BROWN from Ohio, a valuable member of our Agriculture Committee, proposed this in our committee. It was at his urging—and I know also Senator DURBIN's. Although not a member of the Committee, he was also instrumental in proposing and pushing for this option.

The farm bill also strengthens the Milk Income Loss Contract Program and continues it for the duration of the farm bill. Again, here I have to thank the former chairman of our committee, Senator LEAHY, who has been on this Agriculture Committee since before I came to the Senate—now over 25 years ago. Senator LEAHY has been the point person in making sure our family dairy farmers are protected and to make sure they have a seat at this table. In the previous farm bill, in 2002, we had set the percentage of support under the Milk Income Loss Contract Program at 45 percent—45 percent of what, I can tell you later. That was knocked down to 34 percent. We have brought it back up to the 45-percent level in this bill, where it was, by the way, 6 years ago. We didn't increase it; we just brought it back up to that level it had been. We also used an existing formulation the Department of Agriculture uses for the average monthly cost of dairy rations, to adjust this in the future, so we won't have to have these erosions in the future, so if the price of feed goes up, that support for dairy producers will go up. It makes eminently good sense. I think it is reasonable in terms of economics, and also I think it is supportable in terms of having a reasonable price when the feed prices are low. So it is, in a way, kind of a counter-cyclical program for dairy farmers. I thank Senator LEAHY for making sure we included that.

The new farm bill includes two new titles focusing on livestock and specialty crops. In the last farm bill—which I was privileged to chair in 2002—we added a new title on energy. We added two new titles this time, livestock and specialty crops. This bill provides $1 billion for specialty crops in this title, and much more for specialty crops throughout the rest of the bill, investing more in the promotion of specialty crops than any previous farm bills, including funding for market research as well as supports for producers who transition from conventional production into organics. Organic agriculture is one of the fastest growing sectors of American agriculture. We have recognized that by putting more funds in there for transition support for farmers' markets, and for aggregation of commodities from small farmers. The new livestock title promotes animal health, market opportunities, contracting fairness, and stepped-up enforcement and oversight under the Packers and Stockyards Act. So it is good for our livestock producers.

In a time of economic downturn and rapidly rising prices for food staples, millions of low-income Americans have joined the ranks of the hungry and ''food insecure.'' For that reason, basically, all of the money we added on this goes to the nutrition title, bringing the new money into nutrition, which is nearly $10.4 billion in this bill. We are $10 billion over baseline.

The new money we basically got through the Finance Committee—$10 billion—basically was all put into the nutrition program. We took another $400 million from inside the farm bill and added to it. I can honestly say all the new money we put in the bill went into nutrition.

This new funding will reform and strengthen nutrition assistance. We raised the standard deduction. Keep in mind the standard deduction was frozen in 1996, and has wreaked havoc on

our low-income people since then. So the standard deduction in 1996 was $134 a month. If it had not been frozen in 1996, the standard deduction today would be $188 a month, not $134 a month. We could not go to $188. We didn't have enough money. So we raised it to $144 a month, but we indexed it for the future so we won't have this benefit erosion in the future. It gives you some idea of what is happening to low-income families.

Think about this. If we had not frozen that benefit level in 1996 at $134, it would be $188 a month right now. Yet, we could only raise it to $144. We did our job with the money we had. We also provide more money to families with childcare expenses by removing entirely the cap on childcare deductions. We also raised the minimum benefit by almost 50 percent and indexed that also to future inflation, and the asset level is indexed forward. We were unable to raise it because of money concerns, but we did index it for the future. No longer will erosion take place because of inflation.

We increased the food bank supplies by adding some $1.2 billion to the Emergency Food Assistance Program. We provide $1 billion in new funding over the next 10 years for the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program for kids in schools. This program, which I started in the 2002 farm bill, when fully implemented, will serve nearly all children in our poorest elementary schools—that is, the schools that have at least 90 percent of their kids eligible for free and reduced-price meals. In those schools that would fully implement this, almost every poor kid will get free fresh fruits and vegetables during the day.

To meet the soaring worldwide demand for food and energy crops, millions of acres of land are being brought into production. A lot of this land is environmentally fragile. To address that challenge, we authorize nearly $4.5 billion in additional funds for the Environmental Quality Incentives Program and the Conservation Stewardship Program over the next 10 years. Again, these are payments to farmers, to incentivize and encourage them to be even better stewards of our soil, water, air, and wildlife habitats on working lands—rather than taking land out of production. Combined spending for these two programs, the EQIP program and the CSP program, will total more than $27.7 billion in the next 10 years.

With this support, the Conservation Stewardship Program will enroll nearly 13 million acres each year. To participate, producers will have to maintain and expand environmental benefits by adopting rigorous conservation and management practices.

The Wetlands Reserve Program also gets a number of improvements, with an additional $1.3 billion to implement those improvements. We have simplified and streamlined the process of valuing property and getting into the Wetlands Reserve Program. Over the next 5 years, this money will provide for a total enrollment in the Wetlands Reserve Program of over 3 million acres.

This bill also creates a new and interesting focus on restoring the Chesapeake Bay. This money covers the Chesapeake Bay watershed. This is very important to Members of Congress and the Senators from Virginia, Delaware, Maryland, and Pennsylvania. We put $438 million of new money into the environmental and conservation needs of the Chesapeake Bay Initiative.

On the energy side, all-time gasoline prices, as we know, are wreaking havoc with family budgets. But as studies have shown, without the inputs of ethanol, prices at the pump would be as much as 40 cents a gallon higher. Well, this new farm bill will dramatically ramp up the agricultural sector's capacity to produce clean, renewable energy. We provide more than $1 billion to expand the supply of biofuels made from biomass and crop byproducts other than grain. We also provide new assistance to farmers who would grow energy crops, and to entrepreneurs who will build biorefineries to convert the biomass into biofuel.

Like any compromise bill resulting from hard bargaining among regional and other interests, this farm bill, I suppose, is far from perfect—perfection being in the eye of the beholder, of course. I don't think anyone, on either the Democratic or Republican sides, would say they love every little thing in this bill. As the chair of this conference committee, I can tell you it has been a long and difficult road, but the end product is a bill with significant reforms, urgent new investments in nutrition, conservation, energy, and the health of our school kids.

That is why I was disappointed last week when Agriculture Secretary Ed Schafer held a news conference to say the President would veto the bill. The administration said we didn't cut payments to farmers in times of high farm income. But this administration itself actually proposed increasing direct payments, which are least responsive to high prices in income.

By contrast, Congress determined that it makes more sense to ensure the programs that help producers manage risk are as effective as possible if farm revenue is disrupted because of price or production shortfalls. We have only added to the income support if prices or revenue declines. That is the right approach. The administration said, no, we will put more money in there even if you have high prices. We said that is the wrong approach. The right approach is counter-cyclical. That is what we do. We have the support in place so it is available if needed.

What the administration and USDA proposed would have increased payments regardless of the prices. Congress correctly rejected the administration's proposal.

Finally, when the Senate passed the farm bill in December on the Senate floor, the bill was approved with 79 votes—the largest majority vote any farm bill has received since 1949. I was proud of that vote, being chairman of the committee. The bill was further strengthened in the conference process. And we went, I believe, over halfway to accommodate the President's wishes and concerns. He said the income limits weren't low enough. The administration proposed $200,000. As I said earlier, for nonfarm income it used to be $2.5 million. We brought it to $500,000. That is way over halfway in meeting what the President had proposed. So, again, like any compromise bill, this bill has things in it that I suppose any one of us could say is not quite right. But as a compromise bill, it includes real reforms, major advances in conservation, renewable energy, rural economic development, nutrition, and help for our kids in schools.

I am proud of this bill. I hope we have a strong vote in the Senate. I still hope the President will sign it. If he doesn't, I am hopeful we will have the votes to override the veto and put the bill in place for the future of our country.

How much time do I have remaining?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Two minutes.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to discuss briefly the matter of the collective bargaining for our firefighters and public safety employees. I am an original cosponsor of S. 2123. Decker Ploehn, the city administrator in Bettendorf, Iowa, wrote me:

> I have represented both sides of the table [he was police chief at one time] and for the last 18 years have successfully negotiated 5 contracts with our police union because of strong good collective bargaining laws in Iowa. This system has great checks and balances with binding arbitration and a ''no strike'' clause. It causes both sides to come to the table and to make meaningful concessions. We have done so in Bettendorf quite successfully. That is all we're asking for with this legislation—to give public safety officers elsewhere this kind of opportunity.

Many of our Federal workers, such as Capitol Police, Border Patrol agents, Customs agents, immigration enforcement officers, have the right of collective bargaining. It helps them to serve our Nation's security interests.

Again, it is time that we provide this now to the 21 States where our public safety people are not allowed to bargain collectively. This bill passed the House by 314 to 97. Hopefully, it will pass the Senate with an equally large vote.

If you ask any safety officer, they will tell you that they want the tools to do the best job that they can do. These are not the kinds of jobs that people take to get rich. Public safety workers have a different calling—they want to serve their communities. These are the kind of people who showed up from all over the country to help the victims of the attacks on September 11, 2001. Without concern for

their personal safety or compensation, our Nation's first responders are always there for us. That is why they need a seat at the table to discuss their equipment, training, and staffing needs in order to do the best possible job.

That is why I am an original cosponsor of S. 2123, Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act. Not only will this legislation allow police officers and firefighters to band together and share their ideas about how to improve their workplace and therefore our safety, but when they can negotiate for good pay and benefits, we are able to attract the best possible workforce to most ably serve its citizens. This bill would only affect the 21 states that don't already provide their public safety officers with the right to bargain collectively. States that do not currently provide these protections can choose to establish their own collective bargaining systems, or may ask the assistance of the Federal Labor Relations Authority in doing so.

As I mentioned, Decker Ploehn is the city administrator in Bettendorf, IA. I followed him around on a work day back when he was the chief of police there. He contacted my office last week to talk about this bill. He said:

> I have represented both sides of the table and for the last 18 years have successfully negotiated 5 contracts with our police union because of strong good collective bargaining laws in Iowa. This system has great checks and balances with binding arbitration and a ''no strike'' clause. It causes both sides to come to the table and to make meaningful concessions. We have done so in Bettendorf quite successfully.

That's all we are asking for with this legislation—to give public safety officers elsewhere this kind of opportunity.

I would also like to point out that this bill doesn't create a new right to strike. I know there will be some vehement antiunion forces out there scaring people into thinking that somehow this legislation will reduce public safety by creating a situation where police and firefighters will be leaving their posts in labor disputes. It is simply not true.

We must ensure that we have seasoned, dedicated officers by giving them a voice in the workplace. The best way to do that is to uphold their freedom of association, which will enhance the safety of millions of Americans who rely on their services every day. As I said, similar legislation has passed the House by a vote of 314 to 97, and I am hopeful that Congress will soon approve this issue of basic fairness and freedom.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa for his work on the Agriculture bill. It is time we get this bill done. I hope we can do so. I am sure he would agree with some of the statements the Bush administration has made with regard to the question of ethanol that it is not the driving force behind the increase in food prices. This administration has never been overwhelmingly in favor of ethanol, but they have concluded that 2 percent to 3 percent of the increase in food prices deals with ethanol.

We certainly made some progress in reducing the number of gallons we import around the world, sending wealth around the world because we have farmers and American workers who are producing this ethanol. Iowa is in the center of that, and I congratulate the leadership of the Senator from Iowa over the years. It is a net positive for the country.

ENERGY PRICES

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to speak about energy prices because this is a national crisis; it is a matter this Congress needs to deal with.

Prices are at record highs. According to AAA, the average price of regular unleaded gasoline this morning was $3.71 a gallon. For an average family with two cars, that could well mean $70 to $100 a month extra money out of their budget to get the same number of gallons they bought 2 or 3 years ago. This is particularly troubling since 60 percent of the oil we import comes from abroad, and a big portion of that money the American family pays is going to foreign governments hostile to the United States, in some instances. And, it is just not healthy. In my view, it also cannot be disputed that this wealth transfer is a major factor in the economic slowdown we are experiencing today.

The question we in Congress have to ask is, What are we going to do about it? I believe there is a simple answer with many complex parts. The simple answer is, let's get busy doing what works, what we know will work. Certainly, let's not do things that make the situation worse, that is going to drive up the price of energy even more, and that is being proposed in this Senate. It is time to take a long road back to a sound energy policy that can and will bring down the price of gasoline. Permanently? I don't know. We see economies around the world growing, nations such as China that have about one automobile for every 20 people, and we average two automobiles per family in the United States. They are coming into that. They are going to continue to grow, have more cars. South America is growing. Other areas of the world are growing. They are utilizing more energy. They have bigger houses and they have more automobiles and the supply is not going to be able to continue to increase.

I want to talk about the reality today and the fact that I believe energy prices are higher than they need to be, and there are some things we can do to improve them.

Congress has done some things. We increased fuel efficiency. Last year we passed, and the President signed into law, the Energy Independence and Security Act. Among its provisions, this measure raises the CAFÉ standards, the automobile mileage standards, to 35 miles per gallon for an automobile manufacturer's entire fleet by 2020. That is moving. We think we can do that. I supported it. I believe we can get to that goal. I am confident we can.

Prior to this step of going to 35 miles per gallon, CAFÉ standards were just 27.5 miles per gallon for automobiles and 22 miles for light trucks and SUVs. So raising the standard to 35 miles overall will certainly reduce oil demand by ensuring that we travel further per gallon of gas, we get more benefit from each gallon of gas.

I hope Americans, looking at the prices and looking at our national interest and not being so dependent on foreign oil, will seek ways in their own families to save money for themselves and help America by reducing unnecessary utilization of energy. Yet reducing demand through increased efficiency is not the only solution. Our population is growing, and other factors are at work. We are not going to be able to conserve our way out of this problem. We use more energy as the population grows and as people make more money. In order to produce this additional energy, more must be done to increase clean American production of energy. We can do that. The United States has significant reserves of oil at home, and this Congress has the ability to allow these reserves to be produced.

According to the Department of Interior and the U.S. Geological Survey, approximately 119 billion barrels of oil exist on and offshore in the United States. Remember, we produce 40 percent of the energy we utilize today for automobiles. That is liquid energy, and we can produce more of it. It will have an impact on the global price if we increase in the months to come the amount of oil we produce at home.

Developing traditional energy sources of oil is not the only way to increase the supply and reduce the cost of gasoline. The United States has an immense supply of unconventional oil called oil shale. The Congressional Research Service—that is our independent research service in Congress—estimates this country's oil shale reserves to be the equivalent—hold your hat—the equivalent of approximately 2 trillion barrels of oil—trillion barrels. We utilize about 5 billion a year. That is eight times the amount of Saudi Arabia's oil reserves. And we also have an abundant supply of coal which can be converted into gasoline using technology currently proven in South Africa.

This is a step we need to work on and to take. We realize we have to do clean coal, we have to do clean technology in the oil shale area, and we have to understand that it will probably create more CO_2 than just producing a barrel

of oil from Saudi Arabia and burning it in our automobiles because it has to be heated. But in the short term, we are very unwise, as we transition away from oil, if we do not consider coal to oil and shale to oil, both of which, I am told, can be brought in for around $50 a barrel, less than half the world price. We simply have to consider that as we go forward.

According to the Congressional Research Service, the U.S. Government, the people of the United States, spent $237 billion on imported oil in 2007. It is estimated this year, 2008, we will spend $412 billion on imported oil, and the price seems to continue to go up. Indeed, 12 months from today, it may well be over $500 billion for imported oil. This is money that could be churned in our economy paying American workers good wages.

Yet Congress has consistently blocked the development of this Nation's oil resources. I have been here for 12 years. I know how it went down. I have been part of the debate over ANWR and gulf offshore drilling. We finally, 2 years ago, were able to open some areas in the Gulf of Mexico. But we have huge reserves of oil and gas off our coasts throughout America, and we need to do a better job of allowing that to be available so we don't have to buy so much from abroad.

Biofuels can play an important role in keeping the cost of energy down. Despite the claims of detractors, ethanol and biodiesel do reduce our dependence on foreign oil to a significant degree. They keep money at home because this energy is generated here and, as I indicated with Senator HARKIN, it creates jobs in Iowa, in Alabama, and keeps that wealth at home.

The American people may ask: Why aren't we producing American energy if it can reduce the price of gas? And I think improved efficiency and conservation, combined with an increase of supply, can have more of an impact in breaking this boom of oil prices than a lot of people think. It does not have to be unprecedented reserves of oil coming on the market in a short period of time, but a lot of this is speculation, a lot of this is a shortage of supply, and if the demand drops down because people conserve and we can get the supply up a measurable degree and get above that demand with our supply, the ability of these foreign nations and oil companies and speculators to manipulate the price falls completely. The reason they are successful in seeing prices surge is because we have too tight a margin between demand and supply.

The opposition to producing more oil and gas at home has been hypocritical, frankly. While opponents of American energy—the same ones who complain the loudest about high energy costs—they also object to producing more gas and oil in the United States, but they do not object to producing it, apparently, in places such as Saudi Arabia or Venezuela. It is all right to import it and buy it from them. And while they object to production—and by a narrow margin we were able to open the gulf this summer, finally, some—but while they object to production offshore in so many areas of our country and in Alaska, citing environmental concerns that I don't think are realistic and I think are exaggerated, they show no regard, I suggest, for the production of oil offshore in places such as Nigeria or Indonesia or production in the Caspian Sea or the Persian Gulf or the North Sea or off Venezuela and in a lake in Venezuela.

Indeed, we have a great record of environmental stewardship, far superior than most of these countries. Our oil companies would operate their production under the strictest environmental rules in the world.

Even during Hurricane Katrina, not too far from my hometown of Mobile, AL, out in the gulf, not one of the oil platforms leaked. Their safety systems worked as they were designed to, safely shutting off the wells below the surface. Most of them are back up and running today. Producing American energy creates funding for environmental projects throughout America, throughout Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas. These are the four States that have agreed to offshore production. Our States are able to obtain environmental moneys as a part of that agreement we approved 2 years ago. In Alabama, this funding has been used for wetlands preservation, restoration, and educational purposes. Instead of sending our wealth to foreign countries to build palaces for rich sheiks, and hotels that have few occupants that are some of the finest in the world, and skyscrapers, we are using funds from American offshore production to fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to complete other much needed environmental projects.

Tomorrow, this Senate will vote on the American Energy Production Act of Senator PETE DOMENICI. This measure—and I cosponsored it, and others have—is a step in the right direction. It is not the complete solution, but it is something we can do now.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 1 additional minute to wrap up.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. This is a step in the right direction. It would suspend filling the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, invest money in establishing new batteries that will allow us to move to more fuel-efficient electric automobiles—plug-ins, hybrids—utilizing nuclear power. It will produce more offshore and in Alaska and help reduce that $400 to $500 billion wealth transfer that is occurring in our country today and that is impacting adversely our national economy and impacting adversely the family budget.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I believe there is 30 minutes reserved for me to speak. I ask that when I have 2 minutes remaining, the Chair advise me of that, please.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will do so.

FUEL PRICES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, the pending business that will be before the Senate is S. 2284. That is a bill to reauthorize the Federal law governing flood insurance. Our next scheduled vote, as my colleague from Alabama just pointed out, does not relate to that bill. Our next scheduled vote does, in fact, not relate to the subject of flood insurance at all. The next vote will be on an amendment which the Republican leader has filed, allegedly to deal with the high price of oil and the high price of gasoline at the pump. I will oppose that amendment tomorrow when the vote is cast, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

The high price of oil and gasoline and diesel that are refined from that oil is creating a very substantial economic burden on the American consumer and on the U.S. economy. At the close of business Friday, the price of oil stood at about $126 per barrel on world markets. The average price of gasoline in this country was around $4 per gallon. This reflects a dramatic increase over prices a year ago. The increased cost is difficult for many Americans to avoid because many Americans commute to work or they otherwise need to travel substantial distances where there is no ready alternative to the use of their private vehicles. To the extent Congress and the administration can take action to reduce the burden of this increased cost, we should do so.

Unfortunately, the amendment of the Republican leader is not a credible proposal for reducing that burden. We should be honest with the American people about this so-called debate on high gas prices. This is an election-year effort. This is election-year politics in its classic form. It is Washington finger-pointing. Unfortunately, it is very little else.

Let's be clear. The President set the tone for the debate. On April 29, 2 weeks ago, the President went to the Rose Garden to express his concern about the price of gas and to blame the Congress for it. While he was there in the Rose Garden, he also took the occasion to blame the Congress for the rise in food prices. Unfortunately, as far as I know, there has been no effort by the President to sit down with the leaders of Congress and to work out a consensus on constructive actions that might actually help, either with the high price of gas or with the high price

of food. The amendment of the Republican leader, which will come up for a vote tomorrow, continues with this same old ''blame the other guy'' approach.

Let's talk about the facts of why oil and gas prices are so high. In my view, there are supply and demand factors in world oil markets that explain some of what we have seen, and some of those factors are outside our control—at least in the short term. The simple fact is that the market for oil is a global market. The price of oil is reflected on that market.

The United States is the largest purchaser of oil in that market. China is rapidly gaining on us in that regard. We are not even close to being the largest producer of oil for that market. In fact, we import about 60 percent of the oil we consume. If we want to affect the price of oil either by reducing world demand or increasing our supply, our ability to do so is limited.

By far the most significant step we can take to reduce demand in the short and medium term is to improve vehicle fuel efficiency in our cars and our trucks. Last fall, we did just that. Many of us believed the increase in required miles per gallon was too modest, but it was a substantial improvement over what had prevailed for the three previous decades. We need to look at other ways to reduce demand for oil in the short and the medium and the long term.

On the supply side, our ability to affect world prices is even more limited. That is simply because of our limited reserves. We have about 3 percent of the world's oil reserves. Also because most experts believe that U.S. production in the coming years will do well to maintain its current level. We can affect that production somewhat by adopting enlightened policies, but its impact on world markets and consequently on the world price of oil will be limited.

When we look at issues that we in the U.S. Government can most directly and immediately affect, I would cite two. We can reduce the incentives for speculation in the oil market—that is No. 1—and second, we can strengthen the dollar by showing some commitment to getting our own fiscal house in order. Let me comment briefly on each of these issues.

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, which I am privileged to chair, has held several hearings on oil and gasoline prices and markets this year. Other committees in the House of Representatives had similar hearings. Current high prices are a result of several factors. One of them is certainly the tight global supply-demand balance. One thing stands out from all the testimony both the Senate and House has heard: A key factor pushing oil prices into the triple digits in recent months is a dysfunctional energy market.

Here is what a senior vice president of a major oil company said at one of these hearings on the House side:

> When you look at the fundamentals of our business, Congressman, the supply/demand fundamentals, our assessment would be the price should be somewhere around [$]50 [or $]55 a barrel. There is a disconnect. To me, there are three factors that contribute to that. One is the monetary issue, the weaker dollars we've already talked about. The other is geopolitical political risk. And the third, we believe, is speculation.

Other key analysts in the Government and the private sector have made similar statements, although their assumptions about what exact price level was supported by supply and demand fundamentals have differed. But it would be fair to say that key energy analysts are in general agreement that around $30 of the current price of a barrel of oil is a result of market pressures unrelated to supply and demand for physical barrels of oil.

This general assessment of a significant cause of high oil and gas prices is broadly shared. One noted energy economist put it this way recently in the Wall Street Journal:

> Crude futures prices have decoupled from the forces controlling the underlying physical flows of the commodity.

In plain English, that means crude oil prices are not connected to supplies. If oil prices are not being driven by supply and demand, then by what are they being driven? We heard some strong testimony on this in our committee from Cambridge Energy Research Associates, the firm headed by Daniel Yergin, who is a leading oil expert, well known to all in this field. Here is what their analyst had to say in early April:

> Crude oil futures trading activity on the New York Mercantile Exchange—the largest in the world—is currently about 350 percent higher than in 2002. Noncommercial investors have contributed to this increase. . . .
>
> New fundamentals—new cost structures and global financial dynamics—are behind the momentum that pushed oil prices to record highs, around $110 a barrel.

That was $110 a barrel in early April.

If we want to get at the real question why oil today is around $125 a barrel and why gasoline is closing in on $4 a gallon across the country, we will not find the answer in the Republican leader's amendment. We are witnessing a substantial influx in speculative money into energy markets. It is bidding up the price of oil beyond any reasonable level that could be explained by supply and demand. Every consumer can see it at the pump. But do we have any serious effort to regulate that speculation or even to notice it?

A Commodity Futures Trading Commission witness told our committee they did not see any evidence that speculation was a factor in oil prices. I thought they were alone in that view because the amendment of the Republican leader seems to agree in that it fails to acknowledge or deal with this significant part of the problem.

If we are going to protect consumers, we need to have a Federal Government as an effective overseer to start policing these markets. There is a proposal Senator REID has introduced that will begin to address the issue. That bill requires the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to start doing the job Congress intends for it to do; that is, to make sure oil trading is done with adequate transparency and to make sure limits on speculation apply across the board. Right now, it is entirely possible for hedge funds or traders to evade the protections put in place for trading oil in the United States. They simply trade U.S. crude oil in foreign markets that the Commodity Futures Trading Commission has decided it will not regulate. The Commodity Futures Trading Commission could regulate these so-called dark markets, but it has decided not to. Instead of turning a blind eye to this offshore oil trading, Senator REID's bill will ensure that the Commodity Futures Trading Commission makes a priority of protecting American energy consumers. The majority leader's approach is aimed at bringing down the price of oil in the near term by having effective regulation of speculation. Some big hedge funds will not like that, but it will help the average consumer.

Let me talk for a minute about the second issue which both the Congress and the administration ought to be addressing. If we are going to get commodity markets of all kinds to act in a more rational way, we also need to do something serious about our overall fiscal policy in this country.

The United States is borrowing money on world financial markets because we cannot summon the political will to actually pay for the things we want our Government to do. We are fighting a war in Iraq on borrowed money, to the tune of over a half trillion dollars since 2002. A number of us have proposed to strengthen and to extend tax incentives to spur energy production from renewable sources, but those are being opposed by others here in the Senate for the simple reason that we are proposing to pay for those, the extension of those tax provisions, instead of borrowing even more money from overseas to cover their cost.

Because of the mismanagement of the economy and our high borrowing overseas, the value of the dollar has fallen dramatically. The price we are paying for international commodities such as oil is rising. That is another major factor driving up the price of oil. We need to face up to it here in the Senate. If Senators want to lower high oil prices, getting our budget house in order will do much more to strengthen the dollar and to lower gasoline prices—and sooner than any of the new drilling called for in the amendment of the Republican leader.

I have covered two of the most important things we can do to address high oil and gas prices; that is, curbing oil market speculation and, secondly, getting our budget and fiscal policy in order.

Now, let me turn more specifically to the Republican leader's proposal. The

amendment is a grab bag of energy-related provisions which have little connection either to the current or future price of oil or gasoline. Although the amendment contains various other disconnected proposals, the main thrust of the amendment is to increase the amount of Federal land available for leasing for oil and gas exploration and production in the areas proposed for leasing:

First, the Outer Continental Shelf off the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts of the country. And, second, a portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. The underlying assumption on the proposal is that our lack of supply is a result of our refusal to permit exploration and drilling on Federal lands, that changing the law to permit drilling in these two specific areas will solve the problem.

Well, what about that basic assumption? Is our ability to produce oil and gas domestically being held back because of our unwillingness to lease the Outer Continental Shelf off the east coast and the Outer Continental Shelf off the west coast and the area known as the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge? Well, let's look at the facts. What is happening on the supply side for oil production in the United States?

Last year, we saw the amount of crude oil produced in the United States remain constant, instead of falling. That may not sound like a big achievement, but it is an improvement on previous trends. It is no doubt a reaction to higher prices, but it also reflects bipartisan support to increase production on Federal lands in places where it is appropriate. I have three charts that illustrate the general trend of what has been going on, and all of these relate to onshore oil and gas drilling and production.

This is acreage of new national oil and gas leases in millions of acres. Last year, we leased 4.6 million acres of Federal land for oil and gas production onshore in the United States. That is the column on the right.

That is in places such as my State of New Mexico and Wyoming and Colorado. That is almost double the 2.6 million acres we put up for leasing in the year 2000. So the trend is for leasing of more acres of Federal land for oil and gas production onshore.

And, of course, these figures do not include all the leasing we did last year in the Outer Continental Shelf. Let me show another chart. This chart is approvals of applications for permits to drill, APDs. In the business they are referred to as APDs. Last year, we approved 7,124 permits to drill oil and gas wells on Federal land. Again, this is all onshore. That is the right-hand column. That is more than double the number approved in 2000.

This is partly due to the direct funding stream we put in place for this process as part of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. Now, let me show you one other chart. This one relates to drilling activity initiated on Federal lands. As a result of the increased number of drilling permits, and that was the previous chart, we had actual drillings start last year on 5,243 new wells, both oil and gas wells. That is approaching a doubling of the number that were drilled in 2000, which was 2,861.

So these are three charts that make the case for what has been happening onshore. Similar positive trends are underway in the Gulf of Mexico, although the overall results today are more modest. According to the latest report by the Minerals Management Service, total production of oil in the Gulf of Mexico was up slightly in 2007 to 1.3 million barrels per day.

That is an increase of about 10,000 barrels per day of oil over 2006 levels. We have gone from drilling 134 deepwater wells in the Gulf of Mexico in 2006 to 142 new deepwater wells last year. There were also eight announced deepwater discoveries in the Gulf of Mexico in 2007.

We are certainly not in decline in oil production in the Gulf of Mexico, but the increase in activity painted by these statistics is not overwhelming either. So there is still much more we could be doing to support domestic production of oil and gas.

The most effective strategy we could pursue, I believe, is something that is not in the Republican leader's amendment. To understand where our greatest opportunity for making progress on increased domestic production lies, we need to focus on a significant problem in the management of oil and gas on Federal lands, including in the Outer Continental Shelf.

Simply put, all the policy emphasis has been on having more lease sales, but not enough emphasis has been placed on encouraging diligent development of Federal lands once they are leased.

While it is generally true that leases must be produced within certain time parameters, Federal agencies have substantial discretion in managing those provisions. I am concerned we may not be following the correct policies to bring about production in the most timely fashion. I have asked the Government Accountability Office to examine this topic.

Let me illustrate my concern with the following charts. Here, first, with regards to onshore production. This pie chart on the left shows all the leased acreage on Federal land for oil and gas development onshore in the lower 48 States.

As you see, about three-quarters of all of this in red, three-quarters of the Federal land we have leased onshore is not currently being produced. Of the over 45.5 million acres of land that have been leased, oil companies are sitting on 31 million acres on which no production is occurring. A similar story can be told in terms of the Outer Continental Shelf. This is the chart on the right. This is offshore.

Of a total of 41 million acres that have been leased offshore, 33 million of that 41 million are not being produced. The Republican leader's amendment proposes to open the entire Atlantic and Pacific coast to leasing and development. Although the amendment speaks to petitions from Governors to lease in specific areas, the way the amendment is written, the Secretary can open for leasing even areas where no such request is pending, by including them in the next so-called 5-year-plan from the Minerals Management Service.

Here is a map of all the leases in the Outer Continental Shelf in the Gulf of Mexico. To get an idea of what we are talking about, the blue squares represent areas that have producing leases. As we can see, there are many of those. The much more numerous yellow squares represent leased blocks where nothing is happening. The red blocks, which are also scattered around, represent new areas that have been added through recent lease sales.

For all the increases in drilling activity I have mentioned earlier in the talk, you will see we still have a great many areas where no exploration or production is ongoing, even though those areas have been leased. We recently have added even more leased areas to this map.

Here is a second map of the oil-and-gas-producing regions on the North Slope of Alaska. In the middle is the private and State land, the tan-colored area. This small area to the right over here is area 1002, the 1002 area of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge which the Republican leader's amendment would open to leasing.

The large area on the left, this yellow area, is the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska. This area was specifically set aside to be exploited for oil and gas development. The National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska totals 23.5 million acres, most of which can be developed and drilled. The mean estimate of oil resources in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska is 9.3 billion barrels of technically recoverable oil. That is significantly more oil than is estimated to be contained in the national portion of the Coastal Plain of the Arctic Refuge.

To date, 3.8 million acres of this NPRA have been leased. That is twice the size of the portion of the Arctic Refuge that is being talked about in the Republican leader's amendment. Here is a slightly more detailed version of that chart that shows where those leased areas are. You can see that a large portion of the leased areas—those are the areas in red—is on the eastern side of the Petroleum Reserve, very close to the Alpine field which is tied into the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System. So the infrastructure to take oil from the Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, on the North Slope of Alaska to the lower 48 is very close at hand.

So with all those favorable factors in place, you would wonder how many production wells do we have operating on the 3.8 million acres of the Petroleum Reserve that we have leased? And

the answer is zero. Zero current production from these leases should be a substantial cause for concern. It illustrates a basic problem with our domestic production of oil and gas. It is not that we have not leased Federal land for exploration and production. We have leased large tracts of Federal land. We are leasing more all the time.

Oil and gas companies certainly benefit by having these leases on their books and claiming the potential oil as part of their reserves. But we need to get these oil and gas resources out of the reserves column and into the production column.

What does the Republican leader's amendment do about any of this? Absolutely nothing. He is calling for more leases in areas that are much more remote from oil and gas transmission infrastructure than the acreage we have already leased.

It would take a decade or more for those resources to come into production at the very best. Why should we expect oil and gas companies to rush into new areas to begin production when they are sitting on literally millions and millions of acres of existing leases without doing any production on those?

The fact is, having a lease sale in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge will not do a single thing to bring down gasoline prices anytime soon. Opening offshore areas such as off the east coast and off the west coast, where there is no infrastructure, is also a very ineffective response to the prices that consumers are seeing today. These are not real solutions to what is wrong in energy markets today.

If we are serious about doing something to boost domestic production, we need to focus on better management of Federal leases. Let me describe two concrete suggestions in that regard.

First, we might consider imposing a production incentive fee on all the Federal acres that are under lease, a fee that would increase over time but which would be cancelled by royalty payments. That would provide a disincentive for sitting on leases for purposes of inflating a company's reserve estimates.

Second, we enacted some specific provisions in the Energy Policy Act of 2005 that reduced pressure on the leaseholders in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska, in terms of their responsibilities to develop the oil resources there. We changed the law to allow oil companies with a lease in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska to hold it for 30 years or more, without producing.

I opposed those changes to the law but was unable to prevail on that point. Provisions that allow for decades of additional delay in developing oil on Federal lands that are dedicated for production of oil make no sense when that oil is selling at $126 a barrel.

If anyone in this Chamber wants to advocate for oil production in Alaska or anywhere on Federal land, then the threshold test is whether they are willing to change the incentive structure that currently rewards delay and inaction. That dysfunctional incentive structure was put in place in the law we passed in 2005.

If we are not willing to take action to bring the 3.8 million acres already leased in Alaska into production, then there isn't much credibility to the argument that somehow one more lease sale up there will greatly add to energy security.

There is another area in which the Republican leader's amendment misses the mark on promoting domestic oil and gas production. His amendment leaves out the one place offshore where it would be easiest and fastest to get additional production, and that is in the Gulf of Mexico. His amendment opens the entire Atlantic and Pacific coastlines for new oil and gas production but leaves in place the oil and gas moratoria in the Gulf of Mexico. That is out of touch with reality. The Gulf of Mexico is the first place we should be looking to for expanded production, not the one place we should leave off the list.

Let me put up this chart. When we last debated offshore oil and gas production in this Chamber in 2006, we made what I consider to be a very bad bargain. We put off limits—that is the yellow area on the chart—10 times the amount of natural gas that we opened to exploration and drilling. We made available for lease 2 trillion cubic feet of natural gas in the Gulf of Mexico while putting off limits 22 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. We also put new areas of the Gulf of Mexico under moratorium for the first time, including portions of the lease sale 181 area that were closest to the existing oil and gas infrastructure. The area now under current law is off limits until 2022 because of that provision we passed into law in 2006. The portion of the lease sale 181 area we put under moratorium for the first time contains a half billion barrels of oil and 4 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

The available infrastructure to take it to market is already there. The interest by industry in these resources is intense.

This weekend I was reading the current edition of Barron's, the Dow-Jones business and financial weekly. There is a column in there by Jim McTague where he quotes President Bush's former economic adviser, Al Hubbard, as saying:

> If the other 49 states realized what Florida is doing to them, they'd be up in arms.

McTague goes on to lament the fact that President Bush does not support revoking the lease sale moratoria on the outer continental shelf that were first imposed by his father in the early 1990s.

He then states:

> Bush, during the 2000 presidential contest, promised his brother Jeb, Florida's governor at the time, that he'd maintain the drilling ban.

So there you have it. If we are really serious about increasing domestic production and repealing existing moratoria, the place to start is here in the gulf. The Republican leader's amendment leaves that out, much to its detriment.

I have additional comments that I do not have time to go through. There is one area where I very much compliment the minority leader, and that is including in his amendment the proposal to suspend the filling of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve for the remainder of this year. Senator DORGAN has been pushing this legislation for many months. I have been glad to be a cosponsor. I know Senator DOMENICI recently indicated he now supports this position. This is a proposal that is in Majority Leader REID's proposal. It is proposed legislation. It is also in the Republican leader's amendment. I congratulate him for that.

Right after we vote on the Republican leader's amendment, the large comprehensive amendment I have been talking about, the vote right after that will be on the proposal to suspend the filling of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

I hope will get a strong bipartisan vote. Clearly, it would be a step in the right direction. It is something we should do. I hope we can at least include that positive action before the Congress has to turn to other business tomorrow as it plans to, when we get back to discussing the flood insurance.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I understand the minority leader is on his way to make a few remarks. In the meantime, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for quorum call be rescinded.

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

HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN BURMA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to address the heartbreaking humanitarian crisis in Burma and the actions of the military junta there which have shocked our consciences over these last days.

A govrnment that was swift to mobilize last year against a peaceful protest by unarmed monks has astonished us with its sluggish response to the devastating May 3 storm.

