

the opposite message. The Federal Government basically says to Oregon and to other States that are doing a good job, well, tough luck, folks. Instead of rewarding you, we are going to actually stick it to you. We are going to penalize you and limit your reimbursement in spite of the fact that you provide higher quality, more efficient health care.

We are going to try to change that reimbursement system. It will obviously help our State, but I would submit, if one looks at the challenges for Medicare, the head of the General Accounting Office, David Walker, has said Medicare is seven times as great a challenge as is Social Security. And we cannot afford not to have the Smith-Wyden reforms with respect to reimbursement for health care providers. I am very hopeful we will be able to win support in the Finance Committee and in the Senate for those reimbursement changes as well. They make sense for our State, but they are absolutely critical for our country as well.

In addition to health care, which will be a prime focus of our work, Senator SMITH and I want to make sure we promote the use of innovative technologies, making sure that they are accessible and affordable so as to capture the opportunity to use technology to grow incomes and strengthen our economy. Depreciation will be a topic we will focus on because right now businesses that need new technologies to keep up in tough global markets take a big tax hit if they change their equipment as frequently as they need to in order to keep up with the competition.

We intend to work together on the Finance Committee to change tax laws and be able to accelerate the depreciation of equipment and end the penalties our businesses pay for staying on the cutting edge of our economy.

We also intend to promote nanotechnology to continue to work to make Oregon a national leader in the new small science. Americans are not completely sure what this field is all about. A woman came up to me in a small store in Oregon recently and said: RON, I do not know what this nanology is, but I am glad you are working on it.

The science of small stuff is going to be the wave of the future, and unprecedented collaboration between the public and private sectors has made Oregon one of America's leading microtechnology and nanotechnology centers.

Senator SMITH and I joined to be part of an effort in the Senate to provide billions of dollars for nanotechnology that would create regional centers in this exciting field, and we intend to work to make certain that those efforts receive the Federal attention and credit they deserve.

We will also work to build out broadband and the telecommunications technologies. We intend to work again in the Finance Committee to create appropriate tax incentives that will en-

sure broadband gets to the four corners of our State, and, of course, to pick up on our theme that what we are doing makes sense for Oregon and for our country.

I submit that the Smith-Wyden effort, as it relates to broadband, technology, and the Web, will be of great benefit to Alaska as well. We are fortunate to have had a good relationship with Senator STEVENS as well who chairs the Senate Commerce Committee.

The last point I make with respect to technology is as we try to bring all of those folks on to the Web and to be part of our Web-based economy, we should not hit them with a variety of new taxes. The bipartisan Internet tax Freedom Act makes it illegal to level double taxes or discriminatory taxes when one surfs the Web or makes Internet purchases. The two of us will be working on our committees, both the Commerce Committee and the Finance Committee, to make the Internet tax moratorium permanent to preserve Web access and Web commerce for the future.

We want to work together with our colleagues, and we have come today to say we want to promote smart solutions, the kind Oregonians and Americans should expect from the Senate.

I will yield back to Senator SMITH so he can close out our joint presentation, and in yielding tell him that in addition to what we are trying to do for our State and the impact I think our ideas will have for the country in a variety of these areas, technology and health care and the issues we have mentioned, I hope what we are doing in the Senate today will be infectious and will cause other Senators to join in these kinds of efforts.

Very often colleagues have come up to Senator SMITH and me and sort of said, what is in the water out there? What are you guys doing? I have never heard of this. We always respond, try it, you will like it. It is not going to be painful.

I see our friend from Oklahoma, Senator INHOFE, who has always been very kind to me in working on infrastructure and other issues, and I will say that in an acrimonious time, when there are certainly divisions, let us try to find every possible way to come together. We realize it is not always possible to do it, but what is exciting about America is we debate issues in a vigorous way. Certainly Senator SMITH and I do not agree on everything under the Sun, but we certainly agree on a lot of critical matters. Even if we do not, we talk about them in a way that we think is respectful and promotes to our citizens the reality that debate can be thoughtful, it can be contemplative, and it does not always have to be about scorched earth kind of politics. I am very pleased that Senator SMITH will conclude for both of us in our joint presentation. I thank him again for all of his efforts to work with me.

When I had a chance to come to the Congress, and Senator JIM INHOFE and I

were then Members of the House, I dreamed of having this kind of opportunity to work in a bipartisan way in representing our State, and I thank my colleague for doing so much to make that possible.