With thousands dead and perhaps 2 million now at risk of further suffering, the military junta has treated the cyclone as more of a political inconvenience than a national tragedy, focusing on a sham constitutional referendum instead of relief efforts. And

the consequences of this callous response are tragic. As precious time was wasted, what was already a terrible natural disaster became a manmade disaster of spreading hunger and disease. We have heard reports of aid workers being turned away and of visas for aid workers being refused on the grounds that consulates were closed for the weekend.

Today, finally, an American C–130 was permitted into Burma carrying desperately needed supplies. Two more flights are expected tomorrow. This is a positive development, but it is also an extremely modest concession.

It is my hope that these halting steps by the regime in the last day or so augur a greater openness to humanitarian assistance.

The people of Burma should know that, if permitted, America stands ready to help.

PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY AND POLICE WEEK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, all across the country this week, Americans will honor the law enforcement officers who keep our Nation safe and paying solemn tribute to those who have lost their lives in the line of duty. Peace Officers' Memorial Day and Police Week is a time to thank all those who keep us safe, and a time to be grateful for all who have served.

As the Jefferson County Judge Executive in Louisville, KY, I had a strong relationship with the local police force. I was always proud of the department and its leadership and the rank and file officers who worked hard to protect and defend Louisville. I remember the pride we felt when we brought county and city police together to create the Crimes Against Children Unit, and the pride the officers felt when they made it a model for the rest of the country.

Louisville has changed a lot since then, and so has America. On September 11 we awoke to an enemy that has no regard for human life and that has repeatedly expressed its intent to destroy our Nation. We have seen the horror these people can inflict on our cities. And we take them at their word when they say that they plan to do it again. It is because of this threat that today we have an even deeper appreciation for the men and women who enforce our laws, not just as first responders to crime, but as a first line of defense against potential terrorist attacks.

During this Peace Officers' Memorial Day and Police Week, we honor the contributions of our police officers and other keepers of the peace. We remember the sacrifice of those who have fallen in the line of duty, including Officer Jacob Chestnut and Detective John Gibson, who gave their lives right here in the Capitol ten years ago. It was July 24, 1998) when they, as it now says on the plaque commemorating their heroism, ''bravely gave their lives defending the United States Capitol.''

We express our gratitude to the families of America's peace officers and police, who make sacrifices large and small so their loved ones can keep the rest of us safe.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado.

ENERGY PRICES

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I come to the floor again to talk about energy prices. Each week we must finally be at the tipping point where Democrats are at least willing to address high energy prices. Unfortunately, although energy prices remain at an all-time high, it seems we are not there yet. The average American uses 500 gallons of gasoline every year, with the average gas price at $3.61 per gallon. That means the average American will spend more than $1,800 this year on gasoline. That is almost $300 more than they would have spent a year ago. But let's look at a slightly longer period. Let's look at the period since Democrats took control of the Congress and insisted that they had all the answers.

On January 4, 2007, a gallon of gas cost $2.33. That means the average American has spent $960 more on gasoline in the year and a half since Democrats took over. The question is, Why are we not producing the domestic oil available in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge known as ANWR? The U.S. Geological Survey estimates that the potential oil in ANWR would exceed that which is currently being produced in the lower 48 States. We hear a lot of moaning about how we should not open ANWR because that oil would not be available for 10 years. But I remember hearing that exact same argument about 10 years ago. If we had opened ANWR to domestic oil production 10 years ago, we would be less reliant on foreign sources for about 1 million fewer barrels each and every day.

The question is, Why are we not producing in the Outer Continental Shelf? Currently, 58 percent of this area is off limits to production. The National Petroleum Council estimates if congressional restrictions were lifted, we would have access to more than 300 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. This is enough gas to meet all of the current U.S. needs for more than 13 years. Current levels of production in the Outer Continental Shelf employ over 45,000 people. To those of us concerned about employment figures, opening additional areas offshore will lead to more jobs in addition to increased domestic energy.

The question is, Why are we not producing domestic oil from oil shale in Colorado, for example? The Democrats ensured that BLM could not write commercialization regulations by placing a spending prohibition in the fiscal year 2008 omnibus bill which is being applied this year from last year's action. Commercialization regulations do not authorize production or even lease. These regulations simply allow the department to set out the rules of the road for companies so they can make investment decisions—matters such as the length and requirements for oil shale leases, the royalty rate, and reclamation requirements that would be set by commercialization regulations.

Considering there is well over 1 trillion barrels of oil locked in the shale beneath Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming, this is not an inconsequential amount of energy. One trillion barrels of oil would provide for the current consumption levels of 20 million barrels a day for over 136 years. If the numbers seem staggering, that is because they are. The question is, Why are we not addressing the restrictive policies on the construction of new refineries that have led to no new refinery capacity in this country since the 1970s?

We must encourage companies to build new refineries so not only can we produce more oil domestically, but we can refine it into a usable product as well.

The law of supply and demand tells us with high demand and low supply, prices will increase. This seems to have escaped the notice of the Democrat-controlled Congress, however. Oblivious to prices at the pump, this Congress is failing in its duty to the American public.

Each attempt to implement commonsense solutions to current energy problems is met with loud and vehement objections. At this point, these objections can only mean Democrats want energy prices to continue to increase. I can think of no other explanation.

The facts are rather simple. The Congress has blocked efforts to produce trillions of cubic feet of natural gas, trillions of barrels of oil, and prevent the construction of new refineries, nuclear powerplants, and hydroelectric facilities.

The longer we deny access to domestic supplies, the more our current energy shortages will climb. And the less energy we produce domestically, the more we will rely on foreign—and possibly hostile—sources for it.

It is time—it is time—for Congress to step to the plate and ensure this country remains one of the safest and most prosperous nations on Earth. That means increasing domestic energy production and decreasing our dangerous reliance on foreign energy sources.

We will vote in a very short time on whether to increase domestic energy production or whether to maintain the status quo. I can only hope each of us does the right thing and votes in favor of the McConnell amendment to stop the status quo and to ensure we can produce more of the energy we need right here at home.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, have I been assigned a specific amount of time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has been assigned 20 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, day after day, record-high oil and gasoline prices are hurting millions of American consumers and businesses. Unless something is done to make energy more affordable, the record-high prices will continue to reverberate throughout our economy, increasing the prices of transportation and food and manufacturing and everything in between. Skyrocketing energy prices are a threat to our economic and national security, and the time is long past for action.

My Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has conducted four separate investigations into how our energy markets can be made to work better. Most recently, last December, we had a joint hearing with the Senate Energy Subcommittee on the role of speculation in rising energy prices. As a result of these investigations and hearings, I have been advocating a variety of measures to address the rampant speculation and lack of regulation of energy markets which have contributed to sky-high energy prices.

Some of those measures are: First, put a cop back on the beat in the energy markets to ensure these markets are free from excessive speculation and manipulation, and that cop has to be a regulatory agency; stop filling the Strategic Petroleum Reserve until prices are lower; develop alternatives to fossil fuels to lessen our dependence on oil; and impose a windfall profits tax on oil companies that have profited from the massive price increases.

Now, there is not much we can do about some causes of these sky-high gas prices, but there are a number of causes that can be addressed. One key factor in the price spikes of energy is rampant speculation in the energy markets. Traders are trading contracts for future delivery of oil in record amounts, creating a paper demand that is driving up prices and increasing price volatility, solely to take a profit. Overall, the amount of trading of futures in oil on the New York Mercantile Exchange has risen sixfold in recent years.

As this chart shows, from 500,000 contracts for future delivery of oil to 3 million contracts just since 2001. Now, much of this increase in the trading of futures has been due to speculation. Speculators in the oil market do not intend to use crude oil. Instead, they buy and sell contracts for crude oil just to make a profit from changing prices.

The number of futures and options contracts held by speculators has gone from around 100,000 contracts in 2001—which at that time was 20 percent of the outstanding futures and options contracts—and has risen to 1.2 million futures contracts currently held by speculators. That represents now about 40 percent of the outstanding futures contracts in oil on the New York Mercantile Exchange.

That increase can be seen on this chart: the doubling in the percentage of futures contracts, which is represented by purchases by speculators on the New York Mercantile Exchange, from this level—15 to 20 percent in January of 2001—to almost double that amount currently. That is a massive increase in speculation.

As a matter of fact, as this next chart shows, there is now 12 times as much speculation as there was in 2001, while the purchase of nonspeculative futures is up but three times. This chart shows the difference. As shown on this chart, these are the purchases of contracts for future delivery of oil bought by speculators versus nonspeculators.

As shown on the chart, the speculator increase in purchases is that white line, with that dramatic increase, starting in 2003, going all the way up to where it is currently; and the relatively flatter yellow line represents the purchases of future delivery of oil by the nonspeculators since 2001.

Now, not surprisingly, this massive speculation the price of oil will increase has, in fact, helped increase the price of oil to a level far above that justified by traditional forces of supply and demand.

Let me quote some experts about the role of speculation. Some people say: Well, speculation does not have much of an effect. Well, listen to some of the experts.

The president and CEO of Marathon Oil said recently:

> $100 oil isn't justified by the physical demand in the market. It has to be speculation on the futures market that is fueling this.

Mr. Fadel Gheit, oil analyst for Oppenheimer & Company, describes the oil market as ''a farce.''

> The speculators have seized control and it's basically a free-for-all, a global gambling hall, and it won't shut down unless and until responsible governments step in.

In January of this year, as oil hit $100 a barrel, Tim Evans, oil analyst for Citigroup, wrote the following:

> [T]he larger supply and demand fundamentals do not support a further rise and are, in fact, more consistent with lower price levels.

At the joint hearing I made reference to on the effects of speculation we held last December, Edward Krapels, a financial market analyst, said the following:

> Of course financial trading, speculation affects the price of oil because it affects the price of everything we trade. . . . It would be amazing if oil somehow escaped this effect.

Dr. Krapels added that as a result of this speculation, ''there is a bubble in oil prices.''

A fair price for a commodity is a price that accurately reflects the forces of supply and demand for the commodity, not the trading strategies of speculators who only are in the market to make a profit by the buying and selling of paper contracts, with no intent to actually purchase, deliver, or transfer the commodity.

As we all too often have seen in recent years, when speculation grows so large that it has a major impact on the market, prices get distorted and stop reflecting true supply and demand.

Excessive market speculation is a factor that we can and should do a better job of controlling. There are other long overdue actions as well that, if taken as part of a comprehensive plan, can combat rising energy prices.

But as to reining in the speculators, the first step is to put a cop back on the beat in all of our energy markets to prevent excessive speculation, price manipulation, and trading abuses.

In 2001, my Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations began investigating our energy markets. At the time, the price of a gallon of gasoline had spiked upwards by about 25 cents over the course of the Memorial Day holiday. We subpoenaed records from major oil companies and interviewed oil industry experts, gas station dealers, antitrust experts, gasoline wholesalers and distributors, and oil company executives. We examined thousands of prices at gas stations in Michigan, Ohio, California, and other States. In the spring of 2002, I released a 400-page report and held 2 days of hearings on the results of the investigation.

The investigation found that increasing concentration in the gasoline refining industry, due to a large number of recent mergers and acquisitions, was one of the causes of the increasing number of gasoline price spikes. Another factor causing those spikes was the increasing tendency of refiners to keep lower inventories of gasoline. We also found a number of instances in which the increasing concentration in the refining industry was also leading to higher prices in general. Limitations on the pipeline that brings gasoline to my home State of Michigan was another cause of price increases and spikes in Michigan. The report recommended that the Federal Trade Commission carefully investigate proposed mergers, particularly with respect to the effect of mergers on inventories of gasoline.

In March of 2003, my subcommittee released a second report detailing how the operation of crude oil markets affects the price of not only gasoline but also key commodities such as home heating oil and diesel fuel. The report warned that U.S. energy markets were vulnerable to price manipulation due to a lack of comprehensive regulation and market oversight.

Following this report, I worked with Senator FEINSTEIN on legislation to put the cop back on the beat in the energy markets that had been exempted from regulation pursuant to an ''Enron loophole'' that was snuck into other commodities legislation in December of 2000. For 2 years, we attempted to close that ''Enron loophole,'' but efforts to put the cop back on the beat in these markets were unsuccessful, due to opposition from the Bush administration, large energy companies, and financial institutions that trade energy commodities.

In June of 2006, I released another subcommittee report called ''The Role

of Market Speculation in Rising Oil and Gas Prices: A Need to Put a Cop on the Beat.'' This report found that the traditional forces of supply and demand no longer accounted for sustained price increases and price volatility in the oil and gas markets. The report determined that in 2006 a growing number of energy trades occurred without regulatory oversight and that market speculation had contributed to rising oil and gasoline prices, perhaps accounting for $20 out of a then-priced $70 barrel of oil.

The subcommittee report I released in June of 2006 again recommended new laws to increase market oversight and stop market manipulation and excessive speculation. I again coauthored legislation with Senator FEINSTEIN to improve oversight of the unregulated energy markets. Once again, opposition from the Bush administration, large energy traders, and the financial industry prevented the full Senate from considering that legislation.

In 2007, my subcommittee addressed the sharp rise in natural gas prices over the previous year and released a fourth report, entitled: ''Excessive Speculation in the Natural Gas Market.'' Our investigation showed that speculation by a single hedge fund named Amaranth had distorted natural gas prices during the summer of 2006 and drove up prices for average consumers. The report also demonstrated how Amaranth had traded in unregulated markets to avoid the restrictions and oversight in the regulated markets, and how the price increases caused by Amaranth could have been prevented if there had been the same type of oversight in the unregulated markets as in the regulated markets.

Following that investigation, I introduced a bill, S. 2058, to close the Enron loophole and regulate the unregulated electronic energy markets. Working again with Senators FEINSTEIN and SNOWE and with members of the Agriculture Committee in a bipartisan effort, we finally managed to include an amendment to close the Enron loophole in the farm bill that was then being considered by the Senate. The Senate unanimously passed this amendment to close the Enron loophole last December. Last week, the House and Senate conferees on the farm bill reached agreement to include our legislation in the final farm bill, and we hope the Congress will finally pass that important legislation soon.

Although our legislation to close the Enron loophole is vitally important for the energy market oversight as a whole, and for our natural gas markets in particular, because energy traders have recently moved a significant amount of United States crude oil and gasoline trading to the United Kingdom, beyond the direct reach of United States regulators, we have to address that second loophole now as well.

The key energy commodity market for United States crude oil and gasoline trading is now located in London, regulated by the British agency called the Financial Services Authority. However, the British regulators do not have any limits on speculation as we do here in the United States, and the British do not make public the same type of trading data we do. That means traders can avoid the limits on speculation in crude oil imposed on the New York exchanges by trading on the London exchange. It also makes the London exchange less transparent than the New York exchange. The legislation I introduced in 2007 would have required United States traders on the London exchange to provide United States regulators with the same type of trading information they are already required to provide when they trade on the New York Mercantile Exchange. Unfortunately, this provision was dropped from the ''close the Enron loophole'' legislation in the farm bill.

The Consumer First Energy Act, which the majority leader and others introduced last week to address high gas prices and reduce speculation, includes a provision to stop speculation and to increase our access to timely and important trading information and to ensure there is adequate market oversight of the trading of U.S. energy commodities no matter where the trading occurs. This legislation that was introduced last week, and which I am proud to cosponsor, would require the Commodity Futures Trading Commission—the CFTC—to ensure a foreign exchange imposes comparable speculative limits and comparable reporting requirements on speculators that the CFTC imposes on U.S. exchanges prior to allowing traders in the U.S. trading U.S. energy commodities direct access to that exchange through a terminal located in this country. So the bill introduced last week will close that second loophole which I have identified.

I believe this issue is so important that I have also introduced that section to close that second loophole as a separate bill. Senator FEINSTEIN is a cosponsor of that bill. I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD after my statement.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEVIN. In addition to finding that the energy markets needed better regulation and oversight, the report issued by my subcommittee in 2003 also found that the Bush administration's large deposits of oil into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve—SPR—were increasing prices but not overall U.S. energy security. We found that in 2002, the Bush administration, over the repeated objections of its own experts in the Department of Energy, had changed its policy and decided to put oil into the SPR regardless of the price of oil or market conditions. By placing oil into the SPR while oil prices were high and oil supplies were tight, the administration's deposits into the SPR were reducing market supplies and boosting prices, with almost no benefit to national security, given the fact that the SPR is more than 95 percent filled. The DOE experts believed that in a tight market, we are better off with keeping the oil on the market rather than putting it into the ground where it cannot be used.

Following the issuance of this report, in early 2003 I asked the Department of Energy to suspend its filling of the SPR until prices had abated and supplies were more plentiful. DOE refused to change course and continued the SPR fill without regard to market supplies or prices.

After DOE denied my request, I offered a bipartisan amendment with my colleague Senator COLLINS to the Interior Appropriations bill, which provides funding for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve program, to require DOE to minimize the costs to the taxpayers and market impacts when placing oil into the SPR. The Senate unanimously adopted our amendment, but it was dropped from the conference report due to the Bush administration's continued opposition.

The next spring, I offered another amendment, also with Senator COLLINS, to the budget resolution, expressing the sense of the Senate that the administration should postpone deliveries into the SPR and use the savings from the postponement to increase funding for national security programs. The amendment passed the Senate by a vote of 52–43. That fall, we attempted to attach a similar amendment to the homeland security appropriations bill that would have postponed the SPR fill and used the savings for homeland security programs, but the amendment was defeated by a procedural vote, even though the majority of Senators voted in favor of the amendment, 48–47.

The next year, the Senate passed the Levin-Collins amendment to the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the DOE to consider price impacts and minimize the costs to the taxpayers and market impacts when placing oil into the SPR. The Levin-Collins amendment was agreed to by the conferees and is now law.

Unfortunately, passage of this provision has had no effect upon DOE's actions. DOE continues to fill the SPR regardless of the market effects of buying oil, thereby taking oil off the market and reducing supply by placing it into the SPR. In the past year, no matter what the price of oil or market conditions, DOE has consistently found that the market effects are negligible and no reason to delay filling the SPR.

Currently, at the same time the President has urged OPEC to put more oil on the market to reduce supplies, the administration is continuing to take oil off the market and place it into the SPR. The DOE is currently depositing about 70,000 barrels of crude oil per day into the SPR, much of it high-quality crude oil that is ideal for refining into gasoline. It simply defies common sense for the U.S. government

to be acquiring oil at $120 barrel, in a time of tight supply, just before the peak driving season, and put it into the SPR. That is why I have co-sponsored Senator DORGAN's bill to suspend the SPR fill for 1 year, or until prices fall to more acceptable levels, whichever comes first. Passing this legislation will save the taxpayers money and relieve some of the pressure on the oil markets that is driving prices relentlessly higher. A similar provision is also included in the Democrats' Consumer-First Energy Act.

The recent SPR fill has exacerbated yet another problem in our oil markets—the fact that the standard NYMEX futures contract that sets the benchmark price for U.S. crude oil requires a particular type of high quality crude oil known as West Texas Intermediate, WTI, to be delivered at a particular location—Cushing, OK. The standard NYMEX contract price, in turn, has a major influence on the price of fuels refined from crude oil such as gasoline, heating oil, and diesel.

Because the price of the standard contract depends upon the supply of WTI at Cushing, OK, the supply and demand conditions in Oklahoma have a disproportionate influence on the price of NYMEX futures contracts. That means when the WTI price is no longer representative of the price of U.S. crude oil in general, the prices of other energy commodities are also thrown out of whack. In other words, we have an oil futures market that reflects the supply and demand conditions in Cushing, OK, but not necessarily the overall supply and demand situation in the United States as a whole.

I have long called for reform of this outdated feature of the standard NYMEX crude oil contract. In 2003, the PSI report recommended the CFTC and NYMEX to work together to revise the standard NYMEX crude oil futures contract to reduce its susceptibility to local imbalances in the market for WTI crude oil. The subcommittee report suggested that allowing for delivery at other locations could reduce the volatility of the contract. It is truly disappointing that since our report was issued, no progress has been made for allowing for delivery at other places than Cushing, OK. As the price of oil has increased, the distortions and imbalances caused by the atypical nature of the standard contract have gotten worse. It is essential NYMEX repair its crude oil contract.

Putting the cop on the beat in our energy markets, strengthening access to key oil trading information, stopping the SPR fill, and fixing the NYMEX crude oil contract all focus on problems caused by rising energy prices. These consistently rising gas prices also underscore the need to develop advanced vehicle technologies and alternative energy sources that will significantly reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

I have long advocated advanced automotive technologies such as hybrid electric, advanced batteries, hydrogen and fuel cells and promoted development of these technologies through Federal research and development and through joint government-industry partnerships. We need a significant infusion of Federal dollars into these efforts to make revolutionary breakthroughs in automotive technologies. Such an investment will make technologies such as plug-in hybrid vehicles affordable to the American public, and reduce our dependence on oil and reduce prices at the pump.

We need an equally strong investment in development of alternative fuels that can replace gasoline. I have strongly supported efforts to increase our production of renewable fuels and to do that in a way that will also reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. We need a strong push toward biofuels produced from cellulosic materials, which requires a significantly greater Federal investment in biofuels technologies. Cellulosic ethanol has enormous potential for significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions but additional Federal support is required to make this technology financially viable. We need expanded Federal research and development grants as well as increased tax incentives and Federal loan guarantees to make cellulosic ethanol a viable replacement for gasoline. The Federal Government must do its part first to develop these technologies so that they will then in turn be within reach of the American public.

One more point. The burden of higher energy prices is not being shared equally. To the contrary, it is falling hardest upon those who can least afford it. Large oil companies are reaping record profits at the expense of the average American who ultimately bears the full burden of these price increases. At the same time that average Americans are having to devote a greater and greater portion of their income to pay for basic necessities, such as gasoline, household utilities, and food, the major oil companies are reporting record profits, and their executives are taking home annual paychecks of hundreds of millions of dollars. Many of these profits have been generated without any additional investments into energy production. Rather, these companies have seen their profits rise with the flood of speculation. What is a high tide of profits for the oil companies, though, is a tsunami that is overwhelming millions of Americans.

And what are these oil companies doing with these record profits? Are they investing in new technologies? The answer is that the oil companies are not increasing their exploration and development investments by nearly as much as their profits are increasing. Instead, they are devoting large amounts of their profits to acquiring other companies and buying back their own shares. On May 1 of this year, the Wall Street Journal reported that in the first quarter of 2008 ExxonMobil spent $8 billion to buy back company shares, which ''boosted per-share earnings to stratospheric levels,'' whereas it spent less on exploration and actually reduced oil production.

For these reasons, we need to institute a windfall profits tax on the oil companies. We should incentivize big oil companies to invest their windfall profits into things that will increase our own domestic energy production by reducing the amount of the tax for such investments. If they don't make these investments, a portion of that profit should be recouped by the public to help offset the outrageous prices they are facing at the pump.

I have supported a windfall profits tax numerous times when we have voted on it in the Senate. The Consumer-First Energy Act imposes a 25 percent tax on windfall profits of the major oil companies. Windfall profits invested to boost domestic energy supplies would be exempt from the tax, which would encourage investments in renewable facilities and the production of renewable fuels such as ethanol and biodiesel. It would also encourage oil companies to increase their domestic refinery capacity. Proceeds from the tax would be put toward measures to reduce the burdens of rising energy costs and increase our energy independence and security.

Mr. President, let me summarize. Skyrocketing energy prices are tying our already weak economy in knots and causing financial pain to working families throughout this country. Congress cannot just stand by. We should act now to stop the pain.

Immediate steps include putting the cop back on the beat in our energy markets, strengthening our access to key oil trading data in London, fixing the key NYMEX crude oil contract, stopping the senseless filling of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, investing in advanced vehicle technologies and alternative energy sources, and imposing a windfall profits tax on the oil companies. Longer range steps include fixing the fiscal policies undermining the strength of the U.S. dollar, including by eliminating tax cuts for the wealthiest among us, reducing the $12 billion a month spending that is taking place in Iraq, closing the tax loopholes such as the use of tax havens to avoid payment of taxes to Uncle Sam. Those tax havens and that loophole that allows the use of those havens is costing the Treasury in the range of $100 billion a year. We can fight back against exorbitantly high energy prices, but it will take all of our energy and determination to do it.

SUMMARY OF OIL TRADING TRANSPARENCY ACT

SUMMARY

The Levin-Feinstein Oil Trading Transparency Act would direct the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) to ensure that any foreign exchange operating a trading terminal in the United States for the trading of a U.S. energy commodity meets two regulatory requirements that already apply to U.S. exchanges: (1) imposition of speculative trading limits to prevent price

manipulation and excessive speculation, and (2) the mandatory daily publication of trading information from the exchange to ensure market transparency. The bill would also require the CFTC to obtain information from the foreign exchange to enable it to determine how much trading in U.S. energy commodities is due to speculation.

BACKGROUND

Currently, a key foreign exchange (ICE Futures Europe) that recently began trading trades futures contracts for crude oil produced in the United States is allowed by the CTFC to operate trading terminals in the United States.

ICE Futures Europe is owned by the Intercontinental Exchange (ICE), a U.S. company based in Atlanta, Georgia, which also operates the largest electronic energy trading platform in the United States outside of the NYMEX exchange in New York.

ICE Futures Europe trades two types of crude oil, Brent crude oil produced in the North Sea, and West Texas Intermediate (WTI) crude oil produced in the United States. It is the only foreign exchange that trades U.S. crude oil. ICE Futures Europe bases the settlement price of its WTI contract price on the settlement price of the WTI contract traded on the NYMEX exchange, so the price of both WTI futures contracts are virtually identical.

For a number of years the CFTC has allowed ICE Futures Europe to operate trading terminals in the United States. At first, only Brent contracts could be traded on U.S. terminals, but in 2006 ICE began trading WTI contracts in London. This 2006 development allowed U.S. traders to trade WTI futures contracts in London as well as in New York. This means that crude oil produced and used in the United States can be traded by U.S. traders on an exchange that is beyond the reach of U.S. regulators. Approximately 30 to 40% of WTI futures trades—which are key to setting U.S. oil prices—now occur in London, beyond U.S. oversight.

Although the CFTC has a data sharing agreement with the U.K. regulatory authority, the Financial Services Authority (FSA), to obtain trading data from the London exchange, the FSA does not collect or provide data that would enable the CFTC to determine how much WTI futures trading is due to speculation. Absent this information, CFTC weekly reports on speculation in U.S. crude oil futures are incomplete and inaccurate. The FSA also does not impose position limits on traders to limit speculative trading. The absence of these position limits means that a U.S. trader can avoid U.S. oil speculation limits on U.S. exchanges simply by routing its trades through London.

The bill would correct these market deficiencies by disallowing the operation of foreign exchange terminals in the United States, unless the foreign exchange meets comparable requirements for market transparency and speculative limits as now apply in the United States.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it is so important that we as Members of the Senate, Members of the Congress, are on the floor discussing the No. 1 issue—the No. 1 domestic issue certainly in the minds of Americans—and that is the price of energy. The folks back home want to know: What are you going to do to fix it? What is the Congress going to do?

Tomorrow we are going to have an opportunity to vote on a couple of different proposals. I rise this afternoon in support of the passage of the American Energy Production Act. This is a comprehensive energy bill that was introduced last week by the ranking member of the Energy Committee, Senator DOMENICI.

Americans are at a point where I think their patience is wearing thin, their frustration is showing, but it goes beyond just frustration. I think it is fair to say that many across the country are in true economic distress over the prices they are paying now for gasoline, for their home heating oil, many for their natural gas that they are seeing coming into their home and, unfortunately, the prognosis for the future doesn't look much more consoling to the consumer. All estimates indicate these prices will continue to rise in the future.

Look at some of the events of last week in terms of what was happening around the world. The rebel disturbances in Nigeria, concerns about the relations with Iran and production disruptions over there, production disruptions in Iraq—all of this plus many other factors, including the price of the dollar, and what is happening with the Chinese and Indian economies in terms of additional consumers coming on. So many of these factors keep driving the price of oil to the point where last week's closing crude oil price topped out at $126, down to $125 per barrel over the weekend. That hike in price is going to continue to drive the retail prices for refined product even higher, above the $3.62 national average for unleaded regular we reached last week; 52 cents higher than last year.

Talking to the folks back home, it is literally one horror story after another in terms of what people are paying. I know there are many places in the country today where fuel is hovering right at $4 a gallon, but in Alaska we are looking at prices that are much higher than that. In Athaca, fuel was costing $8.65 a gallon last week. This is about a dollar higher than the folks there were paying last year. They are used to paying high prices, but I am here to tell you 8 bucks and 65 cents a gallon is really high. In the community of Kiana, it is $6.25 a gallon. It is exactly $1 higher than they paid last year. At these prices, Alaskans and all Americans are having great difficulty making ends meet. Americans need relief from high fuel prices and they are asking for it now.

I have so many opportunities, coming from a State such as Alaska that is a producing State, a lot of opportunities to talk about how we can produce more as a nation. But I also am very insistent when we talk about an energy policy for this country that we also focus on promoting energy conservation, we also focus on greater energy efficiency and developing the alternative energy so critical for this Nation.

But we also have to make sure when we talk about an energy policy, we recognize there are different components. I liken it to a three-legged stool. You have the conservation and efficiency, you have the renewables and alternatives, but you also have increased production and increased production in traditional energy sources that are done in an environmentally sensitive manner.

The amendment Senator DOMENICI has introduced, the American Energy Production Act, does that in many ways. It proposes to open a couple thousand acres, 2,000 acres—I don't come from a farming State necessarily, but my colleagues from South Dakota and some of the big farm States tell me that 2,000 acres is pretty much the size of a small farm there—of the Arctic Coastal Plain to oil and gas development. We believe this area, the 1002 area of ANWR, is the site with likely the largest onshore oil and gas deposits left in North America. We know if we were to act today to open ANWR tomorrow, it is not going to bring new North Slope oil to the markets tomorrow, but it will affect the psychology of the oil markets. It will show that America is getting serious—finally getting serious—about producing the 40 billion barrels of oil and the hundreds of trillions of cubic feet of natural gas we believe exist in the current moratoria areas.

I think we need to recognize—and so many of my colleagues have stated this already on the floor—ANWR is about the long term. I can't tell my colleagues how many times I have heard on this floor: If we had only opened ANWR 10 years ago when President Clinton vetoed it, we would have that pipeline today. That pipeline would now be full instead of half full as we currently see it. But ANWR is about the bridge, if you will. It is a bridge to an energy future that can get us to the alternatives and to the renewables we keep talking about, and those who are so focused on making sure we have a solid environment and a solid environmental base. This is what so many of my Democratic colleagues are talking about. We need to get to the future of energy, which I agree is absolutely the alternatives and the renewables. But you can't flip a switch and have this Nation powered 100 percent by wind or solar or geothermal or ocean energy. We have to allow for that transition, and ANWR, the oil from ANWR, can help us to do that.

We have had many hearings in the Energy Committee on the issue of production. But earlier this year we heard from witnesses who said the current runup in world oil prices is due to so many of the factors I mentioned a few minutes ago; clearly, the hike in world demand for oil is led by China and by India; what is happening with the weakening of the U.S. dollar, which is used to pay for all of the oil sales; and oil becoming the new gold—a commodity of interest to investors because of the tightness of the world supplies.

Essentially, what it comes down to—so much of the discussion we are talking about—is supply and demand. I suggest that as we look to all these factors that are influencing price right now, one of the ways we can deal with that, one of the ways we can tell the American consumer we are working on this is to produce more energy from non-OPEC nations, to help increase our global supplies, and to help drive down world prices.

Robert Samuelson, a columnist, said in a column, which I will submit for the RECORD, that we need to exert long-term influence on the global balance of supply and demand for energy.

I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

START DRILLING

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

What to do about oil? First it went from $60 to $80 a barrel, then from $80 to $100 and now to $120. Perhaps we can persuade OPEC to raise production, as some senators suggest; but this seems unlikely. The truth is that we're almost powerless to influence today's prices. We are because we didn't take sensible actions 10 or 20 years ago. If we persist, we will be even worse off in a decade or two. The first thing to do: Start drilling.

It may surprise Americans to discover that the United States is the third-largest oil producer, behind Saudi Arabia and Russia. We could be producing more, but Congress has put large areas of potential supply off-limits. These include the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and parts of Alaska and the Gulf of Mexico. By government estimates, these areas may contain 25 billion to 30 billion barrels of oil (against about 30 billion barrels of proven U.S. reserves today) and 80 trillion cubic feet or more of natural gas (compared with about 200 tcf of proven reserves).

What keeps these areas closed are exaggerated environmental fears, strong prejudice against oil companies and sheer stupidity. Americans favor both ''energy independence'' and cheap fuel. They deplore imports—who wants to pay foreigners?—but oppose more production in the United States. Got it? The result is a ''no-pain energy agenda that sounds appealing but has no basis in reality,'' writes Robert Bryce in ''Gusher of Lies: The Dangerous Delusions of 'Energy Independence.' ''

Unsurprisingly, all three major presidential candidates tout ''energy independence.'' This reflects either ignorance (unlikely) or pandering (probable). The United States imports about 60 percent of its oil, up from 42 percent in 1990. We'll import lots more for the foreseeable future. The world uses 86 million barrels of oil a day, up from 67 mbd in 1990. The basic cause of exploding prices is that advancing demand has virtually exhausted the world's surplus production capacity, says analyst Douglas MacIntyre of the Energy Information Administration. Combined with a stingy OPEC, the result is predictable: Any unexpected rise in demand or threat to supply triggers higher prices.

The best we can do is to try to exert long-term influence on the global balance of supply and demand. Increase our supply. Restrain our demand. With luck, this might widen the worldwide surplus of production capacity. Producers would have less power to exact ever-higher prices, because there would be more competition among them to sell. OPEC loses some leverage; its members cheat. Congress took a small step last year by increasing fuel economy standards for new cars and light trucks from 25 to 35 miles per gallon by 2020. (And yes, we need a gradually rising fuel tax to create a strong market for more-efficient vehicles.)

Increasing production also is important. Output from older fields, including Alaska's North Slope, is declining. Although production from restricted areas won't make the United States self-sufficient, it might stabilize output or even reduce imports. No one knows exactly what's in these areas, because the exploratory work is old. Estimates indicate that production from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge might equal almost 5 percent of present U.S. oil use.

Members of Congress complain loudly about high oil profits ($40.6 billion for Exxon Mobil last year) but frustrate those companies' desire to use those profits to explore and produce in the United States. Getting access to oil elsewhere is increasingly difficult. Governments own three-quarters or more of proven reserves. Perversely, higher prices discourage other countries from approving new projects. Flush with oil revenue, countries have less need to expand production. Undersupply and high prices then feed on each other.

But it's hard for the United States to complain that other countries limit access to their reserves when we're doing the same. If higher U.S. production reduced world prices, other countries might expand production. What they couldn't get from prices they'd try to get from greater sales.

On environmental grounds, the alternatives to more drilling are usually worse. Subsidies for ethanol made from corn have increased food prices and used scarce water, with few benefits. If oil is imported, it's vulnerable to tanker spills. By contrast, local production is probably safer. There were 4,000 platforms operating in the Gulf of Mexico when hurricanes Katrina and Rita hit. Despite extensive damage, there were no major spills, says Robbie Diamond of Securing America's Future Energy, an advocacy group.

Perhaps oil prices will drop when some long-delayed projects begin production or if demand slackens. But the basic problem will remain. Though dependent on foreign oil, we might conceivably curb the power of foreign producers. But this is not a task of a month or a year. It is a task of decades; new production projects take that long. If we don't start now, our future dependence and its dangers will grow. Count on it.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. That means we have to actually produce more energy in this country. How do you get from here to there in increased energy production?

I wish to take a few minutes this afternoon and talk about ANWR. ANWR has 10 billion to 16 billion barrels of economically recoverable oil, according to the USGS estimates, and 10 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. We recognize that, by itself, that infusion into the energy market is not going to change the world's energy equation. But pair it with the other things we are talking about in this energy legislation Senator DOMENICI introduced and pair it with the additional barrels that could come from OCS development in current moratoria areas, and the 80 to 100 trillion cubic of natural gas there, and pair it with the fuel from coal-to-liquids development and the oil from U.S. oil shale deposits. Together, all these can start to break the stranglehold OPEC has on us and help to lower the prices.

Now, back to ANWR. I had said that—and I have said this throughout my public life—if opening ANWR was going to come at the expense of our environment and our wildlife, I would have to oppose it. But we have technology we have utilized up north in the past 30 years, since we have been in active production pulling oil from the North Slope, that has truly revolutionized what happens in the Arctic when it comes to development of our resources.

This chart is a New York Times science chart. It is essentially outlining some of the latest drilling technology in an effort to reduce environmental damage from the oil drilling. Directional drilling. It used to be that you would sink your drilling rig and drill straight down. Under the new directional drilling, what you are literally able to do is you sink it but you ''spider'' out, or ''spaghetti'' out underneath the surface. And you can take this in a direction of up to almost 8 miles in every direction around you, with no disturbance to the surface. So you don't see what is going on down below the caribou that are wandering around and are oblivious to the activity up top. But it is a technique that is in place in the Arctic that helps to literally provide about 100 square miles of habitat for the caribou and musk oxen that are between the well pads.

This technology has made the difference for us not only in Alaska in Arctic conditions but truly as we develop our technology for oil exploration around the country. It is difficult to see a lot of the descriptions on this chart, so I will use other maps to show you the ice roads, the pads on the ground, how you utilize a crossing over a river, the 3D seismic technology, how we have been able to reduce the well pads paths.

Initially, when drilling in the 1970s, the well pads were about 13 acres in size. Through the use of this technology, you can limit that footprint to about 5 acres. I wish to show you a picture of how we travel across the tundra so we don't disturb it, you don't see man's footprint or the trucks that are going over it. This is a composite mat that is literally laid on top of the tundra in the summer months, so you don't damage the fragile tundra below. Look at a picture of the ice roads. We do not explore in the summer months. Exploring is in the wintertime. This is a picture of exploratory drilling in Alpine in the winter. You will see around the exploration site—you cannot see the ice road from here, but there are no roads around this. There are no roads that will take you to this site. The way you get there is you build out roads on the ice. It is like a big Zamboni machine making an ice road that will take you across the tundra in the wintertime only—you cannot go out there during the summer—and lay down the

ice road, so when summertime comes, you have this.