I yield to him to wrap up not just on behalf of himself but to wrap up on behalf of both of us.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH. Madam President, I thank the Senator.

I think he said it well. So much can be accomplished if colleagues will focus on the possible instead of the polemic. When we do that, we find that the people's business is moved forward in a positive way and our Nation makes progress.

I conclude with these words: I do not know how long Oregonians will grant me the honor of representing them in the Senate, but I do know for as long as I am in this Chamber and for as long as Senator WYDEN is my colleague, we will continue to look for ways to move beyond partisanship and to continue our partnership for Oregon.

We yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Let me inquire as to what is the regular order?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senators are permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes in morning business.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for up to 20 minutes as in morning business.

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

FOUR PILLARS OF CLIMATE ALARMISM

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I am returning to the floor, as I have many times in the last few years, to further address what I have considered to be probably the greatest single hoax ever perpetrated on the American people, and that is this thing called global warming. As I noted in my last speech, there is a perception, especially among the media and the environmental elitists, that the scientific community has reached a consensus on global warming. As Sir David King, the chief science adviser to the British Government, recently said:

There is a very clear consensus from the scientific community on the problems of global warming and our use of fossil fuels.

Those problems amount to rising sea levels, floods, tsunamis, droughts, hurricanes, disease, and mass extinction of species—all caused by the ever-increasing greenhouse gas emissions. The alarmists confidently assert that most scientists agree with this, and they vehemently dispute claims of uncertainty about whether catastrophes will occur.

It is interesting that most of the people who are talking about gloom and

doom on global warming are the same ones, just a few years ago, in the 1970s, who were talking about global cooling, saying that a little ice age is coming and we are all going to die. But today, to question the science of catastrophic global warming is considered illegitimate. Consider Dr. Daomi Oreskes, who wrote in the Washington Post last December:

We need to stop repeating nonsense about the uncertainty of global warming and start talking seriously about the right approach to address it.

Global warming, then, is no longer an issue for scientific debate. It appears to have soared into the realm of metaphysics, reaching the status of revealed truth.

Madam President, this is absurd. Since 1999, almost all scientific data has shown that this whole thing is, in fact, a hoax. More than 17,000 scientists have signed the Oregon Petition—ironically, after listening to the two Senators from Oregon who had excellent presentations—stating that fears of catastrophic global warming are groundless. These and other scientists who do not subscribe to the so-called consensus are condemned as skeptics and tools of industry. Now, in order to avoid professional excommunication, one must subscribe to the four principal beliefs underlying the alarmist consensus. I am going to call these the four pillars of climate alarmism, all of which, it is said, provide unequivocal support for that consensus view.

What I am going to do is talk about all four pillars, but mainly only one today, and then wait a week and let that soak in and then maybe come back and talk about the other three. The four pillars are as follows: The 2001 National Academy of Sciences report summarizing the latest science of climate change, requested by the Bush administration. Pillar No. 2, which we will be talking about later, is the scientific work of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the IPCC—we have heard a lot about that, most especially its Third Assessment Report, released in 2001. The third pillar is the recent report of the international Arctic Climate Impact Assessment. No. 4 is the data produced by climate models.

I will show over the next several weeks that none of these pillars support the consensus view. Today I will begin my four pillars series with the NAS.

Before I delve into the NAS report, some historical CBO context is in order.

Back in 2001 the Kyoto Treaty was on the verge of collapse. President Bush announced his rejection of the Kyoto Treaty, calling it “fatally flawed in fundamental ways.” Our friends in Europe expressed outrage, even shock, though it was never in doubt where the United States stood. We have not changed our position.

In 1997, here on the floor of the Senate, we passed by a vote of 95 to noth-

ing the Byrd-Hagel resolution. Primarily, the Byrd-Hagel resolution said if you come back from Kyoto with something that treats developing nations differently from developed nations, then we will reject it, we will not ratify it. Of course, that is exactly what happened. So we are supposed to do all these things, but not China and not Mexico, not the other countries—yet that passed 95 to nothing. There was not one dissenting vote.

On June 11, 2001, President Bush delivered a speech detailing Kyoto’s flaws. He also provided an overview of the current state of climate science as described in a report, which he requested, by the National Academy of Science. Although the report offered very modest conclusions about the state of climate science, as described in a report, which he requested, by the National Academy of Sciences. Though the report offered very modest conclusions about the state of climate science, alarmists repeatedly invoke it as ironclad proof of their consensus. So let’s take a closer look at what the NAS had to say.