This is Alpine during the summer months. The photo is grainy, and I apologize for the quality of it. You can see you don't have any roads that lead to the exploration site in the tundra there. This is a picture that was taken in the fall. This white box is the well site that is awaiting actual development.

We have a picture of rendezvous well No. 2. This is located in the National Petroleum Reserve Alaska. This is done in the winter. You can see this is the ice road I am talking about, which literally goes 4 miles, connecting this site to a road system miles away. We have a picture of the same site. This is in the summer, the same site. We have capped off and removed the rig. So the first one was the exploration, and then once the exploration is complete, they cap it off. There is no sign of impact to the area except for this ''Christmas tree'' valve stem that can be removed if, in fact, there is no production that is ever likely in that area.

Again, you may look at this and say: How do you get there? We get there because we are utilizing techniques that allow us and require us to protect the environment, so the impact is as minimal as absolutely possible.

The last picture I wish to put up in this series is this one. Everyone talks about the caribou. I think no picture of ANWR is complete unless we have a picture of the caribou wandering around at Point McIntyre Field while drilling is underway. The caribou—the wildlife—have learned to coexist with the level of development that goes on in the area there.

Again, I think it is important to point out we have gotten smart over the past 30 years. We figured out how to utilize technology so we can gain access to a resource, while at the same time preserving and protecting an area, a part of the country that we know is fragile. That tundra is fragile territory, and we have to treat it right, with respect, and be able to allow a level of subsistence harvest for the Natives who live up there and live off the land. We have to figure out how we balance it. We have worked very hard to do that.

The chairman of the Energy Committee, a colleague for whom I have a great deal of respect and who has worked very hard on so many energy issues spoke a little while ago, and he made the point that to the west of the Prudoe fields, and to the south, we have an area that is known as the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska. His point was, why do we need to open ANWR if we have all this area that is potentially available for oil exploration and development? There are a couple things going on with NPRA. It is a huge area. It is larger than the ANWR area itself. As a consequence, the pockets of oil—the areas that would be conducive for exploration and drilling—are further from the infrastructure, the existing pipelines. So that adds enormous costs to already very expensive operations up north.

You also have some very environmentally sensitive areas in the NPRA, around the Shirukak Lake, where you have a great deal of waterfowl that come through. So we are sensitive to making sure we are not disrupting, to the furthest extent possible, the wildlife, the waterfowl. That, too, is a point of concern. We also recognize the potential in ANWR for greater intensity, in terms of the oil finds, is that much more real. It is estimated that in ANWR we could get approximately 6,860 barrels per acre as opposed to only 480 barrels per acre in the NPRA. Those are factors to consider when we are talking about NPRA and ANWR.

I think it is helpful to put up a map of ANWR, so people can put it into context. The ANWR portion of this bill limits exploration to 2,000 acres of the 19.6 million acres of wildlife refuge. This is just one 10,000th of 1 percent of the refuge. It allows the establishment of critical habitat zones. It requires the use of the best commercially available technology to produce the oil, no matter what the cost is to the company. We believe, truly, this new technology can limit the environmental impact in the north.

Look at what we are talking about, the refuge itself. When people talk about ANWR, some might get the impression we are talking about developing in all of the wildlife refuge, all the 19.6 million acres. That is incorrect. The area we are talking about developing is within the ANWR Coastal Plain. That acreage is 1.5 million acres. Still, look at what you have within the refuge. You have a wilderness area, which has absolutely no development of anything at all, 8.5 million acres that is fully established in the wilderness area. In the balance is about 10 million acres and it is the refuge area. So this is the area—the 1002 we are talking about opening for potential exploration and development. Of that, this tiny little red dot on this map represents 2,000 acres out of the 1.5 million acres. So it is important to put that into context.

We have not had the ANWR debate in some months, so I think it is always nice to refresh people's memories of what ANWR is. You will notice ANWR itself is about the size of the State of South Carolina. We are talking big territory here.

The amendment that was offered by Senator DOMENICI and members of the Energy Committee does more than just open ANWR. ANWR is not the sole answer to the high price of oil. ANWR is not the sole answer to a balanced energy policy. ANWR is just one piece of that puzzle.

The amendment also permits revenue sharing with States that decide to allow OCS development off their coastlines. For the States that do not want it, this also provides new moratoria powers to prevent drilling, powers that could be gone in just 4 years. This is actually a plus for those who are somewhat concerned about OCS development off their coast.

With the new technology we have, the old fears of well blowouts from offshore development should be satisfied. The fear of subsea pipeline leaks should be alleviated by the performances we saw in the Gulf of Mexico during Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma in 2005, category 5 hurricanes, which resulted in no major spills. The fear of water contamination by drilling rigs should be resolved since nontoxic chemicals can now be used.

The amendment also removes the moratorium that is imposed on oil shale production in the West. There is great new technology that permits production from in situ piping, not requiring open-pit mining of the oil shale. We recognize we have so much oil shale in this country. They say America is the Saudi Arabia of oil shale, holding 2 trillion barrels of potential oil production.

Also, the provision in the legislation regarding coal-to-liquids sets a goal of America producing 6 billion gallons of such fuels by 2022, one-sixth of what we theoretically will produce from biofuel by then. But it requires that the fuel not produce more life-cycle carbon emissions than gasoline and allows for waivers to protect the environment. Given that Alaska alone holds the world's largest potential coal deposit and that America contains about 60 percent of the world's total reserves of coal, it is vital that we find some way to utilize the fuel. Coal is the only fossil fuel we can develop where we know we have the technology currently to capture and store any carbon produced and to keep it out of the atmosphere.

We believe that bill could produce another 24 billion barrels of oil—enough to meet our Nation's total needs for 5 years. That will dampen world prices. But if we don't take these steps, we will continue to be in this exact same position of being held hostage by the world's oil cartel for decades until we have new alternative technologies. We have to stop letting ourselves be held over the proverbial barrel by the world's nationally owned oil companies.

We understand in this country that there is no good reason, with our technology, our environmental advancements, not to be producing more of the energy that it needs.

I do want to add a caveat because I have been talking about ANWR, offshore, and coal-to-liquids, that by passing this amendment, it does not mean we shouldn't move full speed ahead to promote noncarbon-emitting nuclear power, that we shouldn't do everything possible to produce more power from wind, biomass, hydropower, solar, geothermal, ocean energy, and all the other technologies. We need them all. What it does mean is America will finally show the world that we are willing to do our part in meeting our energy needs.

There used to be a mantra, if you will, that nations should think globally but act locally. In this country, we should produce more of the energy we consume rather than expect other nations to supply it to us. We have the ability to reduce our dependency on imported energy sources. We just need to get on doing it. I think this amendment will help us cut our prices now, but especially looking out for the long term, help us to avoid higher prices for the years to come.

Over the weekend, I was reading through the local columnists in the Anchorage paper. One guy had it right. He said: I think the Republicans need to be more supportive of alternatives and renewables, the Democrats need to be more supportive of increased domestic production, and the American consumer needs to just conserve more. Sounds like pretty sage and wise advice to me.

With all of those components—increased domestic production, focus on the future of energy, which is renewables and alternatives, and focus on conservation and efficiency—we have ourselves the start of a pretty good energy policy for this country.

I appreciate the time of my colleagues. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

NOMINATION OF JUDGE ROBERT CONRAD

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, anniversaries are usually a time of joy, a time to celebrate, a time to remember happy occasions in one's life. This weekend, my sons celebrated Mother's Day with my wife, their mom, Brooke. Many know this is the 100th anniversary of Mother's Day.

Speaking of their mom, she and I will celebrate our 26th wedding anniversary this August. It is an anniversary that is very special, and it is something I intend to celebrate every day.

But today we mark an anniversary that is more troubling than celebratory. Today marks the 300th day since Judge Robert Conrad was nominated to serve on the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals—the 300th day. Judge Conrad was nominated in July 2007. It has been almost a year, and he still has yet to receive a hearing from the Judiciary Committee. Advise and consent. I don't think it said 300-plus days; it says advise and consent.

This is an anniversary of which I personally am not quite proud and, quite frankly, of which the Senate should be ashamed. We are telling the American people we are unable to fulfill one of the most important responsibilities for which they elect us as Senators. We are telling the American people that we cannot follow through with our constitutional responsibility of advise and consent on Federal judges.

I am not going to spend my time today pointing fingers and placing blame on one party or another. That would be a waste of everybody's time. I am here for quite the opposite reason. We need to encourage our fellow colleagues to better utilize our limited time left in this Congress and start confirming judges to the bench.

The unfortunate reality is that our Federal bench is suffering and, most importantly, vacancies on the bench hurt the American people. I have often said there is no area of daily life that is not affected by judges. Judges make decisions every day that have a long-lasting and significant impact on the entirety of the American people.

Unfortunately, our society has become so extremely comfortable with, if not aggressive about, filing lawsuits, and we must try to reduce that problem in and of itself. But in the meantime, we need to fill these lingering vacancies in order to give judges on the bench the help they desperately need to adjudicate their rapidly increasing caseloads.

Today, we have a great opportunity for this Congress to stop pointing fingers, to stop placing blame, and reverse the dreadful trend of underperformance on Federal judges. I encourage my colleagues to rise above the bickering and come to an understanding that confirming judges should be about legal qualifications and experience.

Judge Bob Conrad now waits for the 300th day for his nomination for a judiciary hearing. He is clearly qualified to serve on the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. It is almost impossible to think of a more qualified candidate. He has an excellent reputation as a knowledgeable and fair district court judge from the Western District of North Carolina.

Bob has twice—twice—been confirmed by the Senate, once in 2001 to become U.S. attorney and once in 2005 to be a U.S. district court judge—a candidate that has been confirmed by this body twice who cannot even get a Judiciary Committee hearing.

Bob received a unanimous—let me repeat that—a unanimous ''well qualified'' rating by the American Bar Association. Not every nominee receives a unanimous ''well qualified'' rating.

Bob's nomination to the Fourth Circuit Court has been endorsed by the Charlotte Observer, the Asheville Citizen-Times, and the Charleston Post and Courier. It is not the papers keeping him out of office; it is the Senate and, specifically, the Judiciary Committee.

Judge Conrad's nomination is also extremely important to North Carolina. My home State must get more representation on the Fourth Circuit Court. Our State has just one seated judge, even though we are the most populous State in the circuit.

Judge Conrad has been nominated to the Fourth Circuit Court seat. This is a seat that has been vacant for 14 years. Let me say that again. This is a judicial seat that has been vacant for 14 years. This Senate cannot fulfill its obligations to put a judge on this bench. It is now a judicial emergency by the Administrative Office of the Courts.

I could continue to list Judge Conrad's outstanding credentials and qualifications and, more importantly, why it is critical that he be confirmed to the Fourth Circuit Court, but really, this distinguished body could use a little less talk and a little more action. It is time to act on this nomination. It is time to give Judge Conrad a hearing and a vote on the Senate floor. He has been waiting patiently for over 300 days, and that is inexcusable.

Some may think they are helping their political party by blocking qualified Presidential nominees from being considered for the Federal bench, but what they are really hurting is our country and the American people. It is not just 1 or 2 of us or 100 U.S. Senators who suffer from this lack of progress, it is all of us.

I remind all of my colleagues that they should not celebrate this 300-day anniversary; they should act on it, they should act to get Bob Conrad a hearing and to get him a vote on the Senate floor. I ask my colleagues to do this for Judge Conrad, but, more importantly, do it for the American people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mrs. DOLE. Mr. President, I come to the floor today, along with my colleague, to speak on the pending nomination of Robert J. Conrad, but I also wish to speak about the nomination of Thomas Alvin Farr to be a district court judge in the Eastern District of North Carolina.

As my great friend and colleague, Senator BURR from North Carolina, has pointed out, these nominations have reached a number of troublesome and frustrating milestones in the past few weeks. Bob Conrad has now been waiting more than 300 days—300 days—for a hearing, and Tom Farr's nomination has languished for a nearly unprecedented duration of over 500 days—500 days—without a hearing. In fact, he now holds the unenviable distinction of being the longest current pending district court nominee.

Bob Conrad and Tom Farr have both received the American Bar Association's highest rating of unanimously ''well qualified'' and still they await a hearing.

Bob Conrad and Tom Farr have the full support of their home State Senators. Both of their blue slips were long ago returned, and still they await a hearing.

The Eastern District seat to which Tom is nominated and the Fourth Circuit seat to which Bob Conrad has been nominated have been declared judicial emergencies by the Judicial Conference. I would add that North Carolina, the most populous State in the Circuit, has historically been significantly underrepresented on the court and presently can claim only one judge, the Honorable Allyson Duncan,

when we should have four or five. And still, these accomplished and capable candidates continue to wait hundreds of days without receiving a hearing.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the distinguished Senator from Vermont, has taken time to meet both Tom Farr and Bob Conrad, and we thank him for the courtesy. Despite the chairman's having met these two thoughtful and impressive men, having heard them pledge their commitment to the law and its impartial administration, they have faced inaction by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Tom Farr and Bob Conrad are two of the most distinguished and respected legal professionals in the State of North Carolina. For his part, Tom graduated at the top of his class, summa cum laude from Hillsdale College, and went on to receive his J.D. from Emory University and his Masters of Law in Labor from the Georgetown University Law Center. Tom spent a year as the late U.S. Senator John East's Labor Committee Counsel. He also has clerked for Judge Frank Bullock of North Carolina's Middle District; served as an Adjunct Professor of Labor and Employment Law; chaired the Magistrate Judge Merit Selection Committee in North Carolina's Eastern District; and is a permanent member of the Fourth Circuit Judicial Conference.

Tom Farr has spent the majority of his career practicing employment law in Raleigh with two of our State's most important law firms. Recognized as a leader in his practice area, Tom has been selected as a Top 100 Super Lawyer for 2 years running by his colleagues and as ''Legal Elite'' for 5 years running by Business North Carolina. He is listed in the Martindale Hubbell Law Directory, the listing of the country's leading attorneys, and has maintained their preeminent ranking for more than a decade.

And regarding the impressive qualifications of Judge Bob Conrad, he is a magna cum laude graduate of Clemson University and received his law degree from the University of Virginia. His career and credentials are known to many in this body. The Senate confirmed him by a noncontroversial voice vote as a Judge in North Carolina's Western District, and he has served since 2006 as that court's chief judge. Bob Conrad is recognized as a judge and judicial scholar of the first order by the attorneys who appear before him and the judges with whom he works.

Indeed, both the Conrad and Farr nominations are supported by a wide array of their colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, many of whom have written the chairman to express their support for these nominees and belief in their fitness for the Federal judiciary.

In this body, we often speak of judicial nominations in terms of numbers: Number of nominees confirmed; number of days pending. And while these numbers are important, let us not lose sight of the fact that these nominees are real people with careers and families; real people who have made sacrifices in those careers, in time spent with those families, all for the opportunity to serve their country as a Federal judge. Yes, appointment to these high offices is an honor representing the entrustment of an awesome responsibility. And the Senate's constitutional duty of advice and consent is not to be discharged lightly. But our duty must be discharged by allowing an up or down vote on these nominees.

I ask my colleagues to move forward and bring some measure of relief to the people of North Carolina's Eastern District and the Fourth Circuit. It is a simple and reasonable request. And action on the nominations of Tom Farr and Bob Conrad is long overdue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, am I listed in the order of morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 25 minutes.

CORRUPTION IN IRAQ

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I am going to speak about energy and respond to a couple of things I heard on the Senate floor and talk about what we are going to be doing tomorrow. But first let me say I finished 2 hours of chairing a Democratic policy committee hearing in which three people testified: two previously serving with the U.S. State Department in the country of Iraq, and one, Major General Nash, who has a great deal of experience internationally.

I come away from that hearing after listening 2 hours to some very patriotic Americans, Judge Brennan and Mr. Mattil, who talked about their experience working for the State Department in Baghdad.

What I heard was unbelievable—almost unbelievable. They were there to try to be supportive of the anticorruption efforts that were underway by our Government and by Judge Radhi al-Radhi, who headed the Commission on Public Integrity in the country of Iraq. What they told me makes me almost furious.

They told me our State Department—yes, our State Department here in the United States—did everything they could to undermine the efforts of Judge al-Radhi and the Commission on Public Integrity and the section in the State Department that was in Iraq trying to root out corruption and support those who were engaged in anticorruption activity. Billions and billions of dollars have literally been stolen. The witnesses today who worked for our State Department in Iraq told us money that has gone through the hands of the Iraqi Ministries, an unbelievably corrupt government, ends up in the hands, among other places, of the insurgents, which then fuels the war against our soldiers. Our State Department, they say in testimony—and I encourage people to write to us and get a copy of this testimony—they say our Government and those in charge in Baghdad not only did nothing about it, but tried—because the Iraq Government, full of corrupt Ministries, was upset with the Commission on Public Integrity investigating them—it was our Government that decided to be helpful to throw Judge al-Radhi out of that country.

This is a man whom they tried to kill. They didn't like him investigating corruption in Iraq so they tried to kill him. Yet our Government paved the way for the Iraqi Government to get rid of him, to throw him out of the country.

On Thursday of this week we are going to write a bill in the Appropriations Committee. I believe the President asks for $172 billion—that is with a ''b''—$172 billion additional, mostly for the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. The question is, how much of that $127 billion going through our Defense Department and then coming into the Iraqi Ministries, how much of that is going to be wasted? How much of that is going to stick in the hands of corrupt officials in the country of Iraq?

If we could dye that money purple and track it through those who stuff it in their pockets in Iraqi Ministries and then pass it along to the insurgents as part of the take, who would we see stealing this money from the American taxpayers, and who would we see undermining the work, every day, of soldiers in Iraq?

We can't leave the country of Iraq, we are told by this administration, until there is stability. There is not going to be stability until we address the issue of corruption. As long as we will turn a blind eye to corruption—which two people from the State Department who worked in Iraq told us today—as long as we turn a blind eye to corruption, which has been done; as long as we betray—yes, betray—those who were standing up in Iraq and risking their lives to get rid of corruption, we don't stand a chance of making an inch of ground in Iraq. In fact, the witnesses today said the Special Inspector General in Iraq, in reporting to us, the Congress, and the American people about progress made in routing out corruption, that Special Inspector General was given information from those in charge in our Government in Iraq that was inaccurate because those responsible for providing the information sent the right information to the Inspector General and then it was pulled back by the State Department and they sanitized it and rewrote it to give a completely different message.

We are not even getting the truth. We are being deceived. I want everyone to read the testimony that came today from Judge Brennan and others and understand what is happening.

As we start on Thursday on this issue of whether we are going to provide another $172 billion, we ought to understand how much of that money is being stolen, how much of that money is going to actually support the insurgency, and what is being done about it. I am going to send letters, as a result of the hearing that I and my colleagues held today, to officials in the State Department, to Secretary Rice, and others demanding to know what she knows and what they know and who is doing something about this and demanding accountability from those in the State Department relative to the testimony that was given today.

Mr. President, I didn't come to talk about that, but I just came from chairing that hearing for 2 hours. It is an unbelievable tale that is very distressing and very disappointing and just cries out for action by the Congress and action by the President and this administration.

THE PRICE OF OIL

Mr. DORGAN. I want to talk about oil prices a bit. I noticed today that some of my colleagues were talking about drilling in Alaska. They said that we should drill in ANWR. That has become the hood ornament for every conversation about energy. If we just drill in ANWR, then things will be fine.

ANWR is one of those pristine areas we have set aside. There are some who want to drill there as a first resort. If ever there is drilling in some part of the world that we have set aside as one of the few pristine areas left, then it ought to be a last resort. Why would you go there as a first resort?

If you take a look at the Outer Continental Shelf and where the reserves of oil and gas really are, You have on that list the Gulf of Mexico, the West Coast, and the Outer Continental Shelf of Alaska. They rank in that order. No. 1 is the Gulf of Mexico; No. 2 is California and the west coast; and No. 3 is the Outer Continental Shelf of Alaska.

I was there with three of my colleagues, Senators DOMENICI, BINGAMAN, and Talent, in the 109th Congress who introduced the legislation to open Lease Sale 181 off the Gulf of Mexico to get new oil and natural gas production. I am proud to say that became law. We got that passed in the 109th Congress.

It was narrowed when we passed it, so I have actually introduced another bill to expand that. I think we should be in the eastern Gulf of Mexico producing more, and we have made progress as a result of my past efforts with Senators DOMENICI, BINGAMAN, and Talent. So don't tell me about ANWR is going to solve all our problems. We are trying to open even more in the Gulf of Mexico for additional production.

With respect to the price of oil at this point, it's been bouncing around at the top like a roller coaster. But here is what is happening with the price of oil. It has nearly doubled in the last year. That should be no surprise to people. If you drive a car you know what is going on. It nearly doubled in the last year.

In my judgment there is nothing that justifies that, and I want to talk about that a little bit. There is nothing with respect to the fundamentals of supply and demand that would justify doubling the price of oil in one year. Take a look at what Stephen Simon, senior vice president of ExxonMobil, a company making enormous profits, said. By the way, they have permagrins. They can't help but smile all the way to the bank with their record profits, some of the highest profits in history. Mr. Simon, said on April 1:

> The price of oil should be about $50-$55 a barrel.

Clarence Cazalot, CEO of Marathon Oil, said,

> $100 oil isn't justified by the physical demand in the market.

Fadel Gheit, Senior Energy Analyst with Oppenheimer & Company who has more than 30 years in this business said to the Star-Telegram on October 26, 2007,

> There is absolutely no shortage of oil. I'm absolutely convinced that oil prices should not be a dime above $55 a barrel.

He is talking about the futures market.

> I call it the world's largest gambling hall. . . It's open 24/7. . . . Unfortunately, it's totally unregulated. ... This is like a highway with no cops and no speed limit, and everyone is going 120 miles an hour.

New Jersey Star Ledger:

> Experts, including the former head of ExxonMobil, say financial speculation in the energy markets has grown so much over the last 30 years that it now adds 20 to 30 percent or more to the price of a barrel of oil.

Here is an example of increases in the speculation in the futures market as opposed to commercial contracts. Speculation has rapidly increased. You can see it has gone up near the 40 percent mark. You will see where it has gone just in recent years, up, up, way up. What has happened is we have much more speculation in the futures market that determines the price of this commodity.

Who is making money with all this? I said the other day, I don't know this guy from a cord of wood. His name is Andrew Hall. There is a story in the Wall Street Journal: ''Trader Hits Jackpot In Oil As Commodity Boom Roars On.''

My guess is this fellow doesn't actually want to buy oil or actually acquire oil. He is just speculating in the futures market. Will Rogers said:

> You will buy things you will never get from people who never have had it.

Right? And you make money all along the way. You have the speculators in neck deep and hedge funds in neck deep in the futures market speculating. Here is a guy who made a quarter of a billion dollars in the last five years speculating in the futures market.

Some say the futures market, you need that. I agree you need that. You need that for liquidity, and you need it for hedging. That's absolutely true. But you don't need a futures market and should not allow a futures market for energy that ratchets up the price of energy in an unbelievable way, solely due to speculation. The fact is, it does great damage to our economy and does great damage to industries in this economy.

I believe we have had five airlines go bankrupt in the last month. We have trucking firms threatening to go belly up because they can't possibly afford to pay for the fuel and make a decent profit. This has an unbelievable impact in our country. It severely damages our economy.

I come from a State that is 10 times the size of Massachusetts.

So you can put ten Massachusetts in my State. We do not have a very large population, but we drive a lot. We are an agricultural state so we use a lot of fuel. Incidentally, per person we use twice as much fuel as New Yorkers use. We use twice as much fuel per person per capita as New Yorkers do, so when this shoots way up through the stratosphere, it hurts us much more than other areas of the country. We know this in a very personal way.

Now, what do we do about that? Well, I have talked about the unbelievable orgy of speculation in the commodity markets. We ought to dampen that speculation by increasing the margin requirements. Buy a stock on margin, you have to put up 50 percent of the money to buy the stock. Buy an oil futures contract, in most cases, you put up 5 to 7 percent to buy an oil futures contract.

If you have too much speculation in that marketplace which is well above that which is needed for liquidity and hedging and normal commercial functions, then you have too much speculative capability, and there is too much speculative activity. Thus, we ought to wring that out. I think there is a way to do that, and that is by increasing the margin requirements.

Now I want to go to the next piece of information, and that is the bill I introduced three months ago to suspend filling the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. I was thinking today about the movie ''Dumb and Dumber.'' I actually watched a little bit of it because it was so dumb. Dumb and dumber represents a policy of putting oil underground at a time when oil prices are up around $128 a barrel. I know ''dumb'' is not a term of art, but I cannot think of anything that would be dumber than continue a policy that makes no sense. Oil is going through the roof so let's stick oil underground by taking it out of supply, store it underground, and thereby increase the price.

Well, here is what we should do instead. This administration is now putting about 70,000 barrels of oil every single day, 7 days a week, at locations like Bryant Mound, Big Hill, and West Hackberry. These are places on the Gulf Coast with salt domes where we

store oil. What is the purpose? It is called the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. We call it the SPR for short. Because if we run into some trouble some day, we want oil preserved in an SPR, and we can call on that oil.

Here is what it looks like. It includes big old tubes that pump oil in the ground. This is the oil that ought to be in the supply pipelines right now so, when you drive up to the gas pump, you are paying a little bit less than you are now paying. Instead of it being available at the gas pump, it is being put underground in the SPR.

We are required as a country by international treaty obligations to have at least a 90-day reserve. We are at about 118 days if you take public and private stocks into account. We are well above our international requirement.

From what I can tell, there are 67 Senators who have signed letters or made statements to the President saying: Stop it. Do not stick oil underground at this time. This is oil that comes off the Gulf of Mexico as a royalty-in-kind oil. Instead of putting it in supply, they are sticking it underground. Furthermore, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is 97 percent filled. It is 97 percent full. And when oil is $128 a barrel, we are sticking it underground. It makes no sense; it defies all common sense.

Yet 51 Democratic Senators sent a letter to the President, and 15 Republicans Senators sent a letter to the President. Also, the Republican Presidential candidate, John McCain, and said ''stop it.'' That's at least 67 Senators.

Last week, Doug Steenland, the President and CEO of Northwest Airlines testified before the Congress. He said:

> Certainly with the prices at this level, and given the demand out there, we don't need to be filling the Strategic Reserve at $122 per barrel.

Now, obviously he has a vested interest, because he and others are engaged in the airline industry.

Here is a quote from James May, President and CEO of the Air Transport Association of America:

> One of the most important and immediate steps that the government can take to help the economy is to stop filling the SPR.

Why do we hear from airlines? We are hearing from airlines, truckers, or any number of industries or families and businesses. The airlines are hurt unbelievably by these prices and so are trucking firms. American families are pulling up to a gas pump trying to figure out how do I manage to pay for this tank of gas. It is not unusual to hear industry officials say: Stop it.

John McCain, Senator MCCAIN:

> With oil at over $100 a barrel and an adequate supply in the [Strategic Petroleum Reserve], it is time to suspend purchases.

Now, why is it that everyone can hear this message except the President and the Vice President? I am told the Vice President is the one who is absolutely insistent that we keep putting oil underground. Why is it that everyone can understand and hear this message loud and clear except the President and his Vice President?

Is it not probably time for all of us to insist that we do that which we know should be done? Fifteen Senators from the minority sent a letter to the President on April 29, 2008, and said:

> We write today to request that the U.S. Department of Energy immediately halt deposits of domestic crude oil into the U.S. Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

Now, having said all of that, we are going to vote tomorrow on a piece of legislation I introduced in early February. I have spoken about it on the floor until people fall asleep when bring it up. I know repetition is difficult around here, but it is important to understand how urgent this is.

The fact is, we all have one thing in common: None of us has ever seen nearly $128 oil until now. We have never seen the price of a barrel of oil go up to $120, $124, or $128 a barrel for oil. None of us has ever experienced that before. So what does it mean to this economy? Do we know? I guess not, but we are witnessing it. I guess we know what it means to the five airlines that are bankrupt.

Do we know what it means to a trucking company? A guy called me the other day. He is running a trucking company in North Dakota that his dad started many years ago. They have a good operation. They are a good family company. They have made a good living for their family over many years. He said you know what. I do not see how we can avoid shutting this company down. We cannot afford the fuel costs. We just cannot afford it any longer.

Now, what are the consequences of all of this, a family driving up to the gas pump and spending $50 or $60 to fill their tank?

Here is what is happening: The speculators in the oil futures area are making a massive amount of money. No question about it. Take a look at hedge fund compensation. It is unbelievable.

The OPEC countries, oh, man, they are going to the bank. They are going to the bank with our money. You pull up to the pump, you are lining the pockets of the OPEC and other oil producing countries. You are lining the pockets of the major integrated oil companies too.

By the way, the major integrated oil companies now all have two names, because they all got married. They liked each other a lot, liked the bottom line. Now, it is ExxonMobil, and it is ConocoPhillips. They have all got two names.

People say to me: what are you talking about? Why do you not let the free market work? Let the free market work. Don't you understand anything? Well, I actually used to teach a little economics in college. But this is not a free market at work. There is nothing about a free market here.

No. 1, you have a cartel, a cartel of countries that makes decisions behind a closed door, and they have the capability to make those decisions stick. In fact, Saudi Arabia is now pumping 800,000 fewer barrels a day than they did two years ago. Does that decision have an impact on price? You bet your life it does. So you have a cartel. It is illegal to have a cartel in this country. You would go to jail for that in this country. But we have a cartel for oil producing nations.

Then you have the major oil companies which are bigger and much stronger, with much more muscle in the marketplace. Why? Because everybody was shaking pom-poms while they wanted to merge. You want to merge? Absolutely. No problem. Get bigger. Fine.

We are supposed to have 2,000 people working for this U.S. Government on antitrust enforcement. You cannot find one of them. I know they are getting paid, but you cannot find one of them. All of these mergers are approved. So now we have got the OPEC cartel, we have got the major integrated oil companies with more muscle in the marketplace. Finally, we have a futures market which has become an orgy of speculation.

Then we are told just let the free market work. What is wrong with you? The free market is fine. I guess it is fine if you are on the receiving end of these policies. If you are the one who is the beneficiary, it is not fine. If you are the one who is going to the bank to make deposits, boy, this works out pretty well for you.

But if you are on the receiving end of oil, gas, jet fuel prices or diesel prices, then you are in deep trouble. The fact is, this is damaging our economy, and it is going continue to damage our economy until we find ways to address it.

I serve on the Energy Committee. I am also Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water, so I spend a lot of time thinking about energy. I understand that in order to address our energy needs we need to do a lot of things, do them right and do them well. We need to produce more. I understand that. I described the need to produce more in the Gulf of Mexico, and what we are trying to do through legislative efforts. We need to produce renewable fuels, and we can and should do that. I think there is great capacity in renewable fuels in the U.S.

We need to conserve more. We waste an unbelievable amount of energy in this country. We need to be much more efficient with all of the things we do. We get up in the mornings and never think. We flick a switch from ''off'' to ''on'' and everything comes on. We put a key in the ignition and turn it and somehow the engine starts, and we go to work. We do not think much about all of those issues, and make sure that conservation and efficiency are unbelievably important.

So we need to consider production, conservation, efficiency, and renewables as important elements of an energy policy. But, again, when my colleagues come to the floor of the Senate and say: Well, you know, if we could have drilled in ANWR, boy, things would be terrific. That is all nonsense. I mean, we can produce much more without going to that which we ought to go to as a last resort, rather than a first resort.

That is why many of us are trying to go beyond Lease Sale 181 in the Gulf of Mexico. We ought to be producing off Cuba as well where China is now allowed to drill and produce. So there is so much we can do. Let's take the first baby steps in the right direction and stop doing things that make no sense. Let's stop putting oil underground into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

My hope is that, while we might disagree on a lot of things on energy policy, the one thing we can and I hope should agree on is to stop putting oil underground when it is going from $120, to $125, to $145 a barrel. I think there are at least 67 and probably 75 Senators who have expressed themselves on that. While we might disagree on other parts of energy legislation, we should not disagree on that, if a substantial, overwhelming majority of the Senate believes it.

You know, one of the regrets I have had in the Senate in recent times is we often get the worst of what each party has to offer rather than the best of both. The fact is we have got two grand political parties in our country. I know on some things we have different beliefs, and we have differences of opinion. There are some things from time to time where we agree. This is an area where we agree right now. It is time to stop filling the SPR at this point. Not forever but at this point. That is an area of broad agreement in this Chamber. I hope we can manifest that agreement tomorrow when we cast a vote on legislation that I introduced three months ago. I have introduced amendments that Republicans like Senator DOMENICI and Senator SNOWE have cosponsored. Many other Senators have signed letters. Senator MCCAIN has expressed himself strongly and positively in support of this position. So let's do what we can achieve.

Will it reduce the price of gasoline? Absolutely. Will it reduce it a lot? I do not know. Probably not a lot, but some. Dr. Philip Verleger, an economist and energy analyst, testified before the Energy Committee last year and pointed out that we are taking certain oil from the Gulf of Mexico and putting underground. This is sweet light crude, a subset, the most valuable subset of oil. He said that it had an impact of about 10 percent on the price of sweet light crude oil.

Let's do what we can do to put some downward pressure on the price of oil.

Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALAZAR). The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, tomorrow we are going to be voting on a couple of different bills, one of which was discussed by my colleague from North Dakota. The other is called the Domenici bill for the senior Senator from New Mexico.

I believe that while the Domenici bill does not answer all of the questions with regard to energy production, it is a very good start because, first and foremost, it addresses the production side. We know there is a huge demand and not enough supply of energy. In many respects, the Domenici bill seeks to remedy that imbalance and provide for more production.

In the last 30 years, U.S. consumption of oil has grown moderately. Our dependence on foreign oil has doubled to more than 13.4 million barrels per day, but our domestic production has remained relatively flat. Whether oil is purchased domestically or from foreign sources, we are feeling the negative effects of high prices more than ever.

We have to do something to help bring down the price of oil and gas at the pump, and today's average was $3.78. What the Domenici amendment does is open up new production, for example, 2000 acres of the 19 million acres of the Arctic Plain which was specifically designated for oil and gas leasing so that with its new environmentally sound directional drilling, very low footprint, at least a million barrels of oil could be made available, roughly 1 million barrels a day for 20 years. That would make a big difference. It also allows that States on both the Atlantic and Pacific could petition the Federal Government to opt out of the current broad moratorium on drilling and, in a responsible, environmental manner unlock potentially millions of barrels of crude oil.

The Domenici amendment streamlines and consolidates the refinery permitting process since frequently that is the bottleneck in getting refined gasoline to the consumer. It eases difficulties usually encountered when they want to build or expand refineries. We haven't built a new refinery in about 30 years.

The amendment suspends delivery to the SPR, echoing comments of my colleague from North Dakota. This is not a magic bullet. Simply not buying some oil and putting it in the SPR, while it won't hurt anything and might actually help a little bit, is a very modest proposal and does nothing to actually add to the supply of energy. But the Domenici amendment includes this provision as well. It is not going to do any harm, and it could do some good. The amendment also allows for the long-term procurement of synthetic fuels by repealing section 526 of last year's energy bill which placed certain emissions requirements on Air Force fuels, for example, and repeals a provision of last year's bill that stipulated a moratorium on oil shale development. U.S. domestic oil companies are doing a lot of research into the potential for shale converted to oil. If we were able to accomplish this, we could produce much more oil in the United States as a result.

The Domenici amendment is not perfect. I would, for example, not have included a coal mandate though, obviously, it would be good if we could convert coal to a liquid fuel that could be put into our transportation needs. I would have included a domestic oil royalty provision that would have required that new leases include price thresholds limiting royalty relief when gas and oil prices are high. That would improve our energy situation. I also believe it is important to look at some of the causes of the high oil and gas prices and some of the potential initiatives that will lessen our reliance on oil which reached $125 a barrel today. I will talk briefly about the weakness of the American dollar which has something to do with that.

The bottom line is, there are very good provisions in the Domenici amendment. While I think it did not go far enough in some areas and had one mandate which is unfortunate, it is an amendment which I will support because it will actually produce oil. Much of what comes from the other side sounds good, but it doesn't produce a single drop of oil. Without that, we are not going to decrease demand to more match supply.

I mentioned that one of the costs of oil for American consumers is the fact that our dollar has decreased in value relative to other currencies. There was a recent editorial in the Wall Street Journal which showed that the price of oil based upon gold or the value of the Euro has remained relatively constant, whereas compared to the price of a dollar, it has increased dramatically, because the dollar is worth less money. If a dollar doesn't buy you as much, you have to have a lot more of them to buy the same quantity of gasoline. I filled up two cars this weekend. In both cases, I could see the fact my dollars weren't going as far as they used to. That was one of the reasons I paid more for the gas I purchased.

European and Asian nations are shielded from this because their currencies, like the Euro and the yen, have maintained their value. Europeans pay 80 Euros for a barrel of oil, while Americans are paying more than $125 as of today. So returning the United States to a strong dollar policy would greatly reduce the price U.S. consumers pay for oil. The Federal Reserve should switch its focus from maintaining economic stability to fighting inflation, its primary goal. In periods of slower economic growth, the Federal Reserve traditionally responds by reducing short-term interest rates, but that can exacerbate inflation which has increased substantially. The Federal Reserve needs to refrain from

reducing interest rates further. Our currency is the foundation for our economy. Without a strong dollar, our economy will not be able to achieve the stability that is necessary to control oil prices for the economy.

Something else we can do, as well as reducing our reliance on foreign oil and promoting reliable and affordable energy sources for the future, is to acknowledge that the mandates we imposed in the last two energy bills aren't actually helping to reduce oil prices but actually have caused them to increase.

I support the development of cost-effective alternatives to fossil fuels, but the alternatives should not increase the already burdensome costs of energy and food on American families. As we know, last year's energy bill effectively mandated that fuel marketers blend $15 billion of corn ethanol. I support efforts to reduce the ethanol mandate included in the Energy bill. That will lower gas prices and help to lower food prices as well. Instead, I believe we should be focusing on other and better sources of renewable energy already available, specifically nuclear energy.

Dr. Patrick Moore, one of the founders of Greenpeace, stated in a Washington Post op-ed 2 years ago:

> Nuclear energy is the only large-scale, cost-effective energy source that can reduce . . . emissions while continuing to satisfy a growing demand for power.

We all know that other countries have relied significantly on nuclear power. Today, France meets 80 percent of its total energy needs with nuclear power and is even able to export surplus energy to Britain and Italy. On top of the clear benefits for France, the country has also experienced a steady decline in per capita emissions of CO_2 since the 1970s. On the other hand, we rely for electricity production on 600 coal-fired electric plants that ultimately produce, according to Dr. Moore, 36 percent of U.S. emissions or nearly 10 percent of global emissions of CO_2. As the public increasingly becomes informed on the advantages of nuclear power, its misgivings about this renewable energy source should diminish.

The benefits to Americans could be great—a clean and renewable source of energy that is produced right here in the United States.

Finally, a word about the majority's energy proposal to increase taxes on domestic oil energy. According to a 2005 report by the nonpartisan Tax Foundation, oil companies have paid $2.2 trillion in Federal, State, and local taxes over the last 25 years. While it is important that tax policies be reviewed from time to time to ensure they still make economic sense, we must be careful not to take actions that would result in even higher prices for consumers. It is hard to imagine that raising taxes on the oil industry would not be passed on to consumers in the form of higher prices. Let's get to expanding our production so we can meet the demand for oil. Let's increase our use of nuclear energy which can make a big difference in providing electricity primarily for electricity production. Let's get back to a strong dollar which is one of the first things we could do without producing a drop of energy to reduce the cost of gasoline we put into our vehicles.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I am pleased our colleagues have come to the floor to talk about the energy crisis. Energy prices are soaring. The Bush administration is doing virtually nothing to help consumers. Congress must act.

I am pleased to hear so many of my colleagues come to the floor to talk about ways in which we can act to try to help the consumer. Americans are hurting today. In my own State of Maryland, my constituents are not only suffering from increased gasoline prices, but electricity prices rose by 72 percent in 2007. For a typical family in Maryland, they have seen a huge increase in their energy costs. For gasoline alone, the average Maryland family spends in excess of $4,500 a year. They have seen an increase in gasoline prices of 153 percent during the Bush administration. If you are a small business, you are vulnerable. Small businesses spend 20 to 30 percent more on energy to produce the same product as a larger company; 62 percent of small businesses have to use a vehicle as part of their business. They don't have the same options larger companies have to invest in energy efficiency as far as equipment is concerned. They certainly don't have the same financing that large companies have. So in these difficult times they have to put mortgages on their homes or, in some cases, even use credit cards. When they use their credit cards, it is the highest possible interest rates they can get. So Marylanders are hurting. Americans are hurting on the energy cost.

The first thing we should have done and we should do today is have an energy policy that makes us energy independent. I have heard a lot of my colleagues talk about it. We have taken some steps in that direction on energy legislation that we passed, but we certainly can do a lot more on the area of energy independence.

We need to be energy independent first and foremost for the security of America. We should not be depending on some country halfway around the world which we disagree with on their international policies because we need their oil and we are dependent on their oil, and we can't do everything we wish to do with that country on foreign policy issues. Secondly, we have to become energy independent for the sake of the environment.

The environmental risks are real. To give one example of global climate change and what greenhouse gas emissions are doing because of the use of petroleum and fossil fuels, I met with my Maryland watermen over the last week and talked about the fragile condition within the Chesapeake Bay and how it is difficult for the different species, including oysters and clams and rockfish, to survive. One of the reasons is the water at the surface is too warm. This is not conducive to good, healthy aquatic life. So the health of the bay is impacted by our dependency and use of oil.

I could talk a lot about our coastal lines in Maryland with the rising sea level and what that is doing as far as the safety of the people who live in my State. So for the sake of our environment, we need to become energy independent and use less fossil fuels.

As we have learned in this economic time, for the sake of our economy, we need to become energy independent. We need to control our energy sources so we can control the economic impact and not have to again be hit with uncertain energy cost increases. Part of that is going to be a renewable portfolio, alternative fuels, conserving fuel. We all know that. But we also need to take immediate action to help the consumer.

As oil prices are rising, gasoline prices are rising, oil companies profits have gone through the roof. The five largest oil companies in 2007 had profits of $103 billion. That is $2 billion a week in profits. In 2008, BP Oil has already shown a 63-percent increase over its 2007 profits. So the consumers are paying more and the oil companies are making a lot more. We need to take action. We need to pass the Consumer First Energy Act. I thank Senator REID for introducing this bill. I am proud to be a cosponsor. I hope we will shortly take this up and be able to pass it. It will help consumers today.

First, it deals with $17 billion that oil companies receive in tax breaks. Remember, the profits of five companies were over $100 billion in 2007. We are talking about tax breaks we are giving which should be used for energy independence. Instead it is making us more dependent upon imported oil. What this legislation would do would be to modify these tax breaks and put the money into an energy independence security trust fund so we can become independent in energy needs.

We have heard a lot of conversation about the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. What is happening today is that the Federal Government is buying 70,000 gallons of gasoline every day. Economics 101, supply and demand, we are increasing the demand for gasoline by 70,000 gallons a day. That has a direct impact on the price of gasoline. We have 97 percent of our needs already in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. There is bipartisan effort to stop the filling of the petroleum reserve as we are hitting these huge increases in cost to the consumer. This legislation deals with that. We should be having better tools to pursue those who are price gouging. This legislation deals with that.

I heard the Senator from North Dakota talk about the speculators. This legislation deals with that. Let me explain that. As Senator DORGAN pointed out, we have speculators, investors who are buying paper on future oil who are causing the price of oil to go up, which means we pay more at the pump. We should be regulating what we call the margins at a much higher level. Margins mean they have to put up not much money. They buy it on credit. Well, this legislation would have the FTC regulate the margin sales and purchases of futures on oil. That makes a lot of sense. It would calm the speculators and save us at the pump. It is another way we can reduce the cost immediately to the consumer. And it deals with offshore speculating, something else we should do.

The legislation also gives the Attorney General the ability to go after collusion on price fixing in gasoline.

So all these provisions in the Consumer First Energy Act are aimed at trying to bring down the cost to the consumer now and keep it lower than it is today. It would provide immediate help and would bring us closer to meeting our goal of energy independence for the sake of our national security, for the sake of our environment, and for the sake of our economy.

So let's remember the struggles of American families with rising energy costs as we work together. Let's put aside partisan differences, and let's pass the Consumer First Energy Act to provide real relief to the consumers in America. It is in the best interests of the consumers. It is in the best interests of our country. I urge my colleagues to act in a bipartisan way to pass this most important legislation.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The Senator from Texas.

PUBLIC OPINION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, so far, the 110th Congress has failed to address some of the biggest problems confronting our Nation today. While some may be content to simply point the finger of blame, I think it is time for the Senate to take a long, hard look in the mirror.

I was struck by a poll I read which I would like to share with my colleagues dated April 9, 2008. This is a Rasmussen poll which said that just 13 percent of likely voters believe Congress is doing a good or excellent job—13 percent. The respondents to the poll were also asked whether they thought Congress had passed in the last year any legislation that was designed to make their life a little bit easier. Incredibly, only 12 percent of these likely voters said Congress had passed any legislation to improve life in America during the last year. Fifty-nine percent said we had not. Fifty-nine percent of the respondents said Congress had not passed any legislation in the last year that had made their life better.

This is quite an indictment. Frankly, I think we are going to have a chance tomorrow morning to demonstrate that either these respondents to this poll had gotten it all wrong or we are going to prove them exactly right, depending on the vote we have tomorrow morning on this important energy legislation I want to talk about in a moment. But first I wish to offer some suggestions on why it is that Congress is so poorly thought of by the American voter. Frankly, I think there are a number of examples. I have four examples of inexplicable delays in how Congress has failed to take care of the Nation's business.

First of all, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. Certainly, one of the most important jobs of the Federal Government is to make sure the American people are safe and secure. Our national security is job No. 1 for the Federal Government.

Over a year ago, our intelligence community alerted us to the fact that an outdated foreign intelligence surveillance system was causing our intelligence gatherers to operate essentially blind to new threats. Despite this urgent plea from the intelligence community, the Speaker of the House has denied an opportunity for the House of Representatives to vote on a bipartisan piece of legislation that came out of the Senate. In fact, this authority has expired for new threats some 87 days ago. Without the critical reform to our foreign intelligence surveillance system, we will not have access to time-critical information that will help protect not only our troops who are deployed around the world but also the American people at home as well. It is just a crying shame that the House leadership would have delayed passage of this important legislation. Again, legislation that was bipartisan and voted out of the Senate is now bogged down and blocked because the Speaker of the House has denied an opportunity for this important legislation to come up.

There is another example, unfortunately, justifying the American public's low opinion of the Congress, and this has to do with the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. We have been waiting 538 days—that is the second number on the chart, 538 days—for Congress to consider the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. After more than a year of trying to negotiate with Congress, President Bush finally submitted this important legislation for fast-track approval. But in a stunning display of just how far Speaker PELOSI is willing to go to delay this important agreement, she opted to rewrite the rules of the House of Representatives in order to avoid having to vote on the bill within the expedited timeline of our trade promotion authority.

This act would have ensured that farmers in my State, the State of Texas, as well as manufacturers and small businesses—it would have provided them a duty-free entry into the markets of the nation of Colombia in South America. Right now, those goods and services bear a tariff of up to 80 percent on their products, notwithstanding that my State of Texas, last year, sold $2.3 billion worth of goods and produce to the nation of Colombia and the people in Colombia. It is one of our best trading partners in South America. So why should our American goods and produce be discriminated against because of these high tariffs? Well, we had a way to solve that 538 days ago, but the Speaker of the House of Representatives has simply refused to allow the House to vote on it.

Recently, American businesses crossed the $1 billion mark in money lost to tariffs in Colombia as a result of the refusal to consider this important legislation. That is $1 billion that could have been saved and invested in our economy, and it is opportunities lost to small businesses and large businesses in America—such as farmers—to sell their goods and produce in Colombia without a tariff.

Well, it is also important because Colombia is one of our very best allies in South America in the fight against the drug cartels and terrorist organizations. Just last week, Colombia extradited a reputed drug kingpin, Luis Hernando Gomez Bustamante, to America. This man is believed to head an organization responsible for 60 percent of the cocaine in America. He is finally now in custody pending trial in America, thanks to the Colombian Government. We need to support Colombia and President Uribe in their fight against men such as Luis Gomez Bustamante who are bringing deadly drugs to our streets. But, instead of the kind of cooperation and reinforcement and appreciation you would expect one friend to show another friend, our friends in Colombia have gotten nothing but a stiff arm from the Congress in a refusal to act on important legislation that would benefit them and would benefit us and would tell the world what it means to be a friend of the United States: beneficial trading relationships that are to the mutual benefit of the trading partners. But that was 538 days ago, with no action, and the clock is still ticking.

Mr. President, 683 days is another important example of mismanagement of the opportunity we have been given to serve the interests of the American people. It was 683 days ago that Peter Keisler was first nominated for a judicial appointment by the President of the United States. Unfortunately, he is not the only nominee who continues to languish while the majority continues to drag its feet in providing an opportunity for an up-or-down vote for these judicial nominees.

Today, as our colleagues from North Carolina have already pointed out, is the 300th day since Judge Robert Conrad's nomination came to the Senate, and he has not even been given the courtesy of a committee hearing—300 days after his nomination came to the Senate.

So far this year, the Senate has approved a total of one circuit court judge—just one. That by any standard is abysmal. While we continue to delay the confirmation of judges, there are 46 judicial vacancies in the Federal judiciary, 13 of which are considered judicial emergencies. And what does Congress do? What does the Senate do? Well, not much, almost nothing to deal with the judicial emergencies and these vacancies and to provide an up-or-down vote on these nominees.

The American people depend on fully functioning courts to find justice. The Senate's failure to do its constitutional duty to confirm or at least to allow a vote on qualified nominees for these vacancies has a very real impact on communities, on businesses, on the residents of the areas in which those courts have jurisdiction, and crime victims to have access to justice. But having no judge who can sit and hear the case is essentially like locking and chaining the front door to the courthouse.

Finally, how long will it be before the majority makes good on its promise that Speaker PELOSI made 749 days ago? It was 749 days ago when she promised the American people that if the Democrats were given the majority, they would have a commonsense solution to rising gas prices. Well, last week, after waiting more than 2 years, Democrats did unveil a plan. The irony is that it has become all too commonplace to find that these energy plans do not have one drop of additional energy but, rather, they recommend, really, more of the same—more taxation, more litigation, more investigations—but not one single drop of additional energy, not one single watt of new energy.

While oil and gas prices have hit record highs virtually every day—today hitting $3.72 a gallon—on January 4, 2007, when Speaker PELOSI and our friends on the Democratic side took charge of both the House and the Senate, that price of a gallon of gas was $2.33. Now it is $3.72. That is about a $1,400-per-family increase in the cost of living. And Congress continues to do next to nothing to deal with it, notwithstanding the promise Speaker PELOSI made some 749 days ago.

Well, the irony is that we have heard, in the plan that has been made by some on the other side of the aisle, that all we need to do is to raise taxes on the domestic oil producers and that will somehow find a way to solve our lack of oil and gasoline. Unfortunately, some of these ideas have been tried before and found to be total and abject failures. For example, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, this same tax idea was tried back during the Jimmy Carter administration. If you are too young to remember what happened during the Carter administration, there were shortfalls in the supply of gasoline, resulting in interminable lines waiting at gas stations. As a result, the Congressional Research Service said that domestic production—that is America's energy production—fell by roughly 5 percent, resulting in an overall increase in the dependence on imported oil from foreign sources. Is that what our friends on the other side of the aisle want, an increase in our dependence on imported oil? Well, I would think not. So why would they come up with these tested and failed schemes to increase our reliance on imported oil? I noticed the distinguished Democratic chairman of the Senate Energy Committee, Senator BINGAMAN from New Mexico, has expressed it in words that perhaps I think are prophetic when he says this windfall profits tax is very arbitrary and bad policy.

Now, while this plan would help further line the pockets of OPEC, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, and anti-American foreign leaders such as Hugo Chavez, this bill would also authorize the American Government to sue OPEC to demand that they increase oil production.

Now, we ought to think about that one a minute. OPEC, after all, is composed of Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, Algeria, Angola, Ecuador, Indonesia, Libya, Nigeria, Qatar, and the United Arab Emirates. What our friends on the other side of the aisle have proposed is we file a lawsuit against Iran and Venezuela and tell them to turn the spigot all the way open. What that would do, of course, assuming it were possible, is it would mean that we were even more dependent on imported oil from our enemies such as Iran and Venezuela—not less. This would only make us more dependent on OPEC—not less.

Now, I believe there is a better solution, and that better solution is to take advantage of the natural resources God has given this great country of ours, one with which we have been supremely blessed. If, in fact, our friends on the other side of the aisle would allow us to pass the Domenici energy amendment—the American Energy Production Act—it would have the potential of producing as much as 3 million additional barrels of oil a day from American natural resources. This bill would open domestic resources such as shale oil in the Arctic and offshore deposits to domestic energy producers. It would immediately send a message to the speculators and commodity investors that there is going to be an additional amount of oil available in the future, up to 3 million barrels a day, and I believe have an immediate downward effect on the price of oil—a barrel of oil which, of course, is 70 percent of the cost of gasoline.

One thing is for sure: By taxing and penalizing our own domestic producers, that is not a solution, and we need to do everything we can in our power to lower prices and not to play additional games by trotting out tired and failed efforts of the past to try to bring down prices. We know the law of supply and demand is one Congress cannot repeal, so that is why we ought to pass the Domenici amendment tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, we are debating two very different amendments on gas prices that are up for a vote tomorrow. We have the proposal of the minority leader that is full of old ideas that will not work and will do absolutely nothing to affect gas prices now or in the future. In fact, the only provision in the minority leader's amendment that would do anything to lower gas prices is lifted directly from the Democratic plan to lower gas prices. This is the provision to temporarily suspend filling the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. In response, the majority leader has offered a clean amendment to temporarily suspend filling the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. This is one of the few options we have to address the pain at the pump our constituents are facing right now.

Every time my friends on the other side of the aisle decide to pay attention to our energy crisis, their solution is always the same: help big oil. In 2005, they authored energy provisions that gave ExxonMobil and other oil giants lavish subsidies that totaled over $14 billion, and these companies are reaping the rewards with record profits announced every quarter. ExxonMobil recently announced $11 billion in profits over a 3-month period. To put that in context, this means ExxonMobil's yearly profit this year might well be almost twice the annual budget of the Department of Energy.

The authors of these proposals argue that if we simply shovel more taxpayer money in the direction of oil companies, this money will eventually trickle down to the people. But, as we have all too often seen, it does not. Gasoline prices are now over $3.70 per gallon, and the specter of $4-per-gallon gasoline is looming around the corner. While oil companies hoard their windfall profits, the American people are suffering.

Yet my friends on the other side of the aisle do not want real relief for the country; they only want to protect big oil's huge profits at any cost by opening every environmentally sensitive area in the country to drilling. Now, President Bush was right when he said we are addicted to oil, but what amazes me is the President's party is unaware they continue to act like addicts. Instead of supporting real plans to conserve oil or even transition to sustainable fuels, they go out in search of their next oil fix.

Some claim the way to lower gas prices is to end a bipartisan, 26-year moratorium to open the Outer Continental Shelf to oil exploration and drill, drill, and drill. But the Energy Information Administration projects that even if we opened the entire Outer Continental Shelf to drilling off the east coast, off the west coast, and opened the entire eastern Gulf of Mexico, nothing would happen to gas

prices. Why? First, because production would not begin before the year 2017. The infrastructure to drill for oil is not just a large oil platform but a network of hundreds of miles of pipeline to transport oil from the platform onto land and then to refineries. This kind of infrastructure simply does not exist on the east coast and in only limited exceptions on the west coast.

The second reason why opening all our shores to oil drilling will not lower gas prices is because by the time full production actually ramped up, in 2030, drilling off all our coasts full tilt would only result in a whopping 3-percent increase in domestic production. And even in 2030, as our continent is rung all the way around by oil platforms, all of this new supply will be eaten up by a 7-percent increase in domestic demand. The Energy Information Administration predicts that: ''Any impact on average wellhead prices is expected to be insignificant.''

So even opening all of our coasts to drilling, as the minority leader proposes, will have no impact on gas prices at all. As my colleagues can see by this chart, the Federal Government has been issuing more and more leasing permits for drilling, but at the same time the price of gasoline has continued to rise. In fact, over 80 percent of the resources in the Outer Continental Shelf are already open for exploration. Since 2001, the Bush administration has issued over 100 new leases. Many of these leases are in the eastern Gulf where the oil industry already has much of the infrastructure necessary to go into production but only 12 of these new wells have been drilled. The industry is only developing a small fraction of the area already open for drilling. Why isn't ExxonMobil pumping some of its profits into developing these areas? If companies are not interested in developing the large fields already open in the Gulf of Mexico, why is it so critical to open environmentally sensitive areas to more drilling?

One might say it is to be expected that those on the side of big oil would use this sort of rhetoric in an election year, but it is much worse than that. The McConnell amendment could be both economically and ecologically devastating. If you look at a picture here taken after a recent oil spill in San Francisco, this is what we can routinely be facing if we allow widespread drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf. We could see our beaches closed for business because of oil spills.

In my home State of New Jersey, our shore is a priceless treasure that my State would protect at any cost, but the shore also generates tens of billions of dollars in revenues each year and supports almost half a million jobs. It simply makes no sense to jeopardize a tourism and fishing economy worth tens of billions of dollars in exchange for a cumulative total of only a half year's supply of oil. The people of New Jersey cannot afford the risk of millions of gallons of oil washing up on our beaches.

This is not just a New Jersey problem. Florida's beaches generate billions of dollars each year. In South Carolina, Myrtle Beach alone brought in $3 billion in revenues. Do we want oil washing up onto the pristine Cape Hatteras National Seashore? What about Virginia Beach? Can Maryland's famous blue crab survive yet another environmental assault?

The bottom line is the minority leader's proposal will do nothing to lower gas prices, but it will jeopardize coastal economies all along both coasts. Is there anything we can responsibly do to ease the pain of such high gas prices? The answer is a resounding yes.

One important way to address oil prices that I hope we will be debating more fully in the next week or so is to better regulate oil markets. Many analysts who have testified before the relevant House and Senate committees agree that based on pure supply and demand, the price of oil should be somewhere between $50 and $70 a barrel. So why are we hitting $125 a barrel? In part, it is because of excessive speculation on futures markets, and unlike other markets such as the commodities involving corn or soybean futures, oil is being traded around the globe with little or no oversight by the U.S. Government. If the Enron disaster teaches us anything, it should be that markets cannot be allowed to operate without real oversight. In the upcoming weeks when the Senate debates the comprehensive Democratic plan to address runaway gas prices, one of the most important aspects of that package will be increased regulation of oil markets so we can effectively combat excess speculation and any possible market manipulation.

Another important measure to bring short-term relief to the pain at the pump is the majority leader's amendment to be voted on tomorrow. This amendment would suspend filling the Strategic Petroleum Reserve at least through December 2008. When the people of this country are suffering with almost $4-a-gallon gas, when the price of oil has broken $125 a barrel, why would we be burying this precious commodity when we need it the most? We should stop pouring all that oil into a hole in the ground until the price of crude oil recedes to $75 or less. This will truly help drive gas prices back down by increasing supply and offering some immediate relief to Americans.

It is very important that we look at these proposals. Even Jim Woolsey is fond of saying, by buying oil in such huge quantities and at such high prices, we are funding both sides of the war on terror. So it seems to me that if we want to do something about kicking our addiction, we don't go after more of it; we move in a different direction. We suspend the Strategic Petroleum Reserve that is already 97 percent full. We will have that opportunity tomorrow. Then we look at market speculation and these other elements of a truly broad-based effort that preserves our natural resources, preserves the economy that those natural resources generate, as the New Jersey shore does, and then ultimately achieves the goal of not only driving down the cost of gas but at the same time move us in a different direction to break our dependency.

So what are the real long-term solutions to ending our dependence on oil and greening our transportation fleet?

The first thing we need to do is drastically improve fuel economy. In 1976, our cars and trucks got 13 miles per gallon. Because of the Arab oil crisis, we passed laws to improve the fuel economy of our passenger vehicles. From 1976 to 1981, we saw a rapid increase in fuel economy. In 1981, our fleet had improved to 21 miles per gallon. But since 1981, without the political will to improve fuel economy standards and the rising popularity of SUVs, the average fuel economy of our passenger vehicle fleet actually declined to 20 miles per gallon in 2006.

What would have happened if we had kept slowly improving the fuel economy of our vehicles from 1981 to the present? If we had increased fuel economy a modest 2 percent per year during that time, our new fleet of vehicles would now average 34 miles per gallon. While this is certainly a huge improvement over where we sit today, it was definitely achievable since this figure is still well below standards set in Japan which are over 40 miles per gallon.

Astonishingly, if we had followed this course, our current demand for oil would be over one-third less than it is today, down over 2 billion barrels of oil per year. Cumulatively, we would have saved over 30 billion barrels of oil. Thirty billion barrels of oil is more oil than the entire proven oil reserves remaining in the United States. This means that this sensible and achievable policy could have saved us more oil than we could ever hope to gain from domestic drilling. It is commendable that we have finally raised fuel economy standards, but we must make even further reductions if we want to make up for lost time.

Of course, fuel efficiency is just part of the answer to solving our addiction to oil. We also need tax incentives to increase the producion and use of superefficient vehicles already out there—such as hybrids. We need a massive investment in cars that can run on sustainable alternative fuels like electricity or cellulosic ethanol. Once we truly have a choice of fuels, the grip of our oil addiction will finally loosen.

This country also needs to invest in our mass transit infrastructure. This weekend the New York Times reported that mass transit is up all over the country. We need a huge investment in mass transit to make sure that we all have multiple transportation options so we are not so reliant on driving.

But while most of the Democratic Party supports these sensible policy reforms, my friends on the other side of the aisle are stuck in the past advocating old positions from previous Congresses. Mr. President, I hope that this will be the last time I need to rise in this Chamber to point out that more oil drilling in environmentally sensitive areas is not the answer to our oil addiction. It is time for an intervention.

It is time for a real cure based on a tough examination and reordering of our energy priorities—and not the tired old policies of the past.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, it is time for us to get real about energy. It is time for us to get real about gas prices. Withholding from the American people new oil supplies needed to get gas prices down will only hurt our families and our workers more.

American families are suffering from record pain at the pump. Truckers and shippers face layoffs and losses. Farmers, processors, and packagers are sending their food to market with higher prices and higher costs, and airlines are once again threatened with bankruptcy.

Whether you drive a car, a big rig or a tractor, you know personally what I am talking about. With average gas prices now topping $3.70 a gallon, you have a right to demand some answers about our energy future. Your pain and suffering demands we supply you with relief. Relief comes in the form of economics 101. Folks, every time prices are too high, there is too much demand and too little supply. Now, maybe some of our colleagues did not take the economics course, but I believe in common sense, and I believe the American people have common sense. They realize that when you don't have enough of something, and the demand keeps going up, the price goes up.

That is how our system works. Answers that focus only on demand and not on supply are not enough to fix the problem. So we are where we are today with record high gas prices inflicting record pain at the pump.

Don't get me wrong. I support good, strong measures to reduce the demand for oil. Last year, I supported Congress's measure to increase aggressively but achievably high standards for corporate average fuel economy, or CAFE. That would force better gas mileage from cars and trucks. But those new fuel efficiency requirements will take years before they have an effect. In the meantime, families and workers will suffer through years of higher gas prices. Auto makers cannot go out tomorrow and build a new fleet of high gas mileage cars and trucks. New cars take years to design and build.

Even if highly efficient cars were available tomorrow, families in the middle of 4-year car loans probably cannot go out and buy a new car. They have to wait until they can purchase a more fuel-efficient car. In the meantime, these families will suffer through more years of higher prices.

We can cut demand with more people riding mass transit, and I have supported mass transit. I will continue to do so. But if you don't have mass transit in your area, such as where I live and where a whole lot of people in rural America live, you cannot move to the city or get a different job. In the meantime, you will suffer through years more of higher gas prices.

We can cut demand by subsidizing hybrid vehicles. Congress supported those tax credits, as I do. But hybrid cars are too expensive now and will take too many years to become affordable to most families. We are working in Missouri to get much more efficient, much lighter batteries that can help meet the needs for hybrid and plug-in cars. In the meantime, while we are working on those technologies, families will suffer through years more of higher gas prices.

I, for one, am unwilling to allow families to suffer years more of higher gas prices, while we wait for demand strategies to work.

To address supply, some say we should take our hat in hand and beg our Middle Eastern suppliers to produce more oil. Since when has increasing our dependence on the Middle East ever been a good idea?

Some propose raising taxes on suppliers searching and developing new domestic oil supplies. Since when has taxing something more ever increased its supply or lowered its price? Never. When we put taxes on those who are searching and developing for new domestic oil supplies, we ensure that there won't be as much and the price will be higher.

Some say we should investigate suppliers to probe what is making prices so high. I too support investigating wrongdoing, but since when has investigating something ever increased its supply or lowered its price?

The American people deserve more than begging, taxing, and investigating. American families and workers deserve real actions toward real solutions. America doesn't need to look that far. Indeed, the solutions to America's supply problems are right here in our own backyard. America's lands, ocean floors, and mountains hold billions of gallons of oil waiting for us to come and get it.

We have millions of gallons of oil beneath the frozen tundra of northern Alaska. Had there not been a veto in 1995 of the development of the sources above the Arctic circle in Alaska, we would be getting a million gallons of oil a day from Alaska. You cannot tell me that would not lower the price. It would have a huge impact. We also have millions of gallons of oil beneath the seabeds miles off our coasts. We have billions of gallons of oil trapped in the shale beneath our Rocky Mountains.

Tapping these new U.S. supplies will help relieve prices immediately. While it is true it will take years before new supplies will come on, we will send an immediate signal to the speculators in the oil trading markets that new suppliers are on their way. They cannot continue to push prices higher.

Today's prices built on limited supply and a world dependent on trouble spots will see America deciding to open vast and safe new oil supplies. Oil prices, built on predicting the future, will have no choice but to fall in the face of a future safe, new supply source for America.

We can also face the future using new technologies. America owns, and uses every day, environmentally friendly oil technologies that are cleaner than ever before for exploring, developing, and producing. We can drill sideways deep underground to avoid sensitive areas above. We can drill many locations from a single site to avoid sensitive areas around.

Environmentally friendly operations in northern Alaska can drill in the winter and be gone long before any animals are active in the spring.

Environmentally friendly operations could drill in the ocean and survive hurricanes such as Katrina with no spilled oil or gas. Does anybody recall the spills resulting when Hurricane Katrina tore through the Gulf of Mexico drilling rigs? No, because they didn't happen.

To say we would repeat the mistakes of the 1960s and 1970s with the same 40-year-old technology is like saying we will all continue to call ourselves on rotary telephones or write each other on typewriters.

Another source of transportation fuel from new technology is coal to liquids. The technology to turn coal into liquid jet fuel or diesel has been around for a hundred years. We now have the technology to capture carbon emissions and make it cleaner than refining conventional oil and, in addition, providing a greater supply.

We are also developing even cleaner and more affordable forms of biofuels. Technology giving us clean-burning corn ethanol today will give us cellulosic ethanol tomorrow with grasses and wood chips.

In my State of Missouri, gas is 10 cents cheaper than it otherwise would be because we require 10 percent ethanol in all pumps. This will save Missouri drivers $285 million this year. Some people say ethanol is driving up prices. Ethanol is a lot cheaper to produce, and it uses fermentation, not the cat cracking that goes into regular gasoline. It brings down prices; it doesn't drive up the price of the fuel. The overall shortage of fuel has driven up the price for food. But most importantly, the Government hoarding food is driving up the price. Don't make farmers the scapegoats. They are responding to the demand Congress made of them to go out and build ethanol-producing plants and produce the ethanol to get cleaner, cheaper, domestically-produced energy. That is what they are doing.

Now the future is brighter in many areas because of new, cleaner technologies. We can have a brighter future of energy supplies if we let all these new technologies work for us.

We can also have a brighter future of energy supplies if we stop being selfish and start thinking about the collective good. Too many individuals are willing to say ''not in my backyard,'' even if it means the group suffers. Too many groups pursue NIMBY strategies even if it means the Nation suffers.

Nobody here is trying to force Alaska to do something Alaska doesn't want to do. Alaskans want to open more of their oil reserves. But it is people in places such as Massachusetts saying no to Alaska.

No one here is trying to force Virginia to do something it doesn't want to do. Virginians want to explore for oil and gas off their coastline. It is people in places such as California and New Jersey saying no to Virginians.

Nobody here is trying to force Colorado to do something it doesn't want to do. Colorado wants to tap the shale beneath its mountains. It is people in places such as Washington, DC, saying no to Colorado.

This type of NIMBY sentiment must end. This type of selfishness must end. This type of inflicting multiyear pain waiting for demand strategies must end. We must no longer deny Americans the new supply solutions they need. We must no longer refuse American families and workers the lower gas prices they demand.

We must not only suspend shipments to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, we must also open new oil supplies in northern Alaska, open new oil and gas supplies under our oceans, and open new oil shale supplies under our mountains, and open our ability to refine more oil. We must open the ability of U.S. workers to manufacture more hybrid batteries.

I urge my colleagues to support the Republican amendment and provision that will be coming tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I know many of my colleagues have spoken about the energy challenge and the crisis we face. I look forward to supporting Senator REID's amendment tomorrow. That amendment has been outlined in great detail during the course of the afternoon. I am in strong support of that amendment.

We are facing a national challenge, and if you look back, historically, when we have been facing a national challenge—and this time is a wartime—not to say all of this crisis is from the war, but whether it is adding to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, or bidding up prices in other parts of the world, it is unconscionable that we have these extraordinary windfall profits that are out of the pockets of working families. And the indifference of this administration to the plight of these working families is appalling.

I applaud our leader for the legislation we will have a chance to vote on tomorrow and, hopefully, we will have a strong vote in support of it. It is inevitable that we are going to be successful because the American people are not going to tolerate the indifference and the extraordinary profiteering that is being experienced in this country at this time. I thank our leader for his efforts and his recommendations to the Senate, and I look forward to voting in support of that tomorrow.

DETAINEE BASIC MEDICAL CARE ACT OF 2008

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am speaking in support of legislation Senator MENENDEZ and I have introduced today. It is the Detainee Basic Medical Care Act of 2008, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to deliver timely and effective medical and mental health care to the individuals in custody.

In the past week alone, the Washington Post, ''60 Minutes,'' and the New York Times have documented the shameful state of medical care in these detention facilities. These are people who come to the United States from all corners of the world. Some come to join their families; others come to search for jobs; others come as refugees. Some may be eligible to remain in the United States. Others may be subject to deportation. But at a minimum, they deserve basic medical care while in detention pending the outcome of their immigration proceedings, which often can take years. None of them deserves a death sentence.

Congress has an obligation to act. The bill's introduction is an important first step, and the legislation raises the medical standards and restores accountability for meeting those standards.

I look forward to working closely with Senator MENENDEZ and others in the Senate to address what is really a national disgrace.

EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE COOPERATION ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, one of fundamental importance and fundamental fairness, legislation we will be voting on tomorrow in the late morning, it is called the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act.

This week, May 11 to May 17, is Police Week, when we honor the sacrifices of the men and women of the law enforcement community who lost their lives this year. These officers paid the ultimate price for their service to our communities. They are American heroes, as are all of the firefighters, emergency medical technicians, and other first responders across the country who protect our families and communities every day.

President Kennedy established the first Police Week in 1962. He called on all Americans to recognize the essential role public safety officers play in safeguarding our rights and freedoms. That role is even more important in today's complex and often dangerous world.

We all continue to enjoy the fundamental rights of a free people because of the sacrifices of these dedicated public servants. The least that we owe them in return is to protect their basic rights and to treat them with the dignity and respect they deserve.

Unfortunately, too many of our public safety officers do not have the same rights in the workplace that most Americans enjoy. Police officers and firefighters perform some of the most difficult and dangerous jobs in our society, but they often don't have a voice at work to talk about safety issues. They are the ones on the front lines fighting fires, preventing crimes, apprehending offenders and doing their best to keep people safe from harm. But they don't have a way to share the lessons they have learned about how to do these difficult jobs safely and effectively.

We are asking these workers to do so much for their communities, and the least we can do in return is give them a voice at the table in the life-and-death discussions that affect their families and their futures.

Across America, unions give millions of workers that kind of voice on the job. Throughout history, unions have always led the fight for a safer, fairer workplace. Unions mean decent wages and benefits. Unions mean economic security and dignity for workers, and a strong middle class for our Nation.

Public safety officers deserve the opportunity to choose for themselves whether they want the advantages that unions bring.

Providing these basic rights of first responders is essential not only for their own interests but also for the safety of our communities, and the safety of our entire Nation. In this post-9/11 era, we have asked first responders to take on a new and indispensable role in homeland security. We face new threats that require efficient and effective coordination between State and local public safety workers and federal security agencies. With these new partnerships, it becomes vital to our national interest that State and local public safety services are carried out as effectively as possible. Studies show that giving workers a voice at the table, and facilitating cooperation between public safety workers and their employers is the best way to improve the quality of public safety services and protect our homeland security.

That is why it is an honor to join Senator GREGG in sponsoring the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act.

This important bill will ensure that all firefighters, police officers, and emergency medical personnel have the opportunity to have a voice in the policies that affect their safety and their

livelihoods. Under this bill, public safety officers will have the right to form and join a union and to bargain over wages, hours, and working conditions. The bill also provides a way to resolve disputes, promote cooperation between labor and management, and reduce the conflicts that can undermine public safety.

The legislation accomplishes these important goals in fair and reasonable ways. States that already have collective bargaining in place for public safety workers are not affected by the bill at all. States that do not currently provide this basic workplace right may establish their own collective bargaining systems, or ask the assistance of the Federal Labor Relations Authority in doing so.

This approach respects the autonomy of the States. The bill sets basic standards, but allows States to find their own separate ways to implement these standards.

The bill does not dictate particular contract terms—all it requires is that there be a process for public safety officers and their employers to come to the table and talk. Each State legislature can have the last word on any agreement that is reached through these negotiations. This careful approach preserves the balance between workers' rights and State interests, enabling each State to have a collective-bargaining system that meets its particular needs and requirements.

Providing these basic workplace rights for all first responders will benefit workers, governments, and the public safety. Collective bargaining is the best way to achieve these strong, cooperative partnerships.

As Dennis Compton, fire chief in the city of Phoenix, has said:

> When labor and management leaders work together to build mutual trust, mutual respect, and a strong commitment to service, it helps focus [a] fire department on what is truly most important . . . providing excellent service to the customers.

Across the country, we have seen how collective bargaining and public safety go hand in hand. In Omaha, the local firefighters' union and the city came together to find innovative ways to meet national safety standards and combat persistent hazards, such as asbestos and unsafe trucks, and their cooperation is paying off. The department previously had one death in the line of duty every 5 years, but since workers received a voice in decisions on safety and health, there have been no fatalities in 12 years.

In Hennepin County, MN, the union representing firefighters and paramedical personnel worked with management to improve services for the public. Through the union, the workers in the county were able to offer their expertise about how to redesign the county's ambulances and stretchers.

These new designs were adopted and saved many firefighters and paramedics from painful back and neck injuries. In turn, the county—and the taxpayers—saved money in workers' compensation and disability benefits.

Taxpayers are obtaining better service at lower cost in Miami as well, because of cooperation between the firefighters' union and the city. The two sides worked together to establish one of the Nation's foremost fire department-based emergency medical services. Response time has been reduced and lives have been saved as a result.

Families and communities deserve the best public safety services we can provide, and they start with the strong foundation that collective bargaining provides. Every New York City firefighter, emergency medical technician, and police officer who responded to the disaster at the World Trade Center on 9/11 was a union member under a collective bargaining agreement, and those agreements strengthened their ability to respond so effectively in that massive crisis.

It is long past time to stop treating our heroic first responders as second class citizens. Giving them the rights they deserve is a matter of fundamental fairness, and an urgent matter of public safety. I commend Senator GREGG for his leadership on this very important issue, and I urge my colleagues to give our heroes the respect and support they deserve by passing this needed legislation.

Mr. President, this chart indicates what I mentioned, that the union in Miami, together with the city, established one of the Nation's foremost fire department-based EMS services, and they had very substantial savings.

This chart is interesting. States without collective bargaining have 39 percent more firefighter fatalities than States that do. Many fire chiefs acknowledge that this is a result of better communication, better cooperation, and a better exchange of information on how to do the job and do it safely. That is what this legislation does. Look at the difference when we are talking about fatalities. This is what is important.

This next chart shows that some 300,000 police officers in 24 States would gain basic workplace rights under the Cooperation Act. On this chart, we have more than 134,000 firefighters in 24 States who would gain basic workplace rights. That is why these firefighters, police officers, and first responders feel so strongly about this legislation.

It is reasonable, it is responsible, it is sound, and it is necessary. We spend a good deal of time around here talking about how we need greater cooperation in dealing with the central challenges on national security and homeland security. Who is at the backbone of homeland security in the United States? Our firefighters, police officers, emergency medical services, and first responders. These are the groups, as indicated on this chart, that are in strong support of this legislation, for the reasons I outlined this evening.

I intend, in the next 2 to 3 days, as we debate this legislation, to go into greater detail in all of these areas. On this issue, there is a strong case to be made. The time to act is now. This is an essential part of our whole national domestic homeland security. It is an essential part of making our fellow citizens safer in their community.

This legislation has been reviewed and studied and has strong support in the Senate. It passed the House of Representatives overwhelmingly. I look forward to strong support in this body.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask for 5 additional minutes to my time being allocated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Tennessee will have a total of 25 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I may not use all of that time, but I wish to respond to the comments of the Senator from Massachusetts. And I will have more to say about this issue, as well, over the next 2 or 3 days as we debate this proposed legislation—involving unfunded mandates and overturning the labor laws of 21 States—about which the Senator from Massachusetts was talking.

When I was Governor of Tennessee a few years ago, I remember the debate we had about whether public safety employees—firefighters, police, and others—should be allowed to collectively bargain in our State. The arguments we considered were many of the ones the Senator from Massachusetts talked about: Did we need to authorize collectively bargaining so there could be better communication, better cooperation, a more effective fire department, a more effective police department?

The answer during the 8 years I was Governor was in every case, no; that it was not in the public interest for the public safety employees to collectively bargain, organize with the inevitable strike that might come because if they collectively bargained and organized, a strike was the weapon they would use to assert their rights.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No, I would rather complete my remarks.

Mr. KENNEDY. Just on that point, if the Senator is going to represent the legislation, I hope he does it correctly.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor, and I did not say the Senator's legislation prohibits strikes, if that is his point. Out of courtesy to the Senator, I will be glad to take a question from him.

Mr. KENNEDY. We will have a chance to debate. I thought the Senator was representing that this legislation permitted the option of striking. It does no such thing.

Mr. ALEXANDER. No, it does no such thing, but as we well remember, in New York City, where striking by public employees is prohibited, transit

workers struck anyway because they collectively bargained and they didn't like the result.

The point I make to the Senator from Massachusetts is that I have a very different view of this issue, and so do the people of Tennessee. We considered this almost every year I was Governor and decided that we did not think it was in the public interest to authorize collective bargaining for public employees, with the exception of teachers.

This proposal has been considered in Tennessee repeatedly since I left the Governor's office—in 1997, 1999, 2001, 2003, and 2005 and each time the State has come to the same conclusion. Elected officials have come to the same conclusion in nearly half of our States. Twenty-one States have decided that in the case of public safety employees, those we admire so much and whom we count on in times of distress, collective bargaining should not be required. That is the decision of 21 States.

What this legislation would do is overturn that judgment. It would say the judgment of the Senator from Massachusetts is better than that of the State legislature of Tennessee. The judgment of the Senator of Massachusetts may be better for the State of Massachusetts, but I respectfully suggest it is not better for the State of Tennessee. I imagine the Senators from 20 other States would have the same opinion.

When I was Governor, I didn't think my wisdom as Governor was superior to that of the mayor of Dyersburg or the mayor of Maryville or the mayor of Nashville about what kinds of labor laws they ought to have there—or the elected city council—or what they should decide about their labor laws. I didn't try to override them in that way.

What I am objecting to—and we will have a chance to talk about this—is the inappropriateness of the Congress of the United States overturning laws in 21 States that, in one form or another, do not allow for collective bargaining of public service employees. This proposed legislation would say to the mayors of small towns in Tennessee, and there are 347 total incorporated cities and towns in Tennessee, and 90 of them have a population greater than 5,000: You will collectively bargain. Instead of dealing directly with your firemen and your policemen and your other public safety employees, you will appoint somebody or let them pick somebody and you will deal with that person. The Senator from Massachusetts may think that creates better cooperation and a better police force, but the people of Tennessee do not think that, and they have considered it time and time again. Why should we decide we know more than they?

There is an amendment to the Constitution. It is called the 10th amendment:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.

That is an important provision. That is the way our country was formed.

We all take an oath to this Constitution, and I believe this legislation has a substantial chance of violating the 10th amendment to our Constitution.

There is one other thing it does. It inevitably imposes new costs on smaller towns. Nashville has a memorandum of understanding between the city government and public safety officers. It has decided to do that. But most of our 90 cities with 5,000 or more people do not think that better communication is improved with public safety employees by collective bargaining or even a memorandum of understanding—the latter of which they are permitted to do. So here we come along and say to a small town in Tennessee: You must collectively bargain; you must appoint this person to deal with.

This legislation would inevitably add to their costs. It would be an unfunded Federal mandate. I will have an amendment later which will say that this law, if it should pass—which I hope it does not—will be amended to provide that if the Governor or the chief executive officer of the city or the town in Tennessee or any other State believes this is an unfunded Federal mandate, the law has no effect.

I think we have a 10th amendment problem, and we have an unfunded Federal mandate problem.

I can remember when all the Republicans—Newt Gingrich, et cetera—in 1994, stood on the steps of the U.S. Capitol and said: We have had it up to here with unfunded mandates. We have had it up to here with Members of Congress who come up with these great ideas and then pass a law and then take credit for it and then send the bill to the Governor or to the mayor. That is what we would be doing here. Those same Members of Congress usually go right back to Massachusetts or Tennessee or wherever they are from, to the Jackson Day Dinner or Lincoln Day Dinner, and make a great speech about local control and how wise all the towns are. They have town meetings up in New England. We have county commissions down in Tennessee. Members of Congress say: We believe in you towns. You are the wise people, you come in and spend hours debating little issues, but we, when we fly into Washington, suddenly have this burst of wisdom that overrides all that you may do.

I think the people of this country should admire and respect and honor our firefighters. But we should honor and respect and admire our Constitution and our Federal system and say that we may have different opinions in different States and different cities about what we do, and then to impose a big unfunded mandate, at least violating the spirit of the 10th amendment to the Constitution by telling every town in Tennessee and 20 other States that suddenly the law is changed, you cannot decide your labor relations anymore, we in Washington will do that for you—I think we need to rethink that.

You know, what the Republicans said in 1994 was: No more unfunded Federal mandates. If we break our promise, throw us out. Well, the voters put in the Republicans—my party—in 1994 and we broke our promise and last year they threw us out. I think they will throw some more people out if we keep ignoring the will of the people and acting as if, when we fly to Washington, DC, we suddenly have a right to run amok on the 10th amendment and to overturn decisions, in my State, for example, that were debated annually during the 8 years I was Governor—and that also were rejected in 1997, 1999, 2001, 2003, and 2005.

This is not a bill about cooperation, this is a bill against the 10th amendment. It is a bill, in addition, that imposes inevitably unfunded Federal mandates on cities and towns that are already struggling. I hope the Senate will reject it.

Mr. President, on a more optimistic note about a bigger problem, there has been a lot of discussion about gas prices. I would like to talk about gas prices and energy prices in a little different way.

Some have blamed this person, some have blamed that person, some have offered a short-term remedy. I would like to challenge our Senate to do something that I believe the American people would be grateful if we did. Let me begin it with a short story.

In 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt asked Senator Kenneth McKellar, a Tennessean who was chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to come down to the White House for a little discussion. The President asked Senator McKellar if he could hide $2 billion in the appropriations bill for a secret project to win World War II, and Senator McKellar replied to the President: Mr. President, that will be no problem. I just have one question: Where in Tennessee do you want me to hide it?

That $2 billion and that place in Tennessee became Oak Ridge, TN, one of three secret cities that became the principal sites of what was then called the Manhattan Project. The purpose of the Manhattan Project was to find a way to split the atom and build a bomb before Germany did so the United States could win World War II. Nearly 200,000 people worked in 30 sites in 3 countries at breakneck speed until they succeeded. The $2 billion appropriation President Roosevelt asked for would be $24 billion today.

According to New York Times science reporter William Laurence:

> Into [the project] went millions of man-hours of what is without doubt the most concentrated intellectual effort in history.

On last Friday, I went back to Oak Ridge, one of those secret cities—now out in the open—and proposed that the United States launch a new Manhattan Project, this one a 5-year project to put

America firmly on the path to clean energy independence. Instead of ending a war, the goal will be clean energy independence so we can deal with rising gas prices, electricity prices, clean air, climate change, and national security—for our country first and then, because the world has the same urgent needs, for the rest of the world.

By ''independence,'' I do not mean the United States would never buy oil from Mexico or Canada or Saudi Arabia. By ''independence,'' I do mean the United States could never be held hostage by any country for our oil supplies.

In 1942, many were afraid that Germany would get the bomb and blackmail the world. Today, countries that supply oil and natural gas can blackmail the world.

Some have questioned whether the word ''independence'' is the right word. I believe it is exactly the right word. Go to the dictionary. The dictionary says that independence means you don't want to be controlled by someone. Our war of independence against Great Britain didn't mean we would never talk to them—we just didn't want to be in their pocket.

I think the American people understand what we mean by clean energy independence. It is the right goal, and I would say the scientists in Oak Ridge whom I talked with on Friday seemed to agree.

A new Manhattan Project is not a new idea. But it is a good idea and fits the goal of clean energy independence. The Apollo program was a sort of Manhattan Project. It sent men to the Moon.

Senator MCCAIN and Senator OBAMA have each suggested a new Manhattan Project for energy. I think it is time for us to begin to put some flesh on the suggestion. What would they mean? Have something ready for them and for us that we could move ahead with. Many Senators have made a similar suggestion. It is time to do more than talk.

During the passage of the America COMPETES Act, we worked together across party lines—the Senator from Massachusetts, who was just here, was key to that. I worked hard on it. Senators MCCAIN and OBAMA and others worked on it as well. Senators DOMENICI and BINGAMAN were the leaders on that legislation here in the Senate. Several suggested as part of that discussion on how to preserve America's competitive edge that we should focus on energy because focusing on energy independence would force the kinds of investments we need to keep our competitive position in the world.

In 1942, the prospect was that Germany would get the bomb before we did. That was the overwhelming challenge. The overwhelming challenge today, according to National Academy of Sciences president Ralph Cicerone, in his address to the academy 2 weeks ago, is to discover ways to satisfy the human demand for and the use of energy in an environmentally satisfactory and affordable way so that we are not overly dependent on overseas sources.

Cicerone estimates that this year Americans will pay $500 billion overseas for oil; that is $1,600 for each one of us, some of it to nations that are funding terrorists who are trying to kill us. It weakens our dollar. It is half our trade deficit. It is forcing gasoline prices toward $4 a gallon and is crushing family budgets.

Then there are the environmental consequences. If worldwide energy usage continues to grow as it has, humans will inject as much CO_2 to the air from fossil fuel burning between 2000 to 2030 as they did from 1850 to 2000.

There is plenty of coal to help achieve our energy independence, but there is no commercial way yet to capture and store the carbon from so much coal burning—and we have not finished the job of controlling sulfur and nitrogen and mercury emissions.

I suggest the Manhattan Project of World War II fits today's proposal for a new Manhattan Project for energy in the following ways. The original project proceeded as fast as possible along several tracks to reach one goal. The entire project, one engineer said, was a shotgun approach, using all possible approaches simultaneously. It had Presidential focus and bipartisan support in Congress. It had the kind of centralized, gruff leadership that only an Army Corps of Engineers general could give it. It broke the mold.

Dr. Oppenheimer told his scientists in 1945 that the bomb was ''too revolutionary to consider in the framework of old ideas.'' So is clean energy independence. It began with a small, diverse group of great minds, as this one needs to as well.

There are also some lessons from the America COMPETES Act that we enacted just last year. Remember how that started. A bipartisan group of us asked the National Academies: Please give us 10 things that we, the Congress and the Government, should do to keep our brainpower advantage so our jobs don't go overseas. The National Academies took us seriously, and within 3 months assembled a small group of wise men and women headed by Norm Augustine, and they gave us 20 recommendations, and we considered them. The President had his ideas. We considered proposals by other competitiveness commissions. The Speaker of the House weighed in. Within a couple of years—it got a little messy a few times—we passed a blueprint which will put us on a path to double our investments in the physical sciences and significantly upgrade our competitiveness efforts from Washington.

Some people have suggested that this year is not a very good year to try such a bipartisan approach. I think it is a perfect year to try a bipartisan approach. Senator OBAMA and Senator MCCAIN and Senator CLINTON seem ready for it. Congressman BART GORDON, the Democratic chairman of the House Science Committee is supportive—we were together in Oak Ridge on Friday. He and I are equally interested in this, just as we were equal participants in the America COMPETES legislation.

I have talked to Senator BINGAMAN and Senator DOMENICI and Senator MURKOWSKI. Many other Senators—I will not begin to mention them all—have suggested this idea. I would say a Presidential election is a perfect time for this. Voters expect us to have answers to $4 gasoline, for climate change, for clean air, and to the national security implications of our overdependence on foreign oil.

The people did not elect us to take a vacation this year just because it is a Presidential election year. So how to proceed? When I spoke with Senator BINGAMAN, the chairman of the Energy Committee, he said: Well, instead of a single Manhattan Project, maybe we need several mini Manhattan projects. And he offered to me the example that Chuck Vest, the former MIT President who is the head of the National Institute of Engineering, has made.

Dr. Vest made an address in which he suggested 14 grand challenges for the 21st century for engineering; three of them had to do with energy.

I think Dr. Vest and Senator BINGAMAN are right. We do not do comprehensive very well. I think we proved that with the collapse of the comprehensive immigration bill. Step-by-step solutions along different tracks toward a single goal are easier to digest and have fewer surprises. And, of course, the Manhattan Project itself in World War II proceeded that way.

So here would be my criteria for choosing several grand challenges toward the goal of clean energy independence:

Grand consequences: This is not a project for small thinking.

Real scientific breakthroughs: We know how to build nuclear powerplants. I think we should be doing it. We know how to drill 50 miles offshore for oil and gas in an environmentally safe way, giving a large part of the revenues to the States so that they can then put them in trust funds for education. I think we should be doing it.

We know how to do a great many things that we are not doing. But this should not be about doing things that we already know how to do. This should be about the scientific breakthroughs to help us within 5 years get firmly on a path to clean energy independence.

Family budget: Our solutions need to fit the family budget so gas prices and electricity prices are something that we can afford.

And finally consensus: We need to come to some consensus. We found with the America COMPETES Act that when we went for consensus, we could pass an important bill. And the members of the Augustine panel wisely put aside some subjects relevant to competitiveness, like excessive litigation,

which we could argue about for days. They left that to the side and focused on 20 things they thought we could agree on, and we did.

So here are seven grand challenges that I would respectfully suggest to begin the suggestion, seven scientific breakthroughs that I believe we should focus on for the next 5 years to put us firmly on a path to clean energy independence which fit the criteria that I outlined.

No. 1, make plug-in electric cars and trucks commonplace. And let me offer another story. Most people remember H. Ross Perot. Many people may have forgotten how he made his money. He noticed that the banks in Dallas in the 1960s were closing their doors at 5 o'clock and turning off their new computers. So Mr. Perot asked the banks: May I buy your idle nighttime computer capacity?

And they said, yes.

He then went to States such as Tennessee, before I was Governor, and said: May I manage your Medicaid data? I have some computer time.

They said yes.

So the banks made a lot of money, the States saved a little money, and Mr. Perot made a billion dollars.

Now, what does that have to do with clean energy? I would mention this: I believe the idle nighttime computer capacity of the 1960s is a lot like the idle nighttime power plant capacity in the United States today.

An example: The Tennessee Valley Authority in my neck of the woods, which produces about 3 percent of all of the electricity in the United States, has the equivalent of 7,000 or 8,000 megawatts of electricity idle most nights. That would be our largest untapped resource in the region: I would think every night, or most nights, seven or eight nuclear powerplants' worth of unused electricity.

Add to that how, beginning in 2010, Nissan, Toyota, General Motors, and Ford—and possibly others—will sell electric cars that can be plugged into wall sockets. FedEx is already using hybrid electricity delivery trucks. TVA could offer smart meters. Many utilities are doing that. That would allow its 9 million customers at night to plug their car or truck in and for a few dollars fill up with electricity and then drive to work and back without using a drop of gasoline.

It might take a while, but it has been estimated that because 60 percent of Americans drive less than 30 miles a day, we could gradually replace most of our light cars and trucks with plug-in electric vehicles that do not use gasoline and cut our overseas oil bill by perhaps as much as half.

In other words, we have got the plugs, the cars are coming, we need the cord. To good to be true? Well, have not Presidents back to Nixon promised a revolutionary car? It has never happened. But times have changed. Batteries are better, gas is $4.

Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

The second grand challenge would be to make carbon capture and storage a reality for coal-burning power plants. This also was one of the National Institute of Engineering's grand challenges. And there may be solutions other than underground storage, such as using algae to capture carbon. Interesting, the National Resource Defense Council argues that, after conservation, coal with carbon capture is the best option for clean energy independence because it provides for the growing power needs of the U.S. and will be easily adopted by other countries.

No. 3, make solar power cost competitive with power from fossil fuels. This is a second of the National Institute of Engineering's grand challenges. Solar power, despite 50 years of trying, produces on one-hundredth of one percent of America's electricity. The cost of putting solar panels on homes averages $25,000–$30,000 and the electricity produced, for the most part, can't be stored. Now, there is new photovoltaic research as well as promising solar thermal power plants, which capture the sunlight using mirrors, turn heat into steam, and store it underground until the customer needs it.

No. 4, safely reprocess and store nuclear waste. Nuclear plants produce 20 percent of America's electricity, but 70 percent of America's clean electricity—that is, electricity that does not pollute the air with mercury, nitrogen, sulfur, or carbon. The most important breakthrough needed during the next five years to build more nuclear power plants is solving the problem of what to do with nuclear waste. A political stalemate has stopped nuclear waste from going to Yucca Mountain in Nevada, and $15 billion collected from ratepayers for that purpose is sitting in a bank. Recycling waste could reduce its mass by 90 percent, creating less stuff to store temporarily while long-term storage is resolved.

No. 5, make advanced biofuels cost-competitive with gasoline. The backlash toward ethanol made from corn because of its effect on food prices is a reminder to beware of the great law of unintended consequences when issuing grand challenges. Ethanol from cellulosic materials shows great promise, but there are a limited number of cars capable of using alternative fuels and of places for drivers to buy it. Turning coal into liquid fuel is an established technology, but expensive and a producer of much carbon.

No. 6, make new buildings green buildings. Japan believes it may miss its 2012 Kyoto goals for greenhouse gas reductions primarily because of energy wasted by inefficient buildings. Many of the technologies needed to do this are known. Figuring out how to accelerate their use in a decentralized society is most of this grand challenge.

No. 7, provide energy from fusion. The idea of recreating on Earth the way the sun creates energy and using it for commercial power is the third grand challenge suggested by the National Institute of Engineering. The promise of sustaining a controlled fusion reaction for commercial power generation is so fantastic that the five-year goal should be to do everything possible to reach the long-term goal. The failure of Congress to approve the President's budget request for U.S. participation in the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor—the ITER Project—is embarrassing.

To sum up the seven grand challenges: No. 1, make plug-in electric cars and trucks commonplace; No. 2, make carbon capture and storage a reality for coal-burning power plants; No. 3, make solar power cost competitive with power from fossil fuels; No. 4, safely process and store nuclear waste; No. 5, make advanced biofuels cost competitive with gasoline. That would be fuel made from crops that we cannot eat, not crops that we can.

No. 6, make new buildings green buildings; and, No. 7, provide energy from fusion.

This is a longer range goal, but one we should work on. Our country is remarkable. We have all of the talent that we had during the time of the original Manhattan Project in terms of university brain power, laboratories, private sector companies. We still believe anything is possible.

These are precisely the ingredients we need during the next 5 years to place ourselves firmly on a path toward clean energy independence within a generation, and in doing so to make our jobs more secure, to help balance the family budget, to make our air cleaner, and our planet safer and healthier, and to lead the world to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington State.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise tonight to continue the discussion on the votes we are going to have tomorrow on this important legislation and, really, what will be the start of the legislative alternative to deal with the high price of gasoline.

I know tomorrow there is going to be a vote, and many of my colleagues have come to the floor talking about the high price of gasoline and what we need to do about it.

I know going home this weekend and filling up my own car I spent over $3.80, and almost $3.90 a gallon. It is not lost on the consumers of Washington State that this problem has to be fixed.

Many of my colleagues are talking about supply. And while I wish this was an issue of simple supply and demand, I think the market is showing us that it is not about supply and demand; that it is about the manipulation of oil markets and the fact that we have deregulated the energy futures market and created loopholes so that the speculators can have their say in how the market functions without the proper oversight that I think we need to restore.

So we are going to have a chance to talk about that later when the Democratic proposal is put forward before the Senate. But tonight I want to make sure my colleagues understand this is not an issue about getting more supply out of the United States. I have been on the Senate floor several times talking about energy executives saying that it is not the companies that have been holding up the supply in the United States or that is going to solve this problem.

But I think it is important to look at the world's oil market and to understand that the United States only has 3 percent of the world's oil reserves. We are not in the top 10 leading countries in producing oil. And this exaggerated chart on size shows the top countries with the most oil: Saudi Arabia and Iran and Iraq and Kuwait and UAE. And this shows by proportion, for national size, how small the United States is. The United States is over here because we do not have that much supply of oil. In fact, if you look on the chart, the top 10 countries, we are not in the top 10 countries in supply of oil. So the bottom line is, do we want to continue to be reliant on these countries for an oil supply or do we want to diversify? I think many of my colleagues realize we have to take aggressive steps to diversify a little differently.

Here is a pie chart that shows exactly where the world oil reserves are: 20 percent in Saudi Arabia, Iraq is another big number, Iran is another big number. This little red piece of the pie here, 2 percent; 2 percent is what the United States has. So this notion that we are going to dramatically change this equation for the U.S. consumer or the price of gas by taking that 2 percent of the world's oil reserves and somehow maximizing it, I do not care how much you maximize it, I do not care how or where you drill, you are not going to change the impact on the price of oil today on the market when these are the other players. These are the people who are dominating the marketplace.

So I think it is very important that we get a handle on this situation. We have seen now that oil has been over $125 a barrel. At one point in time last Friday, oil closed at $126, and went back down.

But we keep seeing this inch up every day. You turn on the television, the situation does not seem as though there is any relief in sight. This keeps going up. This is the national average, $3.71. In my State I clearly saw $3.80. I will not be surprised if it is even higher than that. And we have to do something to give consumers relief. They cannot continue to afford to pay this price.

Well, we have listened now to oil company executives. I like to listen to what they have to say about this matter because they are the people who are involved in the supply and demand on a daily basis. They are the ones who are going out and getting this product and putting it in the marketplace.

Here is the CEO of Marathon Oil, who said:

> $100 oil is not justified by the physical demands in the market.

It is not justified. So here we are, a lot of these executives having testified before various House and Senate committees saying that oil should be at $60 a barrel. They are saying it is not even justified at $100 a barrel. What is causing this problem?

I would have to say that the $100 a barrel in the market is definitely causing problems with various industries. Last week we heard from some in the airline industry who were testifying before the Commerce Committee. These are their first quarter losses: Delta, $274 million; American Airlines, $328 million; United, $537 million.

When you talk to them about these losses, because these are things that help take care of the employees, take care of pensions, take care of bills, they will tell you that fuel costs used to be the second expense in the business. Now it is No. 1 because of the extraordinary costs of fuel. And these are the losses they are racking up because of that.

This is what one market analyst basically was saying about out-of-control jet fuel prices:

> Should the current fuel prices persist, the impact on airline industry profitability is expected to rival if not exceed that of the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

This is a quote from a JP Morgan analyst. What they are saying is, I think people here remember how dramatic the impact was on the airline industry after 9/11, how people did not want to fly. Here is an analyst saying, if this keeps going, it is going to be worse than 9/11.

I had a flight attendant tell me the same thing this weekend. She said: You know, we survived 9/11 and the terrorist attacks. We survived bankruptcy and reorganization. Now we have to survive this. I do not know that we can do it if oil just keeps going up and up and up.

That is what these people are saying; that it is going to get as dramatic as the impact that we saw from 9/11 if we do not deal with this issue. Well, one way I can tell you that we are not going to deal with it, and not because of the legislative approach, simply because if it even was a solution, drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge would only reduce it by a few pennies per gallon when it is at its full peak production, say, 10 to 20 years from now. And the fact that it would only be two pennies per gallon, if you average that out over what a consumer buys in a year, we are only talking about a few dollars to the American consumer because I go back to that chart where it shows the United States with only 2 percent. How can we affect the price? These are new updated numbers.

Basically, the fact is, you cannot affect the price by drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge. That should tell us something. This is a false argument on the other side about the supply.

Our own administration, the Energy Information Administration, came to the conclusion that if we would drill in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge thinking that we were going to put world supply on the market, this was their conclusion, not mine.

They said: OPEC could countermand any potential price impact of ANWR coastal plain production by reducing its exports by an equal amount and basically continuing to keep the price high.

So this notion we are debating tonight, that somehow we are going to drill our way to energy security and lower the $120-plus barrel of oil, even by the account or our own Energy Information Administration, is not correct.

So what do we want to do? Democrats want to police the oil and gas markets. Democrats want to police these markets because we are tired of the oil company executives saying that prices are not justified. We are tired of analysts saying that this price is not justified. We are tired of looking at the results when we deregulate the energy futures market and allow excessive speculation without proper controls. Like we have on the stock exchange, like we have on other exchanges such as NYMEX and the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, we want rules in place. We want rules in place so consumers can be protected.

We know hedge funds are playing a big role here. This is not my quote. This is from Ann Davis of the Wall Street Journal:

> Hedge funds are taking ever-larger bets in a futures market that is smaller than the stock or bond markets, and the funds are using borrowed money to maximize their bets, magnifying the impact on [energy market] prices. That is why people on this side of the aisle have talked about a few things such as closing loopholes and making sure there is transparency in the energy markets. The Amaranth case showed the harm of this excessive speculation and large trader positions without proper market controls. Amaranth was a natural gas company that basically took huge positions in the natural gas market, and because we had deregulated the oversight of that energy trading, they were able to manipulate the market. And after they got out of the marketplace because they crashed after some of their manipulative activities, we were able to see a huge decrease in the price of natural gas. So we know these hedge funds are able to impact the price of energy, and we are very concerned about that.

We know that after the electricity market crisis, we were able to put new rules into place for electricity and natural gas. It ended up having a very positive impact. In fact, this is what the chairman of the FERC said about that:

> The manipulative schemes in question were designed to lower the prices in [a futures] market in order to benefit positions held in a [physical] market.

I want my colleagues to understand how this works, but here is what the

chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission that has oversight over electricity and natural gas markets said. What he was pointing to is the fact that people were driving up the physical price of oil by manipulating the futures market. When the futures market isn't regulated, the price is easier to manipulate. Right now some oil futures for 2015 delivery are well over $100 a barrel, and that is going to continue to dictate the price of oil markets in the future.

One analyst basically said the Government must act:

> Unless the U.S. government steps in to rein in speculators' power in the market, prices will just keep going up.

If we have analysts on Wall Street telling us we should act and do something, they are telling us what is happening on Wall Street. Here is an energy analyst saying:

> Unless the U.S. government steps in to rein in speculators' power in the market, prices will just keep going up.

The reason why they are saying that is there are exemptions for oil that aren't there for other commodities. Cattle futures is an example. If you want to trade in cattle futures, you are not exempt from CFTC oversight. You have to register at an exchange. You have daily reporting requirements. That is so somebody who comes in and takes a big position in oil to impact the price and trades around to impact the price can be evaluated, and the CFTC and others can understand exactly what is going on and there is speculative limits. But look over here at oil trading, not on the NYMEX but on this other international continental exchange, and you see none of the same requirements. So we have deregulated this on this side, and now we wonder why oil has gone from $60 a barrel to $125 a barrel. It is not supply and demand. People in the industry will tell you it is not supply and demand. You have oil company executives telling you it is not supply and demand. You have analysts telling you it is time for us to do something to restore the oversight and transparency so the markets function properly.

I hope we get to this debate on the Senate floor in the next week or so.

As I said, we will be out here to talk more about that because there are several factors in the proposals we are talking about that I think will be important. Obviously, closing the Enron loophole is critical, which we are trying to push out of this body in a final farm bill conference report; this will require oversight of all oil futures in the futures markets, which my colleagues, Senator LEVIN and Senator FEINSTEIN, and others have been working on; getting the FTC to implement market rules, and they are in the process of doing that. Our body has to have a huge oversight in making sure the proper rules are put in place. We want to make sure the price-gouging legislation that is being proposed in the Democratic package gets passed. But having the Department of Justice continue to help in this effort to look at the fact that there has been this lack of transparency and funny business going on in the marketplace is going to be very important for us to continue to police these markets.

I urge my colleagues to think about the fact that this is a real crisis, that our economy can't continue to pay these prices, and that there is nothing wrong with bona fide speculation, but there is certainly something wrong with excessive speculation and with markets that don't have sufficient transparency and oversight or rules in place to make sure it is functioning correctly. That is why Democrats want to make sure we police the oil and gas markets to protect consumers. We are going to propose that through votes on the Senate floor. We are going to continue to push Federal agencies such as the FTC and the Department of Justice and the CFTC to do their jobs.

If I may, Mr. President, on a separate note, I saw last week one of the solar companies made an announcement on their earnings. I will not detail the company today, but the company was very specific in its announcement. It had increased record sales. They were very excited about what was happening in the solar market. But they announced they were going to lay off people, and they were going to cancel jobs. They said in their earnings statement, because this is what companies have to do, you have to give guidance to your investors. You have to tell them what are you are going to do for the rest of the year. This company made this announcement, and it said, because Congress is not giving predictability about the investment tax credit, we can't plan for the future for these projects. So we will be canceling projects, and we will be laying off people.

I say that tonight because I am frustrated we have not been able to get the production tax credits and investment tax credits passed. I thought we would get to this point where companies would start canceling projects and thought that we had until about the first quarter of this year and their earnings statements where, again, they have to give guidance and tell the public what is going on. But that is where we are. We need to do our job. If we believe in this situation where we are right now with this energy crisis out of control and the future being uncertain, it is time to invest in different types of energy solutions. I know many of my colleagues, 88 of us here, support getting a bill out and passed over to the House of Representatives. I know there has been a debate between the Senate and the House of Representatives on that measure and exactly how to pay for it.

What I can say to my colleagues is that when we start losing jobs and canceling projects that are needed for energy production, we haven't done our job. It is time for us to put differences aside and to get this investment tax credit and production tax credit passed and get it implemented so we can save this investment cycle and save the production for what is going to be much needed in future generations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I rise in support of the McConnell amendment which is based on legislation introduced by the senior Senator from New Mexico, Mr. DOMENICI, who was joined by several of us as cosponsors and which seeks a responsible comprehensive national energy policy.

First, I would like to thank Senator DOMENICI for his continued leadership on this issue. For years, many of us have followed his lead in trying to guide us toward policies that would expand our domestic production and supply of energy. Quite frankly, if more of my colleagues had listened to him, we would likely not be here on the floor today decrying the high cost of energy, especially gasoline.

There are three necessary components that we must address to move us toward an energy independent future: Supply, conservation, and alternative sources. I and many of my colleagues understand that conservation and alternative sources are critical pieces of this puzzle. We took some steps to address those issues in the 2000 energy bill with higher CAFE standards and incentives for technological innovation such as hybrids and fuel cells. This amendment before us deals with the third of the three necessary components—domestic supply—because none of the three are by themselves sufficient to achieve real energy security.

The United States is in the midst of an energy crisis. The folks in my State know that all too well. Every day they are working harder and smarter to make ends meet as the prices of the most basic essentials, food and energy, continue to rise at record rates. Between 2000 and 2005, 208,000 manufacturing jobs in Ohio have been lost, and 3 million nationwide, in part because of high energy costs that have forced employers to find savings elsewhere such as payrolls.

There is no question that because of the high cost of natural gas, we have gone from a country where we exported some $19 billion of chemical products to now importing chemical products. The reason for that is we didn't realize natural gas was part of the food stock we needed for the chemical industry.

Energy costs have been skyrocketing in Ohio. Since 2000, gasoline costs have risen 175 percent. Natural gas is up 107 percent. Heating oil prices are up 130 percent. The nearly 350,000 Ohio families with annual incomes of less than $10,000 are now spending more than 47 percent of their aftertax income on energy costs. You wonder how people are able to handle these additional costs they are paying.

I believe it is the result of a tail-wagging-the-dog environmental policy that

has ignored our energy and economic needs. This policy prevents us from taking advantage of our domestic sources of energy and has helped put us in the current crisis. The chickens have come home to roost. Many of us predicted it 8 or 9 years ago. No one seemed to listen.

We need to enact an energy policy that broadens our base of energy resources to create stability, maintain reasonable prices, and protect our Nation's security. It must be a policy that will keep energy affordable, and it must be a policy that would not cripple the engines of commerce that fund the research that will yield environmental protection technologies for the future.

We need a ''second declaration of independence'' to move us away from foreign sources of energy in the near term and away from oil in the long term. While we may not become truly independent of foreign energy, we must make investments today that will help us achieve our goal tomorrow, including renewable fuels and alternative methods of powering our vehicles, such as hybrids, plug-ins, and fuel cells.

I believe the country that becomes least dependent on oil is the country that is going to be prevailing in this century. Other countries are becoming addicted to oil, and we all have heard about why some of this is happening today. The Chinese are building automobiles every day and sucking up as much oil as they possibly can from whatever source they can get it.

I believe this crisis was foreseeable. Since I entered the Senate in 1999, Congress has chosen not to design a comprehensive, long-term national energy policy. We have failed to harmonize our energy, environmental, and economic needs. Unless we do, we will experience a diminished standard of living in the future.

I have been calling for increased domestic production for years. Before I came to the Senate, Congress and President Clinton had a chance to open ANWR to responsible oil exploration. In 1995, when oil was only $19 a barrel—did you hear that, $19 a barrel—President Clinton vetoed increased domestic production. In addition, many of us have been trying to open the Outer Continental Shelf to expanded exploration for years. Again, we have been blocked. Had we opened these domestic sources of oil and gas years ago, prices of gasoline, natural gas, and home heating oil would not be where they are today. As I said, the chickens have come home to roost.

A few years ago, we finally made some limited progress when we passed the 2005 Energy bill. That bill should have been passed early on in this century. We debated it back in 2003 for 6 weeks, and then it got stopped because we could not get the Senate to agree to it. We finally, as I say, got it done in 2005. That bill took some good steps forward. It provides incentives for more oil and gas production. It increases the use of clean coal technologies, nuclear power, and renewable sources of electricity and fuel, and it encourages conservation.

We need to do more, however, if we are to continue to remain competitive in the global economy. We need a plan for a future of tight energy supplies in the near term and plan accordingly so we have a stable bridge to the future that does not set us at a disadvantage against other countries. In the short term, we need to wake up to the fact that our Nation will continue to rely on more traditional forms of energy, such as oil, coal, and natural gas, to fuel our vibrant economy, as no viable alternatives are yet available to take their place.

This is important not just for the economy but for our national security and our environment. In this era when the United States is engaged in the war on terror, energy independence is even more critical. So many of the world's energy exporters are also breeding grounds for the terrorists and anti-American regimes, such as Venezuela, that want to destroy America. Being dependent on these regimes for our energy supply increases the danger to our way of life.

American people should also understand that more and more countries are nationalizing their oil. As a result, they are driving out companies that could invest in exploration, as has been the case in Venezuela, and the same way in Russia. So we are seeing a situation—and I have heard the arguments that we have to get the Commerce Department and other Federal agencies involved, but some of the problem we have is as they nationalize the oil, what they do not do is the exploration that is needed to produce the oil that should be coming on the marketplace.

Increasing domestic energy production, renewable sources, and alternatives to oil would help smooth this country's transition to a carbon-constrained world.

But we are on the cusp of another gathering storm—a storm that could deal a destructive blow to my State of Ohio's already struggling economy and our quality of life. In its wake, we could see the loss of hundreds of good-paying jobs, shocking increases in natural gas, electricity, and gasoline prices, and pocket-numbing decreases in household incomes. I know Americans right now are up against it. But I can tell you, we ain't seen nothing yet if this legislation that is now pending in Congress is passed.

This storm comes in the form of current legislative efforts in Washington to mandate massive reductions in emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases. The debate is not about whether these reductions are necessary. I think I make that very clear; these reductions are necessary. Most of us agree to that. And we must act quickly to address climate change. The debate is about whether to invest the time and effort necessary to do it in a responsible, comprehensive, and progrowth fashion as opposed to rushing through an irresponsible, piecemeal plan that will raise energy costs on already hurting families, send jobs overseas, and fail to help the environment as intended.

As ranking member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety, I am at the center of the debate, and I believe Ohioans should pay close attention. The decisions made could result in the most massive bureaucratic intrusion into the lives of Americans since the creation of the Internal Revenue Service.

As I mentioned, I have long championed harmonizing our economic, energy, and environmental needs. I did so as mayor of Cleveland, as Governor of Ohio, and we had great success in bringing both sides to the table for the betterment of our State and Nation. That is why I am so committed to educating my colleagues and Ohioans about the unprecedented opportunity we have before us when it comes to crafting a comprehensive solution to climate change. We must be smart and measured in our steps forward, always keeping in mind what is best for working families, seniors, and those trying to make ends meet on fixed incomes.

The smart way to go about addressing this problem is not through unilateral actions that would hurt our economy and drive jobs overseas. The policy proposal now under consideration in the Senate—the Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act—would do exactly that.

A recent analysis of the bill by the Environmental Protection Agency provided a devastating critique of their policy proposal, estimating that passage could result in annual losses in gross domestic product as high as $2.5 trillion by 2030. By 2050, annual losses in the GDP could be as high as $5 trillion, with electricity rates doubling over the same period of time.

The impact of this legislation will be disproportionately felt in States such as Ohio that depend on coal for much of their energy needs. Duke Energy, a major electricity provider in Ohio, has released data indicating that if the policy becomes effective in 2012, customers in their service area could suffer a 53-percent increase in their electricity bills.

According to a recent study by the American Council for Capital Formation, Ohio would lose 139,000 jobs by 2020. By 2050, net job losses could grow as high as 487,000. And with Ohio consumers paying as much as 29 percent more for gasoline, 50 percent more for natural gas, and 80 percent more for electricity, disposable household income would be reduced by about $2,000 per year by 2020 and $3,500 per year by 2050.

Additionally, the Lieberman-Warner bill completely disregards the international dimension of the problem. Countries such as China and India refuse to slow their economic development in order to address climate

change. China—and listen to this one—puts two new coal-fired powerplants in service every week and now uses more coal than the United States, the European Union, and Japan combined. India is in the process of building the largest coal mine in the world. With facts like these, America could totally shut down all of our emissions-producing activities and we would not make a dent in CO_2 emissions.

Americans should not suffer for symbolism while countries such as China and India emit increasingly large quantities of greenhouse gases without consequences. Ohioans are already struggling with the cost of living due to higher prices for gasoline, home heating fuel, electricity, food, and health care. Lieberman-Warner will only make things worse.

We cannot tolerate policies that harm our economy and drive businesses overseas to countries that do not recognize their environmental responsibilities or just do not have the political will to act. If we do, we will be worse off on two counts: fewer jobs and an environment that is not any cleaner than when we started.

That is why I am spearheading the development of an alternative solution to climate change which is less intrusive, less costly, and will more quickly achieve greater environmental benefits than the one option now before us. The smart way to address this problem is through collaborative, multinational efforts to develop and deploy the clean energy technologies that everyone recognizes as necessary to solve this global environmental problem.

I am pleased, with the support of our President, that consideration is being given to a clean energy technology fund—of some $2 billion we would participate in—an international clean energy technology fund. I know from reading a paper by Dr. Lin Jiang that China is giving serious thought to working with us. In a paper called ''The Nexus of Energy, Global Warming, and Environmental Concerns: Opportunities for U.S.-China Cooperation,'' Dr. Lin wrote:

> It is clear that greater investment is urgently needed to help China develop cost-effective methods to use coal more cleanly, through, for example, gasification and carbon capture and storage (CCS)2. Collaboration between the U.S. and China in accelerating the adoption of such technologies could be mutually beneficial, since the U.S. is equally abundant in coal reserve as well.

The Asian Pacific Partnership, which resulted from the passage of the Hagel-Pryor-Voinovich, et al. bill, is in its infancy in sharing technological breakthroughs on controlling carbon emissions. It is already happening through the Asian Pacific Partnership. For those who are really interested, you can go to www.asianpacificpartnership.org for more information on what is happening.

Recently, Richard Armitage and Dr. Joe testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and submitted for the record a paper called ''Implementing Smart Power: Setting an Agenda for National Security Reform.''

In this paper, Dr. Nye suggested that:

> The next administration and Congress should establish and fund a joint technology development center. International collaboration helps reduce costs and accelerate the pace of innovation. The U.S. Department of Energy in partnership with major global energy companies should establish a 10-year endowment for funding energy and technology related research. This could be administered by an international consortium of the National Science Foundation and equivalents and disburse grants through a peer review process to researchers to provide venture capital to develop and deploy next generation energy technologies, such as biofuels.

Also, the paper suggests that the next President should ''seek to identify areas of mutual interest between the United States and China on which the two powers can work together on a smart power agenda.

''Work together.''

> Energy security and environmental stewardship top that list, along with other transnational issues such as public health and non-proliferation. Global leadership does not have to be a zero-sum game.

The point I am making is, we are on the edge. We are seeing the result now in terms of the high cost of gasoline, the high cost of natural gas, the high cost of heating oil because of the fact that we did not put together a comprehensive plan some years ago, realizing we are in a global economy, the world is expanding, demand for these resources is growing every day, and in order for us to survive in this century, we have to become a whole lot more independent in terms of energy—as I said, the ''second declaration of independence.'' The only way that is going to happen is to develop a comprehensive plan.

My colleague, Senator ALEXANDER from Tennessee, did a very good job earlier this evening in laying out a comprehensive plan we should put in place. It is not going to happen overnight. It is going to take time for it to take place.

The reason I am bringing up the issue of the legislation dealing with climate change is, again, how do we handle that issue? Do we just go ahead and say: ''Well, we are going to go forward with it. Cap in trade. This is going to solve the problem,'' when most of us know the technology is not there in order to cap carbon and sequester carbon, when most of us know the Chinese and the Indians and other growing economies are sending these greenhouse gases into the air.

Instead of just saying: Well, we will do it on our own, I think it is time for us to get together and realize we are part of this global economy. By working together, not only could the United States be a leader in dealing with climate change and greenhouse gases, but it would also be one of the most fantastic things our country could do in terms of public diplomacy.

We have been banged over the head over the years because we have not got on into Kyoto. That was voted on here on the floor of the Senate and it went down overwhelmingly ''no.'' Then, 2 years ago, we passed the Pryor-Hagel bill. The reason it passed is because it had an international dimension to it.

I think where we are today is we have to say: Here we are and here is where we want to be, and how do we get there. Wouldn't it be wonderful, as I have said, if the United States could be a leader in doing this and bringing other countries together in saying we are going to do this together. I have a motto: Together we can do it. I think that is the approach we should take. If we don't do that, if we go ahead with this cap-and-trade legislation and say: Well, it is going to take care of the problem, we are going to be having the same problem we are having today, only it will be compounded: a 55-percent increase in electric costs by 2012, an 80-percent increase in natural gas costs, and a 30-percent increase in gas costs. We can't handle that. We have to worry about the standard of living of our people. So we have to balance this.

I think if we work on a bipartisan basis, we can come up with something that is spectacular. It is overdue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE COOPERATION ACT

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, we are debating a number of measures in the next couple of days, and one of them that is before the Senate right now is the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act. I wish to speak for a couple of moments about that legislation.

This legislation would allow States that do not currently provide first responders with collective bargaining rights 2 years to revise their State law to do that. After 2 years, the Federal Labor Relations Authority would become responsible for protecting the rights of first responders in those States that still don't provide these rights. The Federal Labor Relations Authority would issue regulations to establish procedures for employees to choose whether to form a union for collective bargaining but would not have any say in the terms of the agreement.

This legislation is critically important for us to respond to emergencies across the country. There are some States that can do it better than others because of limitations. We think at times such as this of the tragedy of 9/11, and it is important at this time to remember that every New York City firefighter, emergency medical person, every police officer who responded to the disaster at the World Trade Center on that horrific day in American history was, in fact, a union member under a collective bargaining agreement. So their unions strengthened their ability to respond to this crisis.

The bill before us, the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act, would give public safety officers the right to bargain over wages, hours, and working conditions, and would ensure that these rights are enforceable in State court. It also provides an efficient and effective dispute resolution mechanism for labor-management conflicts.

It is important to note that this bill does not force any specific regulatory scheme on the States. It gives States plenty of leeway to adopt new collective bargaining laws that make sense for their States. States that choose not to craft their own system can get the help of the Federal Labor Relations Authority.

I guess in summary form, we think of the importance of this legislation in the context of the threats we face: the threat of terrorism, the threat of disasters, all kinds of threats our communities are faced with. I and a lot of other Americans, I believe, want to make sure those who are putting their lives on the line every day, whether they are firefighters or police officers or other emergency personnel, have the peace of mind to know they are protected under law and that they also have the ability to negotiate and watch out for their own wages, benefits, and working conditions.

That is what this legislation seeks to do: To bring States that don't currently have this in place—this labor relations authority in place—to make sure we are doing that in every State of the Union so no matter where you live, those who are protecting us—the police officers, firefighters, and others—have the ability to benefit from the protections they should have under law.

I urge my colleagues, as so many others who have already done so, to support the Public Safety Employer-Employees Cooperation Act. It is very important legislation, and it is important that we pass it here in the Senate.

With that, I yield the floor, and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

OIL AND GAS PRICES

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, despite a little snow the last few weeks, spring is finally arriving in Minnesota. In fact, we had our fishing opener this weekend. It is the time of year when people start going up north. They have their cabins up there. It is not exactly extravagant, but that is their vacation place and that is where they spend a lot of their summer.

A lot of my constituents have been calling our office saying they don't know if they can afford to go up north this summer. Worse than that, we have had many people who drive trucks for a living, who have long commutes to work, who are concerned about even keeping up with their jobs. You can see why. The oil and gas prices have tripled since 2002: Minnesota, $3.49 per gallon; in the United States, gas prices are at $3.66 per gallon. You can see why the truckers are upset with diesel at $4.15 per gallon and oil at $122 per barrel.

I have to pause for a moment to say I have been coming to the Senate floor to address the price of oil for a number of weeks now and it continues to astound me that every time I speak, the prices have gone up even more, and there appears to be no relief in sight. We look at the skyrocketing gas prices in Minnesota where they have gone from about $2.90 up to $3.62 in only 3 months. This is astonishing, and it is even more astonishing that this administration continues to do nothing; that the attitude seems to be this is what is happening, this is what the market says.

I believe there are things we can actually do, of course, in the long term but also in the short term. I don't believe we can continue to do business as usual. I have heard from farmers who are having a hard time making ends meet, even with the high commodity prices, because the cost of their inputs such as diesel fuel for their farm equipment and fertilizer made from natural gas have spiraled out of control. I have heard from people who are having a hard time heating their homes and going on with their lives.

The high price of energy has inflated the price of everything from groceries to transportation to home heating. We had a hearing in the Joint Economic Committee a few weeks ago about the price of food. There are a number of factors at play there, including the low value of the dollar and the export market; including the weather; including some of the demand for biofuels, although that was put as a relatively small factor. But one thing that was mentioned time and time again was the cost of transportation.

In cold northern States such as Minnesota, where people have to pay off large heating bills, this is the time of year they do it. Some of them put it off until now. They are too afraid of thinking about paying their bills for next winter. Middle-class families are struggling with the high cost of health care and college education, and they can't afford the price of gas, especially in our rural areas. You look at the fact that there really haven't been any wage increases or the wages have been stagnant and, in fact, have been going down; you add that to the increasing expenses with the price of gas up about $1,000 or $2,000 a year, depending on how much you drive. For a middle-class family, health care is up something like $1,500 a year; appliances are up, telephone service is up. It comes to about $5,000 extra a year that the middle-class families are expending in the last 8 years.

Not a day goes by that I don't hear about this kind of struggle from my constituents, so it is hard for me to understand how our President seemed so taken aback recently when someone asked him about $4-a-gallon gas. This was on February 28, 2008, not too long ago, and the President said:

> You're predicting $4 a gallon gasoline? That's interesting. I hadn't heard that.

The fact is it is not just interesting to the people of my State; it is, in fact, a budget buster for too many people in my State. This administration has failed to provide Americans with a meaningful energy policy that would provide relief from high gas and energy prices.

This country needs a bold energy policy for the future—not little gimmicks, not little ideas that maybe give you an extra 20 bucks. This country needs something more than someone who is going to say it is interesting. We need a policy that will stabilize prices and give consumers more alternatives, reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and provide us with the next generation of home-grown biofuels.

Brazil has achieved energy independence. They have done it with sugarcane. It is easier to do, but they have done it. They basically leapfrogged our country because their government had the foresight to put a policy in place that pushed the development of biofuels. They have their own oil, but mostly they have their own biofuels.

We can do this; we just need the will. We need to pursue a forward-looking energy policy with the same sense of urgency we used to put a man on the Moon nearly 40 years ago.

In the long term, that is going to mean making strategic decisions in research on hybrid cars, new solar technology, cellulosic ethanol, and other forms of energy from biomass. It is just around the corner. We know that. Chevy is coming out with the Chevy Volt which gives you 30 miles, by plugging your car in every day and then it converts over to biofuels. That is 2 years away. We have new solar technologies. We have cellulosic ethanol right at the University of Minnesota where groundbreaking research is being done. We can do this.

We need better fuel efficiency for our cars and trucks. As the Presiding Officer knows, this Congress was the first Congress since I was in junior high to increase the gas mileage standards for new cars and trucks by 10 miles per gallon. We can do more. We also need a renewable energy standard such as we have in Minnesota where we simply basically are going to provide 25 percent of our energy, our electricity, from renewable sources by the year 2025. That was a bipartisan agreement in our State—the Republican Governor, Democratic legislature, nearly unanimous, supported by our biggest electricity company itself, which took even a higher standard—30 percent—for itself.

These are long-term solutions. I believe very strongly they are important and they are the future and we need to pass them. But there are also things we can do in the short term about high gas prices that could bring immediate relief to the families in my State and across this country. That is why I am proud to cosponsor the Consumer First Energy Act, which Majority Leader REID introduced last week. There are 20 cosponsors, 20 Senators who are already on this bill. The bill attacks high gas prices from five different angles, all of which are achievable in the short term.

The first thing, and the thing I have heard most about when I talked to people in this business, is the role that market speculation is playing in today's price of gas. The administration likes to tell us high gas prices are just a simple case of supply and demand, and more people are driving, so the price of gas goes up. But that answer doesn't hold true any longer. Look at what the oil executives have been saying. On October 30, 2007, the CEO of Marathon Oil said:

> $100 oil isn't justified by the physical demand in the market.

That is the CEO of Marathon Oil on October 30, 2007. I think he might know what he is talking about. Then a more recent quote, on April 11 of this year, by the CEO of Royal Dutch Shell, who said:

> The [oil] fundamentals are no problem. They are the same as they were when oil was selling for $60 a barrel.

On April 1 of this year, senior Vice President of ExxonMobil said:

> The price of oil should be about $50 to 55 per barrel.

If oil should be roughly at $50 or $60 a barrel, given market fundamentals, why is it trading at $118 per barrel? If supply and demand doesn't explain the high price of gas, what does? According to the experts, there is a frenzy of unregulated market speculation in the oil futures market that is driving prices to record highs.

I wish to share a quote from an energy market analyst with Oppenheimer, who recently was named by Bloomberg as a top-ranked energy analyst in the country. He said:

> I am absolutely convinced that oil prices should not be a dime above $55 a barrel. Oil speculators include the largest financial institutions in the world. I call it ''the world's largest gambling hall.'' It is open 24/7. It is totally unregulated. This is similar to a highway with no cop and no speed limit and everybody is going 120 miles per hour.

That will be reassuring to the people calling our office because they cannot afford to go up to the lake this summer. ''The world's largest gambling hall.'' Why are these trades in a commodity as vital as oil—at a time when we are in a very fragile situation internationally and we are doing business with countries we would rather not deal with, why is this commodity, oil, unregulated? In 2000, there was a provision inserted into the Commodity Futures Modernization Act that exempted electronic energy trades from Federal regulation. In the absence of oversight, what was once a small niche market became a booming industry, attracting a rampant speculation from hedge funds and investment banks, the largest financial institutions in the world. Oil and natural gas prices became volatile.

That provision has come to be known as the ''Enron loophole'' because it made possible the many abuses that triggered the western energy crisis and cost the economy $35 billion and nearly 600,000 jobs.

The Federal Government has a critical role to play in conducting aggressive oversight of changing energy markets. Any prosecutor—and the Presiding Officer knows from his past work as a prosecutor—can tell you that good laws are not enough; you need good enforcement. History has shown us that when enforcement is lax, consumers ultimately pay the price. The Consumer First Energy Act addresses the problem of market speculation by stopping traders from routing transactions through offshore markets in order to get around limits on speculation put in place by U.S. regulators. Specifically, the Intercontinental Exchange, or ICE, in London allows trading in American oil futures, gasoline and home heating oil, with far less stringent reporting requirements than what is required here at home. This has driven a lot of speculation offshore and out of reach of our regulators.

This bill will make those foreign trades in American oil and gasoline futures subject to reporting requirements so we can have a proper paper trail and keep track of what is occurring.

This bill would also require the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to increase the margin requirement for oil trades. A margin requirement, as you know, is the amount of money you have to put down if you want to buy and sell oil futures. The margin requirement is currently set by the exchanges themselves, which is like the fox guarding the henhouse. They have set the requirements so low it has led to this rampant speculation.

Some people believe this occurred because many speculators have taken money out of subprime mortgages, or the mortgage market, and put it into oil. The people in Minnesota want to know the people in Washington are looking out for them. I think the way we do that is by reining in some of this rampant speculation with this bill.

The bill also has requirements that will allow us to push on OPEC so they provide the oil they should provide. They are keeping it at an artificially low level. They are colluding to do that.

Yet, at the same time, our country is doing business with many of these countries. This has to stop, and we have to use the leverage we have to push OPEC to produce more oil.

Another part of the bill would ask that we temporarily halt putting oil into our Strategic Petroleum Reserve. This is estimated by energy analysts to bring in about 3 to 5 cents per gallon. They are 97 percent full. Yet our Government is purchasing oil at this incredibly high rate. This bill puts a temporary halt on that so we can put more oil on the market and, at the same time, not burden our country by buying it at this incredibly high rate.

Finally, this bill does something we have been trying to do for years: It takes the oil giveaways and puts them in the hands of those who can actually produce renewable energy. As you know, we came so close to doing this in the past. We were one vote short of blocking the filibuster—a tool the other side has used 68 times now, a record number. We were one vote short of taking $17 billion, over a 10-year period, and putting it into the hands of basically the people of this country, to say there is a better way. Instead of investing in the sultans of Saudi Arabia, we can put our investments in the farmers and workers of this country. If Brazil can do it with sugarcane, we can do it with residue from logging or hybrid cars or with hydrogen fuel cells. We can do it with cellulosic ethanol, the next generation of biofuels—but not if we are unwilling to talk about how we do it, which is put our money where our mouth is, which is to take the giveaways the oil companies have been enjoying for so many years, while seeing record profits, and putting it in the hands of the future.

That is what we are asking this Senate to vote on tomorrow. I can tell you that if you ask the people in Minnesota—whether they are Democrats, Republicans or Independents or whether they are from the Twin Cities or the Iron Range of Minnesota or southern Minnesota—they want to go the next step. They are bold. They figure if we can put a man on the Moon, we can do this. This is why I support this bill. This is our future.

I am very proud to be a sponsor of the bill, and I hope this Chamber is willing to do something tomorrow different than what we have done in this area of energy before. We have taken steps and increased the gas mileage standards, but this is our opportunity to be bold and to respond to the people of this country who are not looking for gimmicks but they are looking at us to do something. We know we can do a long-term solution, research and development, and the transitioning to green jobs. We can do the transition to cellulosic ethanol and put the money there.

In the short term, we need to get rid of this idea that Government should put up our hands and let this keep going, while the rampant speculation goes on and on. We need to place stronger limits on market speculation; temporarily suspend deliveries of oil into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve; put a stop to the oil company giveaways; enact the windfall profit tax, which I know is different than proposals in the past. It kicks in when oil

companies are not truly investing in renewables or adding to its refineries and production. And then we have to put that pressure on OPEC.

These are the kinds of short-term, bold measures the people of this country are looking for. So tomorrow we have our chance. I implore my colleagues to join us. Let's get this done and do something real for the people of this country.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HONORING ROBLEY REX

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I rise to recognize a very special individual from my home State of Kentucky, Mr. Robley Rex. Earlier this month, Mr. Rex celebrated his 107th birthday. To live 107 years in and of itself is an achievement by anyone's standard. In the case of Robley Rex, those 107 years have been especially full of accomplishment and patriotic service. He has filled his lifetime with loyal service to our Nation's Armed Forces, to the U.S. Postal Department, to local businesses, to the Methodist ministries and, perhaps most importantly, to his family and his fellow veterans.

Robley Rex was born in Hopkinsville, KY 1901. Upon turning 18, be enlisted in the U.S. Army and proudly served our Nation. He returned to Kentucky after serving with 5th Infantry in Germany in 1922. Mr. Rex then joined the Veterans of Foreign Wars, VFW, and married Ms. Grace Bivens. He held jobs with local Kentucky businesses before beginning his career as a U.S. Postal Department railroad mail clerk. At the spry, young age of 86, Robley Rex began volunteering through the VFW and was honored by the group for having performed more than 13,600 hours of service over a 20-year period. He also volunteered his time at the VA Medical Center in Louisville, KY, helping the hospital staff and inspiring the patients and their families. He also found time to become an expert in proper flag etiquette. Mr. President, I don't know I anyone who knows more about how to properly care for an American flag than Mr. Rex.

I am proud to represent such a remarkable model of honor and duty and I am pleased to have the opportunity to recognize Robley Rex in front of this distinguished body. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking him for his continued service to our Nation and to Kentucky, and to wish him all the best on his 107th birthday and in the future.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

STAFF SERGEANT CHAD A. CALDWELL

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, my thoughts and prayers are with the family and friends of SSG Chad Caldwell who left this world fighting for democracy and peace for the Iraqi people. By all accounts, he loved his family and country and served three combat tours to safeguard their future.

After graduating from Cheney High School in 2001, Staff Sergeant Caldwell joined the Army. The decorated soldier served one tour in Iraq, followed by a second combat tour in Afghanistan. In February 2007, he signed up for a third tour in Iraq. During this time, he earned two Army Commendation Medals, including one for saving the life of a pregnant woman after the U.N. headquarters in Baghdad was bombed in 2003. The second medal was awarded to Staff Sergeant Caldwell for saving the life of his lieutenant colonel that was caught in gunfire.

I join Arkansans and Washingtonians in lifting his wife Raechel and two young sons, Trevor and Coen, in my prayers. We will never forget the sacrifice made by the Caldwell family.

60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF ISRAEL

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 60th anniversary of the State of Israel, which is being celebrated today around the world. Since May 1948, the Jewish state has transformed itself from a fledgling band of pioneers and immigrants to a strong, robust, and democratic state. Israel has been an indispensible friend over the years and remains our greatest ally in the Middle East. One of the world's most innovative and exemplary countries, Israel has lived up to its founding ideal of being a ''light unto the nations.''

Beset on all sides by enemies, Israel declared its independence under cover of night on the fifth day of the Jewish month of Iyar. The new country was immediately recognized by U.S. President Harry Truman, a decision which continues to make America proud. Still, the surrounding armies immediately invaded. Challenged in a war for its survival, Israel prevailed to enjoy its independence. Israel would face existential threats from larger foes several times again, prevailing each time and steadily growing stronger.

And yet, for 60 years now, the State of Israel has done far more than just survive and persevere. Mr. President, it has thrived.

Politically, Israel has built a sanctuary of democracy, the rule of law, and basic rights and freedoms. Religiously, Israel has built a tolerant society for the Jews, Christians, Muslims, and Bahai who share the Holy Land. Economically, it is a modern marvel, home of some of the most high-level technological advances in the world. In the field of agricultural production, which is so important to my home State of South Dakota, Israel has done the so-called impossible and it has made the desert bloom. The invention of the surface drip irrigation system revolutionized farmers' ability to bring water to their crops, creating a lasting benefit for the entire world.

Congratulations to Israel on 60 years of statehood. Our friendship and alliance with Israel is an extension of our interests and our values, and I look forward to a strong U.S.-Israel relationship for generations to come.

GREAT LAKES LEGACY ACT OF 2008

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, last week, my colleagues from the Great Lakes and I introduced the Great Lakes Legacy Act of 2008. This bill will reauthorize the Great Lakes Legacy Act of 2002, which significantly benefited efforts to clean up contaminated areas of the Great Lakes.

The focus of the Legacy program is to clean up ''Areas of Concern'' in the Great Lakes. These are sites that do not meet the water quality goals established by the United States and Canada in the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. The primary reason that these areas fail to meet water quality goals is the result of contaminated sediments from industrial activity. This contamination results in fish advisories, degradation of fish and wildlife populations, taste and odor problems with drinking water, beach closures, and bird and animal deformities or reproductive problems.

The existing Legacy program has funded several projects throughout the region to remove contaminated sediments in Areas of Concern. In fact, almost 800,000 cubic yards of contaminated sediments have been removed since the program was created in 2002. This is material that has been safely removed from riverbeds so that it no longer poses a threat to human health or the wildlife.

Still, there are 13 Areas of Concern in the State of Michigan alone. The environmental problems are far too grave considering the fact that the Great Lakes holds one-fifth of the world's freshwater, supplies drinking water to tens of million people, and provides a $5 billion fishery. They threaten the Great Lakes as a source of potable water, as a recreational resource, as a commercial asset, and as a natural habitat.

The bill that we have introduced would build on the existing Legacy program in several ways. It would increase the authorization of appropriations from $54 million to $150 million annually in order to clean up the Areas of Concern within 10 years. The bill would give the EPA greater flexibility to manage funds by allowing the EPA to distribute funds directly to contractors and would not require States to maintain previous year's funding levels at a

site. Under this bill, eligible projects would be expanded to include habitat restoration. Many Areas of Concern cannot be delisted until habitat restoration work is done. Also, the bill would give the EPA the discretion to provide Legacy Act funds to demonstration and pilot projects. Finally, the bill would clarify the role of polluters in participating in future projects.

We have been working for decades to try to clean up the Areas of Concern. This bill was drafted based on recommendations from a coalition of environmental and industry groups that are working to protect and restore the Great Lakes, and I want to thank them for their dedication. I hope that my colleagues will support this legislation to continue progress on cleaning up these sites and protecting our precious Great LakA for the use and benefit of citizens throughout the Midwest and across Nation.

TRIBUTE TO PLACIDO DOMINGO

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to pay tribute to someone who has touched the lives of millions not just in this country but across the world. This week, tenor Placido Domingo sings the title role in the new Washington National Opera production of Handel's ''Tamerlano.'' It is his 130th role, an unprecedented feat. He has made each of these parts into something alive and multidimensional. Tragic figures like Otello or Cavaradossi have come to life and, through their actions, have laid out time-honored truths about human emotions and how we live. Mr. Domingo's singing, marked by a clarion tone and natural sense of the shape of a musical phrase, can move us to great heights and the deepest depths. He is a positive force in the world and someone that everyone can celebrate.

Next year marks the 40th anniversary of his debuts at the Lyric Opera of Chicago and the country's premiere opera house, the Metropolitan Opera. He frequently sings across the globe, gracing stages of esteemed European opera houses like London's Royal Opera and Milan's La Scala. He might be most widely known as one of the ''3 Tenors.'' His recording of grand productions and solo recitals fill store racks in my home State of Vermont, as well as the whole country. These are unheralded achievements for any tenor, undertakings that have led to numerous awards like several Grammy awards and his recent election by a respected British magazine as the ''King of Singers.''

Thankfully, his ego is not nearly as long or wide as that list of laurels. He is a deeply respectful individual, and he takes interest in others. He came be extremely kind. He paid me one of the nicest favors last year, when, at a special function, my wife Marcelle asked him to sing ''Happy Birthday'' to me. Rarely has the simple tune been heard with such color and finesse. It was a moment that I will never forget.

Even in that straightforward, if always sweet, tune that amazing sense of the inner workings of music was there. There have been other great tenors but few who have shown such a strong musical sense. The word used most often to describe Mr. Domingo's approach to each score is ''scrupulous,'' a word that means meticulous, fastidious, conscientious. That quality extends into his work from the podium as a conductor and from the boardroom as a general manager, not only of the Washington National Opera but also the Los Angeles Opera. He gets inside whatever he is doing—singing, conducting, administration—and makes it come out fresh, natural, and seemingly right.

He has literally lived and breathed opera throughout his life. As a child, he sang the popular Spanish operas known as zarzuela. The two companies that he directs have commissioned new operas, and it is new operas that make all the difference between a ''has-been'' and a living, breathing art form. Just 2 years ago, the Washington National Opera put on Scott Wheeler's ''Democracy.'' Its themes of politics, love, and Washington still resonate today.

Mr. Domingo spends a great deal of time in the United States, which has received him like the hero he often sings on stage. He knows New York, Washington, and Los Angeles like a native. He undertakes tours to sing across the Nation, sometimes bringing music to communities that may not have a major opera house. He is not an American citizen, but he embraces some of the best qualities of what it means to be an American, energetic and open, alive to life's possibilities. He has forged a special bond with the country, and for that we are all grateful.

As Mr. Domingo takes on his role this week at the Washington National Opera, I know the entire Senate joins me in congratulating and thanking him for his relentless work and his spectacular ability to move us to tears, laughter, and sheer joy.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF NORAD

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I wish to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the signing of the North American Aerospace Defense Command Agreement between the United States and Canada. For Colorado, the home to the headquarters of the North American Aerospace Defense Command, NORAD, this is a proud and joyous 50th anniversary.

Since the May 12, 1958, signing of the first NORAD agreement, NORAD has been a model for international cooperation in defense planning, execution, training, information management, and technological innovation. For half a century, the command has helped detect, deter, and defend against threats to the North American Continent. Today, we honor this legacy of success, but we also look ahead to the next half century of this partnership, so that NORAD can continue to provide for the security of our continent and our homeland.

Over the last 3 years, I have visited frequently with the commanders of NORAD and U.S. Northern Command in Colorado Springs. I am humbled by the work that the men and women of NORAD do day-in and day-out to carry out their mission. At all hours, NORAD executes its missions of aerospace warning, aerospace control, and maritime warning. If any aircraft, missiles, or space vehicles pose a threat to the North American Continent, NORAD provides accurate, unambiguous, and timely warning. The command works closely with its homeland defense, security, and law enforcement partners to prevent air attacks, to safeguard the sovereign airspaces of the United States and Canada, and to provide a capability to respond to unknown, unwanted, and unauthorized air activity approaching and operating within North American airspace. At sea, NORAD provides binational warning of any maritime threat that may be approaching the continent.

Over the last half century, NORAD has been a mechanism for collaboration between the United States and Canada in the interest of security. NORAD exercises command and control of military forces of both countries, so that we can respond to threats efficiently and jointly. NORAD has also allowed a growing level of information and intelligence sharing between the Canadian and American militaries, intelligence services, and other agencies and organizations. This is absolutely vital to our efforts to confront and defeat the threats of the 21st century.

NORAD brings together not only the Active-Duty components of the U.S. and Canadian militaries but also the capabilities of our nations' Reserve components and national, provincial, state, local, and tribal organizations. The product of NORAD's efforts is the broad, binational, multiagency cooperation that has been, and will continue to be, fundamental to our national defense.

Mr. President, today's milestone is an opportunity to reflect on the rewards of the NORAD partnership. These rewards are measured by the security of our citizens but also by the strength of the relationship between our two countries. NORAD's 50-year legacy of cooperation has helped build respect, trust, and confidence between Canadians and Americans. It is a relationship that is longstanding, stable, mutually beneficial, and absolutely essential in today's security environment, where the threats and challenges we face are always evolving.

We must always remember, though, that the success of NORAD is a product of the men and women who make it work. To the Americans and Canadians

who have stood shoulder to shoulder in the command over the past 50 years, I say thank you. We are proud of your professionalism, your commitment to your mission, and your tireless service to our countries. Congratulations on the 50th anniversary of NORAD, and congratulations on a job well done.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HONORING CHRISTINE BARON

• Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I wish to honor an incredible woman, someone who enjoys a prominent and demanding business career while continuously dedicating her time, energy, and expertise to helping those around her. Chris Baron, president of Verizon's Philadelphia Tri-state Region, is receiving a prestigious and well-deserved honor from the Philadelphia Police Athletic League for her tireless community service. It is my honor to add my well-wishes to the festivities.

Chris has been involved in many charities in our region, but I got to know her through her commitment to combating domestic violence. Chris led Verizon's HopeLine program in my home State of Delaware, which provides domestic violence victims with free wireless phones and airtime.

Victims of domestic violence use the phones to contact family, friends, and employers, and they can be crucial in time of emergency. During Chris' tenure heading the program, victims have received over 6,500 wireless phones and Verizon has given more than $150,000 to local organizations, shelters, and law enforcement in the ongoing struggle to curb domestic violence.

Every day, in every State, countless Americans step forward in the face of unimaginable fear. Chris Baron, and those like her, provide safety options, critical support, and services that victims so desperately need.

Receiving this award puts Chris in rare company. Past honorees include Walter Annenberg; Pennsylvania Governor Ed Rendell; Philadelphia district attorney Lynne Abraham; and Julius ''Dr. J'' Erving.

I have said many times on this floor that the Violence Against Women Act is my proudest legislative accomplishment. But I will be the first to acknowledge that VAWA means nothing without the hard-working men and women who implement its ideas. Chris Baron exemplifies the true heroes in our fight against domestic violence.•

RECOGNIZING LOUIS CARNEY

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, today I recognize a longtime and dear friend of mine, Louis Carney, on the occasion of his recent Silver Beaver Award from the Boy Scouts of America. Louis has spent the better part of the last 50 years giving of himself not only to friends, neighbors and family members, but to the Boy Scouts as well. He served as a cubmaster in 1964; den leader in 1965; Webelos leader in 1969; Boy Scout chairman in 1980; vanguard staff in 1987; District Cub Scout Committee in 1981; and District Eagle chairman from 2004 to today. Until very recently, Louis attended Scout Camp annually and is the recipient of countless Scout leadership awards including two Extra Mile awards, the Arrowhead honor, the District Award of Merit, the Eagle Feather award, the Wood Badge Training award, numerous leadership training awards, and an On My Honor award.

In addition to Louis's service to the Scouts, he is a Korean war veteran, worked in the U.S. Postal Service for 25, years and spent time as a potato farmer. During his adult life, he has volunteered at the Family Center, the food kitchen and the Museum of Idaho and served in many leadership positions in the LDS church all in my home town of Idaho Falls, ID. He also has spent thousands of hours volunteering in local schools. He has a reputation for reliability, and his selfless service has been demonstrated countless times and in countless ways when it comes to the youth and community in eastern Idaho. Many grown men who were Boy Scouts in their youth remember Louis's devotion to them and to Scouting, and his example of leadership through service has doubtless lived on in these individuals. When it comes to Scouting, Louis has said ''I love Scouting; it's the one thing that can keep a family together.''

His service went well beyond the Boy Scouts or his community volunteer activities—Louis and I served in our church together when we were both younger. His service was close to home as well. Many snowy mornings, we would wake up to find that Louis had plowed not only our driveway but those of our neighbors. He is the salt of the earth and made his community his neighborhood and made his community members, including me, his neighbors in the truest sense. My wife Susan and I offer Louis our heartfelt congratulations on his Silver Beaver Award and our gratitude for his kindness, generosity, and friendship over the years.•

RECOGNIZING SOUTH DAKOTA COMMUNITIES

• Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the community of Woonsocket, SD, on reaching the 125th anniversary of its founding. Woonsocket is a rural community located in Sanborn County, which is also celebrating the 100th anniversary of its courthouse.

The city of Woonsocket was founded in the summer of 1883 at the junction of the Chicago, Milwaukee, and Saint Paul Railroads, and it was given its name by the Superintendent of the railroad, C.H. Prior after his home town in Rhode Island. The city grew at a tremendous rate upon dedication as 50 lots were sold in the first day. The first church service in the town was held just 3 days after the sale of the first lot. The population grew rapidly and the first business that opened was a saloon.

Woonsocket was named county seat of Sanborn County by the Territorial Legislature in 1884. In October 1906 the city of Woonsocket proposed a Sanborn courthouse. The proposal was accepted and a courthouse was built for $50,000. It was dedicated May 22, 1908.

Today, Woonsocket is still a thriving community, with many restaurants, local businesses and churches all nestled around scenic Lake Prior. With excellent schools, Woonsocket school district boasts a 100-percent graduation rate.

The people of Woonsocket celebrate this momentous occasion on the Fourth of July and are marking the 100-year anniversary of the courthouse on May 22. One hundred and twenty-five years after its founding Woonsocket remains a vital community and a great asset to the wonderful State of South Dakota. I am proud to honor Woonsocket and Sanborn County on these historic milestones.•

CONGRATULATIONS TO FORT A.P. HILL

• Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the soldiers and civilian employees at Fort A.P. Hill for winning the Army Chief of Staff Communities of Excellence Award competition for fiscal year 2008. This prestigious annual award recognizes the tremendous effort made by Fort A.P. Hill to support soldiers, civilian employees, retirees, and their families. In addition, it highlights the superior business practices that have sparked innovation and enhanced efficiency at the installation.

Fort A.P. Hill, as one of the Army's premier installations, has also achieved high marks in this competition in the past, finishing in third place each of the last 3 years. This year, the post hosted a week long visit by a team of evaluators who reviewed every facet of Fort A.P. Hill's operations. Following a scoring assessment by a panel of judges, Fort A.P. Hill was named the competition winner and was awarded $2 million to continue efforts to improve the post.

With nearly 76,000 acres, including a 27,000-acre live fire complex that hosts personnel from every service in the Armed Forces, Fort A.P. Hill is rightly known as ''The Place Where America's Military Sharpens Its Combat Edge.'' I offer my congratulations for a job well done to Fort A.P. Hill's outstanding team.•

CONGRATULATIONS TO DEFENSE SUPPLY CENTER RICHMOND

• Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the 3,000 military and civilian employees at Defense Supply Center Richmond for winning the

Army Chief of Staff Communities of Excellence Award competition for fiscal year 2008. This prestigious annual award recognizes the tremendous effort made by Defense Supply Center Richmond to support members of the Armed Forces, civilian employees, retirees, and their families. In addition, it highlights the superior business practices that have sparked innovation and enhanced efficiency at the center.

As one of three defense supply centers in the country, Defense Supply Center Richmond serves as the lead aviation supplier for the Defense Logistics Agency, managing more than 1.2 million repair parts and operating supply items. This includes over 1,300 major weapons systems and all manner of aircraft parts, manufacturing equipment, and environmental products. Defense Supply Center Richmond annually handles 5.3 million requisitions and supports over 24,500 customers across the globe.

With ongoing military operations around the world, the exceptional work done by the dedicated workforce at Defense Supply Center Richmond has never been more appreciated or come at a more critical time. I offer my congratulations for a job well done to Defense Supply Center Richmond outstanding team.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:00 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1512. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for compensation to States incarcerating undocumented aliens charged with a felony or two or more misdemeanors.

H.R. 4279. An act to enhance remedies for violations of intellectual property laws, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5512. An act to reduce the costs of producing 1-cent and 5-cent coins, provide authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to perform research and development on new metallic content for circulating coins, and to require biennial reports to Congress on circulating coin production costs and possible alternative metallic content.

H.R. 5690. An act to remove the African National Congress from treatment as a terrorist organization for certain acts or events, provide relief for certain members of the African National Congress regarding admissibility, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5818. An act to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make loans to States to acquire foreclosed housing and to make grants to States for related costs.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1512. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for compensation to States incarcerating undocumented aliens charged with a felony or two or more misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4279. An act to enhance remedies for violations of intellectual property laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5512. An act to reduce the costs of producing 1–cent and 5–cent coins, provide authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to perform research and development on new metallic content for circulating coins, and to require biennial reports to Congress on circulating coin production costs and possible alternative metallic content; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5690. An act to remove the African National Congress from treatment as a terrorist organization for certain acts or events, provide relief for certain members of the African National Congress regarding admissibility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5818. An act to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make loans to States to acquire foreclosed housing and to make grants to States for related costs; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEVIN, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 3001. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2009 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 110–335).

S. 3002. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2009 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

S. 3003. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2009 for military construction, and for other purposes.

S. 3004. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2009 for defense activities of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 3001. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2009 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Armed Services; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 3002. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2009 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Armed Services; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 3003. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2009 for military construction, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Armed Services; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 3004. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2009 for defense activities of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Armed Services; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 3005. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish procedures for the timely and effective delivery of medical and mental health care to all immigration detainees in custody, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. BAYH, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 3006. A bill to establish procedures for the expedited consideration by Congress of certain proposals by the President to rescind amounts of budget authority; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SPECTER, and Mr. COLEMAN):

S. 3007. A bill to hold the surviving Nazi war criminals accountable for the war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity they committed during World War II, by encouraging foreign governments to more efficiently prosecute and extradite wanted criminals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOND (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. OBAMA, Mrs. DOLE, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 3008. A bill to improve and enhance the mental health care benefits available to members of the Armed Forces and veterans, to enhance counseling and other benefits available to survivors of members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. HAGEL):

S. 3009. A bill to designate the Federal Bureau of Investigation building under construction in Omaha, Nebraska, as the ''J. James Exon Federal Bureau of Investigation Building''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 558. A resolution designating June 10, 2008, as ''National Hunger Awareness Day'' and authorizing the collection of food donations during the period beginning May 12, 2008, and ending June 10, 2008, from concerned Members of Congress and staff to assist families suffering from hunger and food insecurity in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. BURR, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BROWN, Mr. STEVENS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. Res. 559. A resolution designating May 15, 2008, as ''National MPS Awareness Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. Res. 560. A resolution proclaiming the week of May 18 through May 24, 2008, as ''National Public Works Week''; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. WEBB):

S. Con. Res. 82. A concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 22

At the request of Mr. WEBB, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 22, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a program of educational assistance for members of the Armed Forces who serve in the Armed Forces after September 11, 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 211

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 211, a bill to facilitate nationwide availability of 2-1-1 telephone service for information and referral on human services. volunteer services, and for other purposes.

S. 329

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 329, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for cardiac rehabilitation and pulmonary rehabilitation services.

S. 432

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 432, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for kidney disease education services under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 579

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 579, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences to make grants for the development and operation of research centers regarding environmental factors that may be related to the etiology of breast cancer.

S. 1382

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1382, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of an Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Registry.

S. 1437

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1437, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the semicentennial of the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

S. 2010

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2010, a bill to require prisons and other detention facilities holding Federal prisoners or detainees under a contract with the Federal Government to make the same information available to the public that Federal prisons and detention facilities are required to do by law.

S. 2059

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2059, a bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to clarify the eligibility requirements with respect to airline flight crews.

S. 2123

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2123, a bill to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions.

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2123, supra.

S. 2130

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2130, a bill to express the sense of the Senate on the need for a comprehensive diplomatic offensive to help broker national reconciliation efforts in Iraq and lay the foundation for the eventual redeployment of United States combat forces.

S. 2141

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2141, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and extend the Fetal Alcohol Syndrome prevention and services program, and for other purposes.

S. 2279

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) were added as cosponsors of S. 2279, a bill to combat international violence against women and girls.

S. 2369

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2369, a bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide that certain tax planning inventions are not patentable, and for other purposes.

S. 2465

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2465, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to include all public clinics for the distribution of pediatric vaccines under the Medicaid program.

S. 2504

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 2504, a bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to grant a Federal charter to the Military Officers Association of America, and for other purposes.

S. 2511

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2511, a bill to amend the grant program for law enforcement armor vests to provide for a waiver of or reduction in the matching funds requirement in the case of fiscal hardship.

S. 2519

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2519, a bill to prohibit the awarding of a contract or grant in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold unless the prospective contractor or grantee certifies in writing to the agency awarding the contract or grant that the contractor or grantee has no seriously delinquent tax debts, and for other purposes.

S. 2555

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2555, a bill to permit California and other States to effectively control greenhouse gas emissions from motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 2618

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2618, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research with respect to various forms of muscular dystrophy, including Becker, congenital, distal, Duchenne, Emery-Dreifuss Facioscapulohumeral, limb-girdle, myotonic, and oculopharyngeal muscular dystrophies.

S. 2619

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2619, a bill to protect innocent Americans from violent crime in national parks.

S. 2702

At the request of Mr. SALAZAR, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2702, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to, and increase utilization of, bone mass measurement benefits under the Medicare part B Program.

S. 2708

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin

(Mr. KOHL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2708, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to attract and retain trained health care professionals and direct care workers dedicated to providing quality care to the growing population of older Americans.

S. 2726

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2726, a bill to amend the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to help offset the costs of intrastate transportation, storage, and distribution of bonus commodities provided to States and food assistance agencies under the emergency food assistance program.

S. 2774

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2774, a bill to provide for the appointment of additional Federal circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

S. 2790

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2790, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of comprehensive cancer care planning under the Medicare program and to improve the care furnished to individuals diagnosed with cancer by establishing a Medicare hospice care demonstration program and grants programs for cancer palliative care and symptom management programs, provider education, and related research.

S. 2799

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2799, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand and improve health care services available to women veterans, especially those serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2812

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2812, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the provision of telehealth services under the Medicare program.

S. 2852

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2852, a bill to provide increased accessibility to information on Federal spending, and for other purposes.

S. 2930

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2930, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to extend to members with dependents the second basic allowance for housing for members of the National Guard and Reserve and retired members without dependents who are mobilized in support of a contingency operation, and for other purposes.

S. 2991

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) were added as cosponsors of S. 2991, a bill to provide energy price relief and hold oil companies and other entities accountable for their actions with regard to high energy prices, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 512

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 512, a resolution honoring the life of Charlton Heston.

AMENDMENT NO. 4737

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4737 intended to be proposed to S. 2284, an original bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the flood insurance fund, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SPECTER, and Mr. COLEMAN):

S. 3007. A bill to hold the surviving Nazi war criminals accountable for the war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity they committed during World War II, by encouraging foreign governments to more efficiently prosecute and extradite wanted criminals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation with Senator NELSON of Florida in support of the Simon Wiesenthal Center's ''Operation: Last Chance,'' a final effort to bring the remaining Nazi war criminals to justice.

The atrocities committed by Nazis and their allies were vast, redefining the modern conception of crimes against humanity. In the Nuremburg trials and other courts, many Nazis faced accountability for their atrocities committed under the shroud of World War II. Unfortunately, some of the most guilty perpetrators of these acts escaped justice, when they fled to South America, Eastern Europe, or simply faded into postwar anonymity.

The Simon Wiesenthal Center, which is committed to raising awareness of the Holocaust, is determined not to let the remaining perpetrators escape justice. In 2002, the center initiated ''Operation: Last Chance,'' which sought to capitalize on the opening of the Soviet archives to identify the remaining Nazi war criminals. However, time is running short, and several of the most wanted Nazis remain at large.

We are thus introducing a bill to support the center's efforts. This legislation would require that the President report on foreign cooperation in prosecuting, extraditing, and receiving extradition of wanted Nazis. It would also indicate that the United States should take such cooperation into account when considering target countries for admission into or renewal of the Visa Waiver Program.

For too many victims of the Holocaust, the crimes committed by the Nazis and their allies over 60 years ago have not been adequately redressed. Too many countries are ambiguous about helping in the search for the remaining Nazi fugitives, and so little time remains. I thus hope that this bill can help the Simon Wiesenthal Center in its pursuit of justice, and in doing so, finally lay to rest some of the terrible ghosts of the twentieth century.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3007

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''World War II War Crimes Accountability Act of 2008''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Surviving Nazi war criminals are becoming increasingly rare.

(2) The identities of many of the remaining criminals were made known only after the end of the Cold War and the collapse of Communist governments throughout eastern Europe.

(3) In most of these formerly communist countries, the volume of available information is enormous, and the available resources to study it and identify war crimes suspects is comparatively small.

(4) In the United States, the Office of Special Investigations (OSI) of the Department of Justice is responsible for detecting, investigating and taking legal action to denaturalize or deport persons who took part in Nazi-sponsored acts of persecution committed abroad between 1933 and 1945.

(5) As of April 2008, OSI had successfully prosecuted more than 100 people involved in Nazi war crimes who were residing in the United States.

(6) As a government office with limited resources, OSI is under enormous strain to

identify and prosecute those criminals identified by newly-released records before it is too late.

(7) Some foreign governments hinder the efforts of OSI, Congress, and the United States government to extradite or deport convicted Nazi war criminals from the United States to their country of origin or other relevant jurisdiction.

(8) Certain nongovernmental organizations have been instrumental in the search for wanted Nazi war crimes suspects for over 60 years.

(9) In 2002, the Simon Wiesenthal Center launched Operation: Last Chance to maximize the identification and help facilitate the prosecution of the remaining unprosecuted Nazi war criminals, helping to achieve justice for the victims of the Holocaust.

(10) Simon Wiesenthal, a survivor of the Nazi death camps whose work stands as a reminder and a warning for future generations, dedicated his life to—

(A) documenting the crimes of the Holocaust; and

(B) hunting down the perpetrators still at large.

(11) As founder and head of the Jewish Documentation Center in Vienna, Simon Wiesenthal successfully brought to justice wanted Nazi war criminals, including—

(A) Franz Stangl, the commandant of the Treblinka death camp;

(B) Franz Murer, ''The Butcher of Wilno''; and

(C) Erich Rajakowitsch, who was in charge of the ''death transports'' in Holland.

(12) Mr. Wiesenthal's work, which contributed enormously to the modern understanding of justice, war crimes, and crimes against humanity, should be continued.

(13) Of the most guilty Nazis and Nazi collaborators still at large, Operation: Last Chance has identified the following suspects:

(A) Dr. Aribert Heim, who served as a medical doctor at the Sachsenhausen, Buchenwald, and Mauthausen concentration camps, is the most wanted ex-Nazi still at large. His most terrible crimes were committed at Mauthausen, where he murdered hundreds of inmates by administering lethal injections of phenol to their hearts or by other torturous killing methods during the fall of 1941. His whereabouts are unknown.

(B) Dr. Sandor Képiró, who served as an officer in the Hungarian gendarmerie, was 1 of several Hungarian officers convicted in 1944 for the mass murder of several thousand civilians (mostly Jews) in the city of Novi Sad on January 23, 1942. In the wake of the occupation of Hungary in March 1944, he was pardoned, promoted, and returned to active service. He escaped to Austria in 1945, fled to Argentina in 1948, and returned to Hungary in 1996.

(C) Milivoj Asner, who served as the police chief of the city of Slavonska Pozega. During 1941 and 1942, Mr. Asner orchestrated the robbery, persecution and destruction of the local Serb, Jewish and Gypsy communities, which culminated in the deportation of hundreds of civilians to Ustasha concentration camps, where most of the deportees were murdered. After his exposure in Operation: Last Chance, the former police chief later escaped once again to Klagenfurt, Austria where he currently resides.

(D) Charles Zentai is accused of murdering 18-year-old Peter Balazs, a Jewish boy he caught riding a Budapest tram without the requisite yellow star on November 8, 1944. After Hungarian requests for his extradition went unanswered, Zentai was able to immigrate to Australia in February 1950, where he currently lives.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States should actively encourage extradition and prosecution of the remaining Nazi war criminals (as described by 8 U.S.C. 1182 (a)(3)(e));

(2) the Simon Wiesenthal Center should be commended for its historic work in bringing to light the atrocities of the Holocaust and in advancing justice for Nazi war criminals through Operation: Last Chance; and

(3) the Office of Special Investigation of the Department of Justice is advancing the declared foreign policy of the United States by bringing wanted World War II criminals to justice and should be commended for its actions.

SEC. 4. DESIGNATION OF VISA WAIVER PROGRAM COUNTRIES.

(a) COOPERATION.—After a country is initially designated as a visa waiver program country under section 217(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(c)), the Attorney General, in evaluating the effect that such designation would have on the law enforcement and security interests of the United States under paragraph (2)(C) of such section, shall consider the extent to which such country is cooperating in—

(1) extraditing or prosecuting wanted or indicted Nazi war criminals to the relevant jurisdiction; and

(2) admitting into their territory aliens described in section 212(a)(3)(E)(i) and ordered removed from the United States by a United States immigration judge, the Board of Immigration Appeals, or a Federal court .

(b) PRESIDENTIAL DISCRETION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the President determines that it would not be in the national interest of the United States to terminate a country's designation as a visa waiver program country based on the evaluation under subsection (a), the President may decline to terminate such designation after providing advance written notification to—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(2) CONTENTS.—In providing notification under paragraph (1), the President shall—

(A) identify each crime suspect described in subsection (a)(2) whose admission has not been effected; and

(B) submit copies of all decisions rendered by United States immigration judges, the Board of Immigration Appeals, and Federal courts that relate to such crime suspects.

SEC. 5. ANNUAL REPORT.

In each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2013, the President shall submit an annual report to the committees listed in section 4(b)(1), which describes, for each country that has a pending application for entry into or renewal of the visa waiver program, whether such country is—

(1) cooperating satisfactorily in extraditing or deporting wanted Nazi war crimes suspects to the jurisdiction in which they have been indicted or convicted;

(2) prosecuting wanted Nazi war crimes suspects effectively within such country's jurisdiction; and

(3) cooperating satisfactorily in admitting to the territory of such country aliens described in section 212(a)(3)(E)(i) and ordered removed from the United States territory by a United States immigration judge, the Board of Immigration Appeals, or a Federal court.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Senator GORDON SMITH of Oregon and I are introducing the World War II Accountability Act, which seeks to compel foreign governments harboring Nazi war criminals to prosecute and extradite those individuals. It is a sad truth that more than 60 years after World War II some countries continue to provide safe haven for these war criminals. Bringing these surviving Nazis to justice is a time-sensitive affair, and one that can bring much needed peace to those remaining holocaust survivors who have already suffered so much.

In the United States, the Office of Special Investigations, OSI, of the Department of Justice is responsible for detecting, investigating and taking legal action to denaturalize or deport persons who took part in Nazi sponsored acts of persecution committed between 1933 and 1945. As of August 2005, OSI had successfully prosecuted 100 persons involved in Nazi war crimes who were residing in the U.S.

Nongovernmental organizations are also integral to these detection and investigation efforts. In 2002, the Simon Wiesenthal Center launched Operation: Last Chance to maximize identification and to help facilitate the prosecution of remaining Nazi war criminals.

Of the most egregious Nazi war criminals, Operation: Last Chance has identified suspects like Mr. Milivoj Asner, who served as the police chief of the city of Slavonska Pozega. Mr. Asner orchestrated the persecution and destruction of the local Serb, Jewish, and Gypsy communities, which culminated in the deportation of hundreds of civilians to Ustasha concentration camps. Mr. Asner currently resides in Klagenfurt, Austria. The center has also identified Dr. Aribert Heim, who served as a medical doctor at the Sachsenhausen, Buchenwald, and Mauthausen concentration camps. His most terrible crimes occurred at Mauthausen, where he murdered hundreds of prisoners by administering lethal injections into their hearts or by other tortuous killing methods. Dr. Heim's whereabouts are unknown.

Unfortunately, even the best efforts of OSI and organizations like the Simon Wiesenthal Center to identify and investigate Nazi war criminals are not enough. Some foreign governments hinder the extradition of convicted Nazi war criminals between the U.S. and their country of origin.

The World War II Accountability Act seeks to remedy this situation by making cooperation in the extradition of Nazi war criminals a prerequisite to a country's inclusion in the U.S. visa waiver program. This is a powerful incentive for countries that continue to harbor these criminals. I believe it is a necessary tool to compel the relevant countries to cooperate with our search for justice. For holocaust survivors, this justice is long overdue.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 558—DESIGNATING JUNE 10, 2008, AS ''NATIONAL HUNGER AWARENESS DAY'' AND AUTHORIZING THE COLLECTION OF FOOD DONATIONS DURING THE PERIOD BEGINNING MAY 12, 2008, AND ENDING JUNE 10, 2008, FROM CONCERNED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND STAFF TO ASSIST FAMILIES SUFFERING FROM HUNGER AND FOOD INSECURITY IN THE WASHINGTON, DC, METROPOLITAN AREA

Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 558

Whereas food insecurity and hunger are a fact of life for millions of low-income citizens of the United States and can produce physical, mental, and social impairments;

Whereas recent data published by the Department of Agriculture show that 35,500,000 people in the United States live in households experiencing hunger or food insecurity, and of that number, 22,800,000 are adults and 12,600,000 are children;

Whereas households with children had nearly twice the rate of food insecurity as those without children;

Whereas 3.3 percent of all United States households (3.8 million households) have accessed emergency food from a food pantry 1 or more times;

Whereas 55.5 percent of food-insecure households have participated in at least 1 of the 3 major Federal food assistance programs: the Federal food stamp program established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), the school lunch program established by the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.), and the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children established under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786);

Whereas the problem of hunger and food insecurity can be found in rural, suburban, and urban portions of the United States, touching nearly every community of the Nation;

Whereas, although substantial progress has been made in reducing the incidence of hunger and food insecurity in the United States, certain groups remain vulnerable to hunger and the negative effects of food deprivation, including the working poor, the elderly, homeless people, children, migrant workers, and Native Americans;

Whereas the people of the United States have a long tradition of providing food assistance to hungry people through acts of private generosity and public support programs;

Whereas there is a growing awareness of the important public and private partnership role that community-based organizations, institutions of faith, and charities provide in assisting hungry and food-insecure people;

Whereas more than 50,000 local community-based organizations rely on the support and efforts of more than 1,000,000 volunteers to provide food assistance and services to millions of vulnerable people;

Whereas all citizens of the United States can help participate in hunger relief efforts in their communities by—

(1) donating food and money to such efforts;

(2) volunteering for such efforts; and

(3) supporting public policies aimed at reducing hunger: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 10, 2008, as ''National Hunger Awareness Day'';

(2) calls on the people of the United States to observe National Hunger Awareness Day—

(A) with appropriate ceremonies, volunteer activities, and other support for local anti-hunger advocacy efforts and hunger relief charities, including food banks, food rescue organizations, food pantries, soup kitchens, and emergency shelters; and

(B) by continuing to support programs and public policies that reduce hunger and food insecurity in the United States; and

(3) authorizes the collection of food donations during the period beginning May 12, 2008, and ending June 10, 2008, from concerned Members of Congress and staff to assist families suffering from hunger and food insecurity in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area.

SENATE RESOLUTION 559—DESIGNATING MAY 15, 2008, AS ''NATIONAL MPS AWARENESS DAY''

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. BURR, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BROWN, Mr. STEVENS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 559

Whereas mucopolysaccharidosis (referred to in this resolution as ''MPS'') is a genetically determined lysosomal storage disorder that renders the human body incapable of producing certain enzymes needed to break down complex carbohydrates;

Whereas complex carbohydrates are then stored in almost every cell in the body and progressively cause damage to those cells;

Whereas the cell damage adversely affects the human body by damaging the heart, respiratory system, bones, internal organs, and central nervous system;

Whereas the cellular damage caused by MPS often results in mental retardation, short stature, corneal damage, joint stiffness, loss of mobility, speech and hearing impairment, heart disease, hyperactivity, chronic respiratory problems, and, most importantly, a drastically shortened life span;

Whereas the nature of the disorder is usually not apparent at birth;

Whereas, without treatment, the life expectancy of an individual afflicted with MPS begins to decrease at a very early stage in the life of the individual;

Whereas recent research developments have resulted in the creation of limited treatments for some MPS disorders;

Whereas promising advancements in the pursuit of treatments for additional MPS disorders are underway;

Whereas, despite the creation of newly developed remedies, the blood brain barrier continues to be a significant impediment to effectively treating the brain, thereby preventing the treatment of many of the symptoms of MPS;

Whereas treatments for MPS will be greatly enhanced with continued public funding;

Whereas the quality of life for individuals afflicted with MPS, and the treatments available to them, will be enhanced through the development of early detection techniques and early intervention;

Whereas treatments and research advancements for MPS are limited by a lack of awareness about MPS disorders;

Whereas the lack of awareness about MPS disorders extends to those within the medical community;

Whereas the damage that is caused by MPS makes it a model for study of many other degenerative genetic disorders;

Whereas the development of effective therapies and a potential cure for MPS disorders can be accomplished by increased awareness, research, data collection, and information distribution;

Whereas the Senate is an institution than can raise public awareness about MPS; and

Whereas the Senate is also an institution that can assist in encouraging and facilitating increased public and private sector research for early diagnosis and treatments of MPS disorders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 15, 2008, as ''National MPS Awareness Day''; and

(2) supports the goals and ideals of ''National MPS Awareness Day''.

SENATE RESOLUTION 560—PROCLAIMING THE WEEK OF MAY 18 THROUGH MAY 24, 2008, AS ''NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK''

Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 560

Whereas public works infrastructure, facilities, and services are of vital importance to the health, safety, and well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas those facilities and services could not be provided without the dedicated efforts of public works professionals, including engineers and administrators, who represent State and local governments throughout the United States;

Whereas those individuals design, build, operate, and maintain the transportation systems, water infrastructure, sewage and refuse disposal systems, public buildings, and other structures and facilities that are vital to the citizens and communities of the United States; and

Whereas it is in the interest of the public for citizens and civic leaders to understand the role that public infrastructure plays in—

(1) protecting the environment;

(2) improving public health and safety;

(3) contributing to economic vitality; and

(4) enhancing the quality of life of every community of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) proclaims the week of May 18 through May 24, 2008, as ''National Public Works Week'';

(2) recognizes and celebrates the important contributions that public works professionals make every day to improve—

(A) the public infrastructure of the United States; and

(B) the communities that those professionals serve; and

(3) urges citizens and communities throughout the United States to join with representatives of the Federal Government and the American Public Works Association in activities and ceremonies that are designed—

(A) to pay tribute to the public works professionals of the Nation; and

(B) to recognize the substantial contributions that public works professionals make to the Nation.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 82—SUPPORTING THE LOCAL RADIO FREEDOM ACT

Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. WEBB) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. CON. RES. 82

Whereas the United States enjoys broadcasting and sound recording industries that are the envy of the world, due to the symbiotic relationship that has existed among these industries for many decades;

Whereas, for more than 80 years, Congress has rejected repeated calls by the recording industry to impose a performance fee on local radio stations for simply playing music on the radio and upsetting the mutually beneficial relationship between local radio and the recording industry;

Whereas local radio stations provide free publicity and promotion to the recording industry and performers of music in the form of radio air play, interviews with performers, introduction of new performers, concert promotions, and publicity that promotes the sale of music, concert tickets, ring tones, music videos, and associated merchandise;

Whereas Congress found that ''the sale of many sound recordings and the careers of many performers benefited considerably from airplay and other promotional activities provided by both noncommercial and advertiser-supported, free over-the-air broadcasting'';

Whereas local radio broadcasters provide tens of thousands of hours of essential local news and weather information during times of national emergencies and natural disasters, such as September 11th and Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, as well as public affairs programming, sports, and hundreds of millions of dollars of time for public service announcements and local fund raising efforts for worthy charitable causes, all of which are jeopardized if local radio stations are forced to divert revenues to pay for a new performance fee;

Whereas there are many thousands of local radio stations that will suffer severe economic hardship if any new performance fee is imposed, as will many other small businesses that play music including bars, restaurants, retail establishments, sports and other entertainment venues, shopping centers, and transportation facilities; and

Whereas the hardship that would result from a new performance fee would hurt American businesses, and ultimately the American consumers who rely on local radio for news, weather, and entertainment, and such a performance fee is not justified when the current system has produced the most prolific and innovative broadcasting, music, and sound recording industries in the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress should not impose any new performance fee, tax, royalty, or other charge relating to the public performance of sound recordings on a local radio station for broadcasting sound recordings over the air, or on any business for such public performance of sound recordings.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that the hearing scheduled before Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, for Tuesday, May 13, 2008, at 9:45 a.m., will be held in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Thursday, May 15, at 9:30 a.m., in room 562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, first, I wish to ask unanimous consent that Julia Ann Frudden and Shannon Sanders of my staff be granted floor privileges for the duration of today's session.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the floor privileges be extended to Paul Hazlehurst and Brian Kelliher, two detailees of my staff, for the remainder of the 110th Congress.

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

FOREIGN TRAVEL FINANCIAL REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following reports for standing committees of the Senate, certan joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Daniel Inouye:									
Korea	Won		700.00						700.00
Philippines	Peso		452.80						452.80
Charles Houy:									
Korea	Won		700.00						700.00
Philippines	Peso		452.80						452.80
Elizabeth Schmid:									
Korea	Won		700.00						700.00
Philippines	Peso		452.80						452.80
Galen Fountain:									
Brazil	Real		244.00						244.00
Chile	Peso		430.00						430.00
Peru	Nuevo Sol		175.00						175.00
United States	Dollar				9,584.30				9,584.30
Dianne Preece:									
Brazil	Real		244.00						244.00
Chile	Peso		430.00						430.00
Peru	Nuevo Sol		175.00						175.00
United States	Dollar				9,584.30				9,584.30
Stacy McBride:									
Brazil	Real		244.00						244.00
Chile	Peso		430.00						430.00
Peru	Nuevo Sol		175.00						175.00
United States	Dollar				9,584.30				9,584.30
Fitzhugh Elder:									
Brazil	Real		244.00						244.00
Chile	Peso		430.00						430.00
Peru	Nuevo Sol		175.00						175.00
United States	Dollar				9,584.30				9,584.30
Warren Harper:									
Brazil	Real		244.00						244.00
Chile	Peso		430.00						430.00
Peru	Nuevo Sol		175.00						175.00
United States	Dollar				9,584.30				9,584.30
Nikole M. Manatt:									
Philippines	Peso		405.00						405.00
Cambodia	Dollar		252.00						252.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Thailand	Baht		536.00						536.00
Bangladesh	Taka		232.00						232.00
United States	Dollar				8,759.92				8,759.92
Charles Kieffer:									
Italy	Dollar		988.25						988.25
France	Dollar		1,270.15						1,270.15
United States	Dollar				4,535.80				4,535.80
Tad Gallion:									
Italy	Dollar		988.25						988.25
France	Dollar		1,236.15						1,236.15
United States	Dollar				4,535.80				4,535.80
Senator Tom Harkin:									
Morocco	Dirham		165.00						165.00
Ghana	Cedi		231.00						231.00
Cote d'Ivoire	Franc		170.40						170.40
Rosemary Gutierrez:									
Morocco	Dirham		165.00						165.00
Ghana	Cedi		231.00						231.00
Cote d'Ivoire	Franc		170.40						170.40
Pam Smith:									
Morocco	Dirham		165.00						165.00
Ghana	Cedi		231.00						231.00
Cote d'Ivoire	Franc		170.40						170.40
*Delegation Expenses:									
United States	Dollar						75.00		75.00
Douglas Clapp:									
France	Euro		1,635.00		395.00				2,030.00
United States	Dollar				8,141.81				8,141.81
Bruce Evans:									
France	Euro		1,635.00		395.00				2,030.00
United States	Dollar				8,141.81				8,141.81
Senator Daniel Inouye:									
Israel	Shekel		535.00						535.00
United States	Dollar				7,148.30				7,148.30
Elizabeth Schmid:									
Israel	Shekel		940.00						940.00
United States	Dollar				7,421.30				7,421.30
Nicole Di Resta:									
Israel	Shekel		940.00						940.00
United States	Dollar				7,421.30				7,421.30
Ellen Murray:									
South Africa	Rand		1,019.83						1,019.83
United States	Dollar				6,776.70				6,776.70
Lisa Bernhardt:									
South Africa	Rand		1,042.82						1,042.82
United States	Dollar				6,762.70				6,762.70
Adrienne Hallet:									
Uganda	Shilling		1,082.50						1,082.50
South Africa	Rand		686.00						686.00
United States	Dollar				7,965.40				7,965.40
Erik Fatemi:									
Uganda	Shilling		1,082.50						1,082.50
South Africa	Rand		686.00						686.00
United States	Dollar				7,872.44				7,872.44
Senator Larry Craig:									
Turkey	Lira		708.54						708.54
Czech Republic	Koruna		897.92						897.92
Spain	Euro		402.00						402.00
United States	Dollar				9,930.07				9,930.07
Rebecca M. Davies:									
Italy	Dollar		1,162.50						1,162.50
France	Dollar		1,359.40						1,359.40
United States	Dollar				4,625.80				4,625.80
Allen Cutler:									
New Zealand	Dollar		1,500.00						1,500.00
United States	Dollar				10,811.56				10,811.56
Paul Grove:									
Philippines	Peso		405.00						405.00
Cambodia	Riel		252.00						252.00
Thailand	Baht		536.00						536.00
Bangladesh	Taka		232.00						232.00
Hong Kong	Dollar		396.00						396.00
United States	Dollar				9,826.32				9,826.32
Michele Wymer:									
Philippines	Peso		405.00						405.00
Cambodia	Riel		252.00						252.00
Thailand	Baht		536.00						536.00
Bangladesh	Taka		232.00						232.00
Hong Kong	Dollar		396.00						396.00
United States	Dollar				9,914.32				9,914.32
Senator Ted Stevens:									
Korea	Won		635.97						635.97
Philippines	Peso		311.40						311.40
Sid Ashworth:									
Korea	Won		700.00						700.00
Philippines	Peso		452.80						452.80
Arthur E. Cameron, Jr.:									
Dominican Republic	Peso		900.00						900.00
United States	Dollar				596.40				596.40
Howard Goodloe Sutton, Jr.:									
Dominican Republic	Peso		900.00						900.00
United States	Dollar				596.40				596.40
Paul Grove:									
Kuwait	Dinar		164.00						164.00
Jordan	Dinar		873.00						873.00
United States	Dollar				7,960.81				7,960.81
Michele Wymer:									
Kuwait	Dinar		164.00						164.00
Jordan	Dinar		873.00						873.00
United States	Dollar				7,960.81				7,960.81
Senator Robert F. Bennett:									
Canada	Dollar		206.83						206.83
Nathan Graham:									
Canada	Dollar		166.83						166.83
Senator Judd Gregg:									
Mali	Franc		306.00						306.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Nigeria	Naira		166.00						166.00
Namibia	Dollar		226.00						226.00
South Africa	Rand		1,522.00						1,522.00
Argentina	Peso		393.00						393.00
Paul Grove:									
Mali	Franc		306.00						306.00
Nigeria	Naira		166.00						166.00
Namibia	Dollar		226.00						226.00
South Africa	Rand		1,522.00						1,522.00
Argentina	Peso		393.00						393.00
Arthur E. Cameron, Jr.:									
Thailand	Baht		536.00						536.00
Hong Kong	Dollar		582.00						582.00
United States	Dollar				9,607.00				9,607.00
Howard Sutton:									
Thailand	Baht		536.00						536.00
Hong Kong	Dollar		970.00						970.00
United States	Dollar				9,637.00				9,637.00
Allen Cutler:									
Singapore	Dollar		396.00						396.00
Hong Kong	Dollar		773.00						773.00
United States	Dollar				9,651.76				9,651.76
Senator Sam Brownback:									
Israel	Shekel		825.00						825.00
Azerbaijan	Manat		317.00						317.00
France	Franc		412.50						412.50
United States	Dollar				7,039.05				7,039.05
Ariel Wolf:									
Israel	Shekel		2,000.00						2,000.00
United States	Dollar				6,118.64				6,118.64
Sean Woo:									
Azerbaijan	Manat		444.00						444.00
France	Franc		888.50						888.50
United States	Dollar				10,436.90				10,436.90
Kevin McDonald:									
Switzerland	Franc		1,254.47						1,254.47
United States	Dollar				2,919.71				2,919.71
Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison:									
Kuwait	Dollar		328.00						328.00
United States	Dollar				8,022.00				8,022.00
Dennis A. Balkam:									
Kuwait	Dollar		328.00						328.00
United States	Dollar				8,022.00				8,022.00
Total						58,431.71	267,871.33	75.00	326,378.04

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements by the Department of State under the authority of Section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of Pub. L. 95-384, and expenses paid pursuant to S. Res. 179, agreed to May 25, 1977.

ROBERT C. BYRD, Chairman,
Committee on Appropriations, Apr. 23, 2008.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Michael J. McCord:									
United States	Dollar				8,667.00		90.00		8,757.00
Germany	Dollar		882.00						882.00
Belgium	Dollar		343.00						343.00
William G. P. Monahan:									
United States	Dollar				10,164.60				10,164.60
Germany	Euro		345.86						345.86
Poland	Zloty		235.67						235.67
Belgium	Euro		580.65						580.65
Lucian L. Niemeyer:									
United States	Dollar				6,977.12				6,977.12
Germany	Euro		1,010.00		80.00				1,090.00
Lynn F. Rusten:									
United States	Dollar				10,269.60				10,269.60
Germany	Euro		320.00						320.00
Poland	Zloty		264.00						264.00
Belgium	Euro		576.00						576.00
Gregory T. Kiley:									
United States	Dollar				8,860.40				8,860.40
Germany	Euro		1,300.00		40.00				1,340.00
Senator Mel Martinez:									
Morocco	Dollar		667.15						667.15
Turkey	Dollar		285.70						285.70
Czech Republic	Dollar		277.93						277.93
Spain	Dollar		561.10						561.10
John Goetchius:									
Morocco	Dollar		104.84						104.84
Czech Republic	Dollar		81.55						81.55
Spain	Dollar		116.92						116.92
Ken Lundberg:									
Morocco	Dollar		148.00						148.00
Turkey	Dollar		104.00						104.00
Czech Republic	Dollar		233.00						233.00
Spain	Dollar		220.00						220.00
Senator Joseph I. Lieberman:									
United States	Dollar				8,956.00				8,956.00
Pakistan	Dollar		452.00						452.00
Spain	Dollar		594.00				2,000.00		2,594.00
Frederick Downey:									
United States	Dollar				8,956.00				8,956.00
Pakistan	Dollar		547.00				12.00		559.00
Spain	Dollar		348.00						348.00
Vance Serchuk:									
United States	Dollar				8,956.00				8,956.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Pakistan	Dollar		443.00						443.00
Spain	Dollar		354.00						354.00
Senator John Thune:									
Morocco	Dollar		300.00						300.00
Turkey	Dollar		180.00						180.00
Czech Republic	Dollar		330.00						330.00
Spain	Dollar		402.00						402.00
Andrea Fouberg:									
Morocco	Dollar		117.73						117.73
Turkey	Dollar		89.28						89.28
Czech Republic	Dollar		275.78						275.78
Spain	Dollar		402.00						402.00
Senator John Cornyn:									
Kuwait	Dollar				8,287.00				8,287.00
Russell J. Thomasson:									
Kuwait	Dollar		70.00		8,026.00				8,096.00
Senator Jack Reed:									
United States	Dollar				8,036.76				8,036.76
Elizabeth King:									
United States	Dollar				8,036.76				8,036.76
Evelyn Farkas:									
United States	Dollar				3,383.72				3,383.72
Panama	Dollar		576.00						576.00
Colombia	Dollar		779.00						779.00
Venezuela	Dollar		552.00						552.00
Senator Lindsey Graham:									
United States	Dollar				3,093.32				3,093.32
Kuwait	Dollar		164.00						164.00
Germany	Euro		308.00				100.00		408.00
Matthew Rimkunas:									
Germany	Euro		308.00				100.00		408.00
Evelyn Farkas:									
China	Yuan		492.00						492.00
North Korea	Won		806.00						806.00
United States	Dollar				9,715.00				9,715.00
Senator John McCain:									
Iraq	Dollar		7.50						7.50
Jordan	Dollar		36.83						36.83
Israel	Dollar		58.38						58.38
United Kingdom	Dollar		260.29						260.29
France	Dollar		23.00						23.00
Ireland	Dollar		8.87						8.87
Richard Fontaine:									
Germany	Dollar		408.00						408.00
Senator Lindsey Graham:									
Ireland	Dollar		31.87						31.87
Jordan	Dollar		29.71						29.71
Israel	Dollar		58.38						58.38
England	Dollar		386.41				41.02		427.43
Richard Fontaine:									
Jordan	Dollar		141.00						141.00
Israel	Dollar		180.00						180.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		393.00						393.00
Michael J. Kuiken:									
United States	Dollar				9,557.18				9,557.18
Djibouti	Franc		224.00						224.00
Egypt	Pound		458.00						458.00
Ethiopia	Birr		260.00						260.00
Kenya	Shilling		547.00						547.00
Dana W. White:									
China	Renminbi		796.73						796.73
Japan	Yen		873.42						873.42
United States	Dollar				10,637.01				10,637.01
Senator Carl Levin:									
United States	Dollar				6,692.91				6,692.91
Jordan	Dollar		291.00						291.00
Richard D. DeBobes:									
United States	Dollar				7,897.91				7,897.91
Jordan	Dollar		291.00						291.00
Melissa C. Shuffield:									
United States	Dollar				4,370.47				4,370.47
Jordan	Dollar		139.71						139.71
Israel	Dollar		71.13						71.13
United Kingdom	Dollar		375.73						375.73
Senator Joseph I. Lieberman:									
Kuwait	Dollar				5,148.00				5,148.00
Jordan	Dollar		69.00						69.00
Israel	Dollar		58.00						58.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		360.00						360.00
France	Dollar		755.00		1,227.00		1,944.00		3,926.00
Italy	Dollar		639.00		3,055.00				3,694.00
Vance Serchuk:									
Kuwait	Dollar				5,275.00				5,275.00
Israel	Dollar		121.00						121.00
France	Dollar		648.00		1,227.00				1,875.00
Italy	Dollar		485.00		3,055.00				3,540.00
Jordan	Dollar		50.00						50.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		360.00						360.00
William G.P. Monahan:									
United States	Dollar				7,897.91				7,897.91
Jordan	Dollar		155.75						155.75
Senator James M. Inhofe:									
Zambia	Kwacha		41.36						41.36
Ethiopia	Birr		45.79						45.79
Jordan	Dinar		41.80						41.80
Germany	Euro		6.36						6.36
Anthony Lazarski:									
Cote d'Ivoire	Franc		50.47						50.47
Zambia	Kwacha		37.36						37.36
Ethiopia	Birr		99.37						99.37
Jordan	Dinar		36.36						36.36
Germany	Euro		53.88						53.88
Mark Powers:									
Zambia	Kwacha		42.72						42.72
Ethiopia	Birr		48.32						48.32

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jordan	Dinar		50.69						50.69
Germany	Dollar		72.01						72.01
Elizabeth French:									
Zambia	Kwacha		37.36						37.36
Ethiopia	Birr		55.62						55.62
Jordan	Dinar		22.36						22.36
Germany	Euro		18.89						18.89
Total			28,359.59		186,545.67		4,287.02		219,192.28

CARL LEVIN, Chairman,
Committee on Armed Services, Apr. 16, 2008.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Richard Shelby:									
England	Pound		2,840.00						2,840.00
France	Euro		2,236.00		447.99				2,683.99
Spain	Euro		984.00						984.00
Portugal	Euro		678.00						678.00
United States	Dollar				9,108.34				9,108.34
William Duhnke:									
England	Pound		1,136.00						1,136.00
France	Euro		2,236.00		447.99				2,683.99
Spain	Euro		984.00						984.00
Portugal	Euro		678.00						678.00
United States	Dollar				9,108.34				9,108.34
Anne Caldwell:									
England	Pound		2,840.00						2,840.00
France	Euro		2,236.00		447.99				2,683.99
Spain	Euro		984.00						984.00
Portugal	Euro		678.00						678.00
United States	Dollar				9,108.34				9,108.34
Senator Robert F. Bennett:									
Switzerland	Franc		414.00						414.00
Shawn Maher:									
Belgium	Euro		348.24						348.24
United Kingdom	Pound		205.00						205.00
United States	Dollar				7,163.80				7,163.80
Senator Richard Shelby:									
Mali	Franc		894.94						894.94
Nigeria	Naira		666.00						666.00
Namibia	Dollar		446.00						446.00
S. Africa	Rand		2,188.00						2,188.00
Argentina	Peso		1,518.00						1,518.00
Senator Bob Corker:									
Mali	Franc		894.94						894.94
Nigeria	Naira		666.00						666.00
Namibia	Dollar		446.00						446.00
S. Africa	Rand		2,188.00						2,188.00
Argentina	Peso		1,518.00						1,518.00
Senator Mike Crapo:									
S. Africa	Rand		2,062.00						2,062.00
Argentina	Peso		1,518.00						1,518.00
United States	Dollar				4,648.40				4,648.40
Mark Oesterle:									
Mali	Franc		556.00						556.00
Nigeria	Naira		666.00						666.00
Namibia	Dollar		446.00						446.00
S. Africa	Rand		2,062.00						2,062.00
Argentina	Peso		1,335.00						1,335.00
Stacie Oliver:									
Mali	Franc		556.00						556.00
Nigeria	Naira		666.00						666.00
Namibia	Dollar		446.00						446.00
S. Africa	Rand		2,062.00						2,062.00
Argentina	Peso		1,335.00						1,335.00
Laura Friedel:									
Mali	Franc		556.00						556.00
Nigeria	Naira		666.00						666.00
Namibia	Dollar		446.00						446.00
S. Africa	Rand		2,062.00						2,062.00
Argentina	Peso		1,335.00						1,335.00
Anne Caldwell:									
Mali	Franc		556.00						556.00
Nigeria	Naira		666.00						666.00
Namibia	Dollar		446.00						446.00
S. Africa	Rand		2,062.00						2,062.00
Argentina	Peso		1,335.00						1,335.00
Total			54,743.12		40,481.19				95,224.31

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Chairman,
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, Apr. 30, 2008.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Joel Friedman:									
United States	Dollar				5,324.80				5,324.80
United Kingdom	Pound		436.97						436.97
Ireland	Euro		1,124.25						1,124.25
Total			1,561.22	5,324.80					6,886.02

KENT CONRAD, Chairman,
Committee on the Budget, Apr. 2, 2008.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Kristine Lynch:									
Italy	Euro		1,392.00						1,392.00
United States	Dollar				580.66				580.66
Senator Claire McCaskill:									
China	Yuan		1,220.00						1,220.00
United States	Dollar				12,588.54				12,588.54
Tod Martin:									
China	Yuan		1,002.60						1,002.60
United States	Dollar				11,059.00				11,059.00
Total			3,614.60		24,228.20				27,842.80

DANIEL K. INOUYE, Chairman,
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, Apr. 17, 2008.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY & NATURAL RESOURCES FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Jeff Bingaman:									
United States	Dollar				8,801.54				8,801.54
Japan	Yen		1,574.47						1,574.47
Korea	Won		882.15						882.15
Robert S. Simon:									
United States	Dollar				9,479.63				9,479.63
Japan	Yen		1,583.01						1,583.01
Korea	Won		887.28						887.28
Singapore	Dollar		946.41						946.41
Jonathan S. Epstein:									
United States	Dollar				8,801.54				8,801.54
Japan	Yen		1,518.29						1,518.29
Korea	Won		848.45						848.45
Frank Macchiarola:									
United States	Dollar				8,801.54				8,801.54
Japan	Yen		1,516.60						1,516.60
Korea	Won		847.43						847.43
Kathryn Clay:									
United States	Dollar				8,801.54				8,801.54
Japan	Yen		1,443.63						1,443.63
Korea	Won		839.42						839.42
Allen Stayman:									
United States	Dollar				5,854.86				5,854.86
Micronesia	Dollar		650.00						650.00
Joshua Johnson:									
United States	Dollar				3,714.73				3,714.73
Micronesia	Dollar		650.00						650.00
Total			14,187.14		54,255.38				68,442.52

JEFF BINGAMAN, Chairman,
Committee on Energy & Natural Resources Committee, Apr. 28, 2008.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1, TO MAR. 31, 2008

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Chuck Grassley:									
Morocco	Dollar		350.64						350.64
Turkey	Dollar		235.70						235.70
Czech Republic	Dollar		259.55						259.55
Spain	Dollar		610.01						610.01
Kurt Kovarick:									
Morocco	Dollar		354.84						354.84
Turkey	Dollar		201.44						201.44
Czech Republic	Dollar		353.18						353.18
Spain	Dollar		403.49						403.49
Joshua Odintz:									
United Kingdom	Pound		587.51						587.51
Ireland	Euro		1,012.00						1,012.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1, TO MAR. 31, 2008—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
United States	Dollar				5,294.80				5,294.80
Nancy Ellen McCarthy:									
United Kingdom	Pound		474.00						474.00
Ireland	Euro		997.27						997.27
United States	Dollar				5,324.80				5,324.80
Jason Mulvihill:									
United Kingdom	Pound		543.00						543.00
Ireland	Euro		1,212.62						1,212.62
United States	Dollar				5,294.80				5,294.80
Payson Peabody:									
United Kingdom	Pound		499.42						499.42
Ireland	Euro		851.38						851.38
United States	Dollar				5,324.80				5,324.80
Kathleen Kerrigan:									
United Kingdom	Pound		139.00						139.00
Ireland	Euro		630.00						630.00
United States	Dollar				5,294.80				5,294.80
Anna Taylor:									
United Kingdom	Pound		414.91						414.91
Ireland	Euro		962.77						962.77
United States	Dollar				5,294.80				5,294.80
Lauren Bazel:									
United Kingdom	Pounds		332.75						332.75
Ireland	Euro		883.11						883.11
United States	Dollar				5,294.80				5,294.80
Michael Hamond:									
United Kingdom	Pounds		228.14						228.14
Ireland	Euro		340.11						340.11
United States	Dollar				5,294.80				5,294.80
Jennifer Cook:									
United Kingdom	Pounds		343.96						343.96
Ireland	Euro		1,105.00						1,105.00
United States	Dollar				5,294.80				5,294.80
Kara Getz:									
United Kingdom	Pounds		338.43						338.43
Ireland	Euro		961.99						961.99
United States	Dollar				5,294.50				5,294.50
Senator Maria Cantwell:									
China	Yuan		432.00						432.00
South Korea	Won		400.00						400.00
United States	Dollar				8,821.00				8,821.00
Maura O'Neill:									
China	Yuan		432.00						432.00
South Korea	Won		400.00						400.00
United States	Dollar				8,821.00				8,821.00
Jonathan S. Hale:									
China	Yuan		432.00						432.00
South Korea	Won		800.00						800.00
United States	Dollar				8,923.94				8,923.94
*Delegation Expenses:									
United States	Dollar						1,150.11		1,150.11
Total			18,522.22		79,573.64		1,150.11		99,245.97

*Delegation expenses include transportation, security, embassy overtime, reciprocal meals and official functions, as well as other official expenses in accordance with the responsibilities of the host country.

MAX BAUCUS, Chairman,
Committee on Finance, May 5, 2008.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2007

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Maria Cantwell:									
United States	Dollar				8,277.70				8,277.70
Cambodia	Dollar		75.00						75.00
Jonathan Hale:									
United States	Dollar				5,422.42				5,422.42
Cambodia	Dollar		314.00						314.00
South Korea	Won		122.00						122.00
Darci Vetter:									
Panama	Dollar		187.59						187.59
United States	Dollar				1,574.70				1,574.70
Demetrios Marantis:									
Panama	Dollar		242.38						242.38
United States	Dollar					1,574.70			1,574.70
Stephen Schaefer:									
Panama	Dollar		112.80						112.80
United States	Dollar				1,574.70				1,574.70
Jim Messina:									
Cuba	Dollar				425.00				425.00
United States	Dollar		1,255.37						1,255.37
Melodee Hanes:									
Cuba	Dollar				425.00				425.00
United States	Dollar		1,105.83						1,105.83
Demetrios Marantis:									
Cuba	Dollar				425.00				425.00
United States	Dollar		1,255.37						1,255.37
Chelsea Thomas:									
Cuba	Dollar				425.00				425.00
United States	Dollar		1,611.36						1,611.36
Total			6,281.70		20,124.22				26,405.92

MAX BAUCUS, Chairman,
Committee on Finance, Mar. 25, 2008.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS—AMENDED REPORT—FOURTH QUARTER 2007 FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1, TO DEC. 31, 2007

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
James Greene:									
Indonesia	Rupiah		2,498.93						2,498.93
United States	Dollar				7,812.70				7,812.70
Total			2,498.93		7,812.70				10,311.63

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., Chairman,
Committee on Foreign Relations, Apr. 22, 2008.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Barrasso:									
Kuwait	Dollar		27.00						27.00
United States	Dollar				9,343.77				9,343.77
Senator Joseph R. Biden, Jr.:									
Kuwait	Dinar		495.00						495.00
Pakistan	Rupee		283.00						283.00
India	Rupee		181.00						181.00
Turkey	Lira		205.00						205.00
United States	Dollar				9,019.17				9,019.17
Senator Benjamin Cardin:									
Czech Republic	Koruna		794.00		50.00				844.00
Austria	Euro		1,173.00						1,173.00
United States	Dollar				612.00				612.00
Senator Norm Coleman:									
Kuwait	Dinar		404.25						404.25
United States	Dollar				8,006.16				8,006.16
Senator Jim DeMint:									
Kuwait	Dinar		528.49						528.49
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		708.51						708.51
United States	Dollar				9,886.76				9,886.76
Senator Christopher Dodd:									
Belgium	Euro		335.00						335.00
United Kingdom	Pound		512.00						512.00
United States	Dollar				9,002.96				9,002.96
Senator Chuck Hagel:									
Russian Federation	Ruble		1,302.00						1,302.00
United Kingdom	Pound		216.00						216.00
United States	Dollar				9,171.00				9,171.00
Pakistan	Rupee		81.00						81.00
India	Rupee		126.00						126.00
United States	Dollar				6,977.00				6,977.00
Senator Johnny Isakson:									
Kuwait	Dinar		59.25						59.25
United States	Dollar				1,353.65				1,353.65
Djibouti	Franc		6.66						6.66
Equatorial Guinea			6.66						6.66
United Kingdom	Pound		97.92						97.92
United States	Dollar				4,976.07				4,976.07
Senator John Kerry:									
India	Rupee		80.00						80.00
Pakistan	Rupee		130.00						130.00
Turkey	Lira		80.00						80.00
United States	Dollar				6,976.92				6,976.92
Senator Richard G. Lugar:									
United Kingdom	Dollar		130.00						130.00
Kazakhstan	Dollar		130.00						130.00
Turkmenistan	Dollar		130.00						130.00
Azerbaijan	Dollar		130.00						130.00
Ukraine	Dollar		130.00						130.00
United States	Dollar				8,116.67				8,116.67
Senator Robert Menendez:									
United States	Dollar				8,006.77				8,006.77
Senator David Vitter:									
Kuwait	Dinar		27.00						27.00
United States	Dollar				9,343.77				9.343.77
Senator George Voinovich:									
Germany	Euro		425.00						425.00
India	Rupee		270.00						270.00
Egypt	Pound		260.00						260.00
Israel	Shekel		519.00						519.00
Jonah Blank:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		386.00		574.00				960.00
Afghanistan	Dollar		225.00						225.00
Pakistan	Rupee		1,519.00		172.00				1,691.00
India	Rupee		536.00		169.00				705.00
United States	Dollar				9,550.78				9,550.78
Jonah Blank:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		94.00						94.00
Pakistan	Rupee		80.00						80.00
India	Rupee		78.00						78.00
Turkey	Lira		102.00						102.00
United States	Dollar				9,075.82				9,075.82
Anthony Blinken:									
Pakistan	Rupee		127.00						127.00
India	Rupee		111.67						111.67
Turkey	Lira		101.92						101.92
United States	Dollar				6,707.92				6,707.92
Joshua Blumenfeld:									
Belgium	Euro		360.00						360.00
United Kingdom	Pound		412.00						412.00
United States	Dollar				6,160.81				6,160.81
Rachael Bohlander:									
Kuwait	Dinar		27.00						27.00
United States	Dollar				9,343.77				9,343.77
Jason Bruder:									
Georgia	Lari		2,232.00						2,232.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Armenia	Dram		495.00						495.00
Turkmenistan	Manat		242.00						242.00
United States	Dollar				9,027.94				9,027.94
Neil Brown:									
United Kingdom	Dollar		263.80						263.80
Kazakhstan	Dollar		263.80						263.80
Turkmenistan	Dollar		263.80						263.80
Azerbaijan	Dollar		263.80						263.80
Ukraine	Dollar		263.80						263.80
United States	Dollar				8,146.67				8,146.67
Neil Brown:									
Angola	Kwanza		1,784.00						1,784.00
South Africa	Rand		303.00		1,460.50				1,763.50
Nigeria	Naira		1,914.00		403.26				2,317.26
Equatorial Guinea	Franc		364.00						364.00
United States	Dollar				14,554.59				14,554.59
Perry Cammack:									
Jordan	Dollar		873.00						873.00
Syria	Dollar		678.00						678.00
United States	Dollar				6,678.51				6,678.51
Perry Cammack:									
Kuwait	Dollar		242.00						242.00
United States	Dollar				8,267.77				8,267.77
Steven Feldstein:									
Egypt	Pound		748.00						748.00
Israel	Shekel		1,664.00						1,664.00
United States	Dollar				8,384.18				8,384.18
Steven Feldstein:									
Mali	Franc		801.00						801.00
Germany	Euro		764.00						764.00
United States	Dollar				14,220.78				14,220.78
Rob Gatehouse:									
Colombia	Peso		1,317.21						1,317.21
United States	Dollar				581.30				581.30
James Greene:									
Mali	Franc		1,169.54						1,169.54
United States	Dollar				12,478.53				12,478.53
Thailand	Baht		1,024.00						1,024.00
United States	Dollar				10,712.56				10,712.56
Mark Helmke:									
Thailand	Baht		1,290.00						1,290.00
United States	Dollar				10,812.58				10,812.58
Catherine Henson:									
Djibouti	Franc		6.66						6.66
Equatorial Guinea	Franc		6.66						6.66
United Kingdom	Pound		97.92						97.92
United States	Dollar				4,160.07				4,160.07
Ashley Holbrook:									
Kuwait	Dinar		498.49						498.49
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		705.51						705.51
United States	Dollar				9,886.76				9,886.76
Mirah Horowitz:									
United States	Dollar				8,006.77				8,006.77
Frank Jannuzi:									
China	Yuan		2,064.00						2,064.00
Republic of Korea	Won		1,200.00						1,200.00
United States	Dollar				8,977.52				8,977.52
China	Yuan		2,154.00						2,154.00
North Korea	Won		1,284.00						1,284.00
United States	Dollar				9,715.96				9,715.96
Gregory Keeley:									
Kuwait	Dinar		27.00						27.00
United States	Dollar				9,343.77				9,343.77
Erin Logan:									
Kuwait	Dinar		409.50						409.50
Turkey	Lira		284.00						284.00
United States	Dollar				8,367.00				8,367.00
Mark Lopes:									
Egypt	Pound		800.00						800.00
Israel	Shekel		1,825.00						1,825.00
United States	Dollar				8,384.18				8,384.18
Mexico	Peso		840.00						840.00
Guatemala	Quetzal		664.00						664.00
United States	Dollar				2,017.12				2,017.12
Frank Lowenstein:									
India	Rupee		110.00						110.00
Pakistan	Rupee		109.00						109.00
Turkey	Lira		110.00						110.00
United States	Dollar				6,976.92				6,976.92
Keith Luse:									
China	Yuan		1,133.91						1,133.91
North Korea	Won		1,154.09		396.00				1,550.09
United States	Dollar				1,892.49				1,892.49
Carl Meacham:									
Colombia	Peso		136.00						136.00
Chile	Peso		2,515.00						2,515.00
United States	Dollar				6,347.30				6,347.30
Steve Moore:									
Kuwait	Dinar		112.25						112.25
United States	Dollar				8,118.41				8,118.41
Thomas Moore:									
Czech Republic	Koruna		495.00						495.00
Austria	Euro		402.00						402.00
United States	Dollar				7,822.17				7,822.17
Kenneth Myers, Jr.:									
United Kingdom	Dollar		160.00						160.00
Kazakhstan	Dollar		160.00						160.00
Turkemenistan	Dollar		160.00						160.00
Azerbaijan	Dollar		160.00						160.00
Ukraine	Dollar		160.00						160.00
United States	Dollar				8,116.67				8,116.67
Kenneth Myers, III:									
United Kingdom	Dollar		258.00						258.00
Kazakhstan	Dollar		258.00						258.00
Turkmenistan	Dollar		258.00						258.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Azerbaijan	Dollar		258.00						258.00
Ukraine	Dollar		258.00						258.00
United States	Dollar				8,146.67				8,146.67
Kenneth Myers, III:									
Germany	Euro		432.00						432.00
Belgium	Euro		673.00						673.00
United States	Dollar				8,252.49				8,252.49
William Niebling:									
Thailand	Baht		1,502.07						1,502.07
United States	Dollar				10,842.56				10,842.56
Michael Phelan:									
Angola	Kwanza		1,784.00						1,784.00
South Africa	Rand		303.00		1,460.50				1,763.50
Nigeria	Naira		1,914.00		403.26				2,317.26
Equatorial Guinea	Franc		394.00						394.00
United States	Dollar				14,554.59				14,554.59
Paul Rosen:									
Mexico	Peso		1,060.93						1,060.93
Guatemala	Quetzal		431.00						431.00
United States	Dollar				2,017.12				2,017.12
Nilmini Rubin:									
United Kingdom	Pound		1,170.00						1,170.00
Norway	Kroner		1,410.00						1,410.00
United States	Dollar				9,086.90				9,086.90
Rexon Ryu:									
Russia	Ruble		1,563.00						1,563.00
United Kingdom	Pound		266.00						266.00
United States	Dollar				9,171.00				9,171.00
Rexon Ryu:									
Pakistan	Rupee		164.00						164.00
India	Rupee		151.00						151.00
Turkey	Lira		150.00						150.00
United States	Dollar				6,977.00				6,977.00
Rexon Ryu:									
Syria	Dollar		850.00						850.00
United States	Dollar				10,140.43				10,140.43
Jennifer Simon:									
Austria	Euro		702.00						702.00
United States	Dollar				5,705.00				5,705.00
Jennifer Simon:									
Switzerland	Franc		2,345.00						2,345.00
United States	Dollar				6,243.00				6,243.00
Chris Socha:									
Kuwait	Dinar		482.34						482.34
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		731.68						731.66
United States	Dollar				9,876.76				9,876.76
Puneet Talwar:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		394.00						394.00
United States	Dollar				9,400.81				9,400.81
Puneet Talwar:									
The Netherlands	Euro		990.00						990.00
Belgium	Euro		490.00						490.00
United States	Dollar				7,557.69				7,557.69
Puneet Talwar:									
Russia	Ruble		1,613.00						1,613.00
China	Yuan		349.00						349.00
United States	Dollar				10,444.87				10,444.87
Debbie Yamada:									
Czech Republic	Koruna		735.00		50.00				785.00
Austria	Euro		1,092.00						1,092.00
United States	Dollar				612.00				612.00
Total			78,742.07		487,797.70				556,539.77

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., Chairman,
Committee on Foreign Relations, Apr. 23, 2008.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Tom Coburn:									
United States	Dollar				9,886.76				9,886.76
Kuwait	Dollar		328.00						328.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		652.00						652.00
Bryan O'Leary:									
United States	Dollar				9,886.76				9,886.76
Kuwait	Dollar		328.00						328.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		652.00						652.00
Christian Beckner:									
United States	Dollar				1,456.14				1,456.14
United Kingdom	Pound		300.00		120.00		42.00		462.00
Netherlands	Euro		1,405.00		100.00		49.00		1,554.00
Belgium	Euro		60.00		83.00				143.00
Todd Stein:									
United States	Dollar				1,386.14				1,386.14
United Kingdom	Pound		300.00		120.00		42.00		462.00
Netherlands	Euro		1,405.00		100.00		49.00		1,554.00
Belgium	Euro		60.00		83.00				143.00
Eric Andersen:									
United States	Dollar				1,386.14				1,386.14
United Kingdom	Pound		300.00		120.00		42.00		462.00
Netherlands	Euro		1,405.00		100.00		49.00		1,554.00
Belgium	Euro		60.00		83.00				143.00
Total:			7,255.00		24,910.94		273.00		32.438.94

JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN, Chairman,
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, Apr. 3, 2008.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Tucker Shumack:									
United States	Dollar				5,324.80				5,324.80
United Kingdom	Pound		435.43						435.43
Ireland	Euro		912.38						912.38
Total:			1,347.81		5,324.80				6,672.61

JOHN F. KERRY, Chairman,
Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, Apr. 15, 2008.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP—AMENDED REPORT—FOURTH QUARTER 2007 FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2007

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Kerry:									
United States	Dollar				12,287.24				12,287.24
Indonesia	Rupiah		830.00						830.00
Kathleen Frangione:									
United States	Dollar				6,731.11				6,731.11
Hong Kong	Dollar		346.74						346.74
Indonesia	Rupiah		2,246.35						2,246.35
David Wade:									
United States	Dollar				4,909.20				4,909.20
Indonesia	Rupiah		806.00						806.00
*Delegation Expenses:									
Indonesia	Rupiah						3,787.96		3,787.96
Total:			4,229.09		23,927.55		3,787.96		31,944.60

SENATOR JOHN F. KERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship,
Apr. 1, 2008.

*Delegation expenses include transportation, security, embassy overtime, reciprocal meals and official functions, as well as other official expenses in accordance with the responsibilities of the host country.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
David Koger			4,390.00						4,390.00
	Dollar				11,635.60				11,635.60
Andrew Kerr			3,640.00						3,640.00
	Dollar				10,387.39				10,387.39
Randall Bookout			4,390.00						4,390.00
	Dollar				12,965.00				12,965.00
Melvin Dubee			1,938.00						1,938.00
	Dollar				12,970.53				12,970.53
Alissa Starzak			1,151.00						1,151.00
	Dollar				10,966.37				10,966.37
Jennifer Wagner			2,753.24						2,753.24
	Dollar				11,901.04				11,901.04
James Smythers			3,087.00						3,087.00
	Dollar				11,901.04				11,901.04
Andrew Kerr			999.00						999.00
	Dollar				8,369.76				8,369.76
Senator Bill Nelson			1,856.20						1,856.20
	Dollar				6,773.42				6,773.42
Caroline Tess			1,368.00						1,368.00
	Dollar				6,381.42				6,381.42
Brenda Strickland			1,856.20						1,856.20
	Dollar				6,773.42				6,773.42
Senator Christopher S. Bond			1,254.00						1,254.00
							690.36		690.36
	Dollar				11,030.29				11,030.29
Louis Tucker			1,254.00						1,254.00
	Dollar				11,441.41				11,441.41
Sameer Bhalotra			1,254.00						1,254.00
	Dollar				15,411.41				15,411.41
Michael Dubois			1,254.00						1,254.00
	Dollar				1,030.29				1,030.29
John Maguire			1,595.00						1,595.00
	Dollar				10,074.74				10,074.74
Michael Pevzner			1,595.00						1,595.00
	Dollar				10,074.74				10,074.74
Senator Ron Wyden			1,568.00						1,568.00
							400.00		400.00
	Dollar				3,554.67				3,554.67
John Dickas			1,568.00						1,568.00
	Dollar				3,554.67				3,554.67
Jennifer Hoelzer			1,568.00						1,568.00
	Dollar				3,554.67				3,554.67
Louis Tucker			2,228.00						2,228.00
	Dollar				14,614.51				14,614.51
Senator Christopher S. Bond			2,228.00						2,228.00
	Dollar				14,614.51				14,614.51
Senator Evan Bayh			197.53						197.53
	Dollar				8,443.00				8,443.00
Todd Rosenblum			967.00						967.00
	Dollar				8,443.00				8,443.00
Paul Matulic			958.00						958.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
	Dollar				9,193.43				9,193.43
Gregory Thielmann			907.00						907.00
	Dollar				9,193.43				9,193.43
Jennifer Wagner			943.00						943.00
	Dollar				9,193.43				9,193.43
Caroline Tess			1,031.00						1,031.00
	Dollar				2,962.57				2,962.57
John Dickas			811.00						811.00
	Dollar				2,962.57				2,962.57
Total			50,609.17		260,372.33		1,090.36		312,071.86

JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV, Chairman,
Chairman, Committee on Intelligence, Apr. 30, 2008.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Arlen Specter:									
United Kingdom	Pound		231.00						231.00
Israel	Shekel		210.00						210.00
Pakistan	Rupee		47.66						47.66
Jordan	Dinar		73.86						73.86
Syria	Pound		46.97						46.97
Austria	Euro		407.35						407.35
Belgium	Euro		228.78						228.78
United States	Dollar				4,517.45		50.58		4,568.03
Christopher Bradish:									
United Kingdom	Pound		231.00						231.00
Israel	Shekel		519.00						519.00
Pakistan	Rupee		248.00						248.00
Jordan	Dinar		141.00						141.00
Syria	Pound		111.00						111.00
Austria	Euro		627.00						627.00
Belgium	Euro		442.00						442.00
United States	Dollar				4,517.45				4,517.45
Senator Jon Kyl:									
Israel	Shekel		109.46						109.46
Dubai	Dirham		211.84						211.84
Prague	Koruna		83.68						83.68
Timothy Morrison:									
Israel	Shekel		75.46						75.46
Dubai	Dirham		8.92						8.92
Prague	Koruna		40.26						40.26
Total			4,094.24		9,034.90		50.58		13,179.72

PATRICK J. LEAHY, Chairman,
Committee on the Judiciary, Apr. 7, 2008.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Bernard Sanders:									
Ghana	Cedi		231.00						231.00
Ivory Coast	Franc		170.40						170.40
Morocco	Dirham		165.00						165.00
Senator Michael B. Enzi:									
Zambia	Kwacha		35.00						35.00
Ethiopia	Birr		11.00						11.00
Jordan	Euro		47.00						47.00
Germany	Euro		47.00						47.00
Sharon Waxman:									
United States	Dollar				7,994.62				7,994.62
Jordan	Dinar		829.00						829.00
Syria	Pound		592.00						592.00
Caya Lewis:									
United States	Dollar				8,250.15				8,250.15
Botswana	Pula		1,284.00						1,284.00
Hayden Rhudy:									
United States	Dollar				7,854.13				7,854.13
Botswana	Pula		1,284.00						1,284.00
Total			4,695.00		24,098.90				28,794.30

EDWARD M. KENNEDY. Chairman,
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, Apr. 23, 2008.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), MAJORITY LEADER, TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jessica Lewis:									
United States	Dollar				825.02				825.02
Mexico	Pesos		785.00						785.00
Total			785.00		825.02				1,610.02

HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, Apr. 1, 2008.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), REPUBLICAN LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2008

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Tom Hawkins:									
United States	Dollar				14,644.51				14,644.51
New Zealand	Dollar		800.00						800.00
Australia	Dollar		1,428.00						1,428.00
United States	Dollar				9,886.76				9,886.76
Kuwait	Dinar		499.80						499.80
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		551.00						551.00
Doug Hampton:									
United States	Dollar				9,886.76				9,886.76
Kuwait	Dinar		599.80						599.80
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		651.00						651.00
Senator John Ensign:									
United States	Dollar				9,886.76				9,886.76
Kuwait	Dinar		271.80						271.80
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		566.00						566.00
Delegation Expenses:									
Kuwait	Dinar						447.13		447.13
United Arab Emirates	Dirham						217.75		217.75
David Schiappa:									
Argentina	Peso		2,179.95						2,179.95
Mali	Franc		806.00						806.00
Nigeria	Naira		666.00						666.00
Namibia	Dollar		446.00						446.00
South Africa	Rand		2,062.00						2,062.00
Total			11,527.35		44,304.79		664.88		56,497.02

MITCH McCONNELL, Republican Leader,
Apr. 23, 2008.

NATIONAL HUNGER AWARENESS DAY

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 558, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 558) designating June 10, 2008, as ''National Hunger Awareness Day'' and authorizing the collection of food donations during the period beginning May 12, 2008, and ending June 10, 2008, from concerned Members of Congress and staff to assist families suffering from hunger and food insecurity in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 558) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 558

Whereas food insecurity and hunger are a fact of life for millions of low-income citizens of the United States and can produce physical, mental, and social impairments;

Whereas recent data published by the Department of Agriculture show that 35,500,000 people in the United States live in households experiencing hunger or food insecurity, and of that number, 22,800,000 are adults and 12,600,000 are children;

Whereas households with children had nearly twice the rate of food insecurity as those without children;

Whereas 3.3 percent of all United States households (3.8 million households) have accessed emergency food from a food pantry 1 or more times;

Whereas 55.5 percent of food-insecure households have participated in at least 1 of the 3 major Federal food assistance programs: the Federal food stamp program established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), the school lunch program established by the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.), and the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children established under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786);

Whereas the problem of hunger and food insecurity can be found in rural, suburban, and urban portions of the United States, touching nearly every community of the Nation;

Whereas, although substantial progress has been made in reducing the incidence of hunger and food insecurity in the United States, certain groups remain vulnerable to hunger and the negative effects of food deprivation, including the working poor, the elderly, homeless people, children, migrant workers, and Native Americans;

Whereas the people of the United States have a long tradition of providing food assistance to hungry people through acts of private generosity and public support programs;

Whereas there is a growing awareness of the important public and private partnership role that community-based organizations, institutions of faith, and charities provide in assisting hungry and food-insecure people;

Whereas more than 50,000 local community-based organizations rely on the support and efforts of more than 1,000,000 volunteers to provide food assistance and services to millions of vulnerable people;

Whereas all citizens of the United States can help participate in hunger relief efforts in their communities by—

(1) donating food and money to such efforts;

(2) volunteering for such efforts; and

(3) supporting public policies aimed at reducing hunger: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 10, 2008, as ''National Hunger Awareness Day'';

(2) calls on the people of the United States to observe National Hunger Awareness Day—

(A) with appropriate ceremonies, volunteer activities, and other support for local anti-hunger advocacy efforts and hunger relief charities, including food banks, food rescue organizations, food pantries, soup kitchens, and emergency shelters; and

(B) by continuing to support programs and public policies that reduce hunger and food insecurity in the United States; and

(3) authorizes the collection of food donations during the period beginning May 12, 2008, and ending June 10, 2008, from concerned Members of Congress and staff to assist families suffering from hunger and food insecurity in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area.

NATIONAL MPS AWARENESS DAY

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 559, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 559) designating May 15, 2008, as ''National MPS Awareness Day.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 559) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 559

Whereas mucopolysaccharidosis (referred to in this resolution as ''MPS'') is a genetically determined lysosomal storage disorder that renders the human body incapable of producing certain enzymes needed to break down complex carbohydrates;

Whereas complex carbohydrates are then stored in almost every cell in the body and progressively cause damage to those cells;

Whereas the cell damage adversely affects the human body by damaging the heart, respiratory system, bones, internal organs, and central nervous system;

Whereas the cellular damage caused by MPS often results in mental retardation, short stature, corneal damage, joint stiffness, loss of mobility, speech and hearing impairment, heart disease, hyperactivity, chronic respiratory problems, and, most importantly, a drastically shortened life span;

Whereas the nature of the disorder is usually not apparent at birth;

Whereas, without treatment, the life expectancy of an individual afflicted with MPS begins to decrease at a very early stage in the life of the individual;

Whereas recent research developments have resulted in the creation of limited treatments for some MPS disorders;

Whereas promising advancements in the pursuit of treatments for additional MPS disorders are underway;

Whereas, despite the creation of newly developed remedies, the blood brain barrier continues to be a significant impediment to effectively treating the brain, thereby preventing the treatment of many of the symptoms of MPS;

Whereas treatments for MPS will be greatly enhanced with continued public funding;

Whereas the quality of life for individuals afflicted with MPS, and the treatments available to them, will be enhanced through the development of early detection techniques and early intervention;

Whereas treatments and research advancements for MPS are limited by a lack of awareness about MPS disorders;

Whereas the lack of awareness about MPS disorders extends to those within the medical community;

Whereas the damage that is caused by MPS makes it a model for study of many other degenerative genetic disorders;

Whereas the development of effective therapies and a potential cure for MPS disorders can be accomplished by increased awareness, research, data collection, and information distribution;

Whereas the Senate is an institution than can raise public awareness about MPS; and

Whereas the Senate is also an institution that can assist in encouraging and facilitating increased public and private sector research for early diagnosis and treatments of MPS disorders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 15, 2008, as ''National MPS Awareness Day''; and

(2) supports the goals and ideals of ''National MPS Awareness Day''.

NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 560, submitted earlier today by Senator BOXER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 560) proclaiming the week of May 18 through May 24, 2008, as ''National Public Works Week.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, without intervening action or debate, and that any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 560) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 560

Whereas public works infrastructure, facilities, and services are of vital importance to the health, safety, and well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas those facilities and services could not be provided without the dedicated efforts of public works professionals, including engineers and administrators, who represent State and local governments throughout the United States;

Whereas those individuals design, build, operate, and maintain the transportation systems, water infrastructure, sewage and refuse disposal systems, public buildings, and other structures and facilities that are vital to the citizens and communities of the United States; and

Whereas it is in the interest of the public for citizens and civic leaders to understand the role that public infrastructure plays in—

(1) protecting the environment;

(2) improving public health and safety;

(3) contributing to economic vitality; and

(4) enhancing the quality of life of every community of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) proclaims the week of May 18 through May 24, 2008, as ''National Public Works Week'';

(2) recognizes and celebrates the important contributions that public works professionals make every day to improve—

(A) the public infrastructure of the United States; and

(B) the communities that those professionals serve; and

(3) urges citizens and communities throughout the United States to join with representatives of the Federal Government and the American Public Works Association in activities and ceremonies that are designed—

(A) to pay tribute to the public works professionals of the Nation; and

(B) to recognize the substantial contributions that public works professionals make to the Nation.

MEASURES INDEFINITELY POSTPONED—S. 2534, S. 2626, S. 2675, S. 2725, AND S. 2673

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following calendar numbers be indefinitely postponed en bloc: Calendar Nos. 677 to 680 and Calendar No. 696.

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

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 13, 2008

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow, Tuesday, May 13; that following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for use later in the day, and the Senate resume consideration of S. 2284, flood insurance, as under the previous order.

I further ask that the Senate recess from 12:30 until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus luncheons.

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

PROGRAM

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, under the previous order, there will be 1 hour for debate equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees prior to votes in relation to the McConnell amendment related to energy; the Reid amendment related to energy; passage of S. 2284, flood insurance; and cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 980, first responders collective bargaining. Therefore, Senators should expect a series of rollcall votes to begin shortly after 11 a.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, May 13, 2008, at 10 a.m.