The 2001 NAS report was wide-ranging and generally informative about the state of climate science. It stated that, “Because there is considerable uncertainty in current understanding of how the climate system varies naturally and reacts to emissions of greenhouse gases and aerosols, current estimates of the magnitude of future warming should be regarded as tentative and subject to future adjustments (either upward or downward).”

Let me repeat that: “Considerable uncertainty in current understanding.” “Estimates should be regarded as tentative and subject to future adjustments.” Does this sound like solid support for the consensus view? Surely there must be more. Well, in fact there is.

Under the headline “The Effect of Human Activities,” the NAS addressed the potential impact of anthropogenic emissions on the climate system. Here’s what it said:

Because of the large and still uncertain level of natural variability inherent in the climate record and the uncertainties in the time histories of various forcing agents (and particularly aerosols), a causal linkage between the buildup of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and the observed climate changes in the 20th century cannot be unequivocally established.

Again, that’s worth repeating:

Because of the large and still uncertain level of natural variability . . . [u]ncertainties in the time histories of various forcing agents . . . cannot be unequivocally established.

I read numerous press accounts of the NAS report, yet I failed to come across reporting of this quote. Is this what the consensus peddlers have in mind when they assert that everything is “settled”?

The NAS also addressed the relationship between climate change and aerosols, which are particles from processes such as dust storms, forest fires,

the use of fossil fuels, and volcanic eruptions. To be sure, there is limited knowledge of how aerosols influence the climate system. This, said the NAS, represents “a large source of uncertainty about future climate change.”

By any conceivable standard, this and other statements made by NAS cannot possibly be considered unequivocal affirmations that man-made global warming is a threat, or that man-made emissions are the sole or most important factor driving climate change. It certainly cannot provide the basis for the United States Congress to adopt economically harmful reductions of greenhouse gas emissions.

It would be a grand folly to do that, especially considering what the NAS had to say about global climate models. The NAS believes much of the uncertainty about climate change stems from those models, which researchers rely on to make projections about future climate changes. These models, as the NAS wrote, contain serious technological limitations that cast doubt on their ability to simulate the climate system:

[the models] simulation skill is limited by uncertainties in their formulation, the limited size of their calculations, and the difficulty of interpreting their answers that exhibit as much complexity as in nature.”

Model projections, as the NAS pointed out, rest on a raft of uncertain assumptions.

Projecting future climate change first requires projecting the fossil-fuel and land-use sources of CO₂ and other gases and aerosols, the NAS found. “However, there are large uncertainties”—please note the phrasing again, “large uncertainties”—in underlying assumption about population growth, economic development, life style choices, technological change and energy alternatives, so that it is useful to examine scenarios developed from multiple perspectives in considering strategies for dealing with climate change.

For this reason, simulations produced by climate models provide insufficient proof of an absolute link between anthropogenic emissions and global warming.

The fact that the magnitude of the observed warming is large in comparison to natural variability as simulated in climate models is suggestive of such a linkage, [according to NAS] but it does not constitute proof of one because the model simulations could be deficient in natural variability on the decadal to century time scale.

That last point demands further elaboration and emphasis. The NAS thinks climate models could be off by as much as a decade, or perhaps 100 years. Why is this important? Global climate models constitute one of the Four Pillars. Alarmists frequently point to computer-generated simulations showing dramatic, even scary, pictures of what might happen decades from now: more floods, more hurricanes, more droughts, the Gulf Stream shutting down. In many cases, the media eagerly report what these models produce as pure fact, with little or

no explanation of their considerable limitations.

The NAS also addressed the work of the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, another of the Four Pillars. The IPCC's 2001 Third Assessment Report, particularly its Summary for Policymakers, is frequently cited as proof of the consensus view. But the NAS disagrees. "The IPCC Summary for Policymakers," the NAS wrote,

could give an impression that the science of global warming is settled, even though many uncertainties still remain.

Here again, the NAS is saying the science is not settled.

The NAS also addressed the IPCC's future climate scenarios. These scenarios are the basis for the IPCC's projection that temperatures could increase to between 2.7 to 10.4 degrees Fahrenheit by 2100. The NAS said:

The IPCC scenarios cover a broad range of assumptions about future economic and technological development, including some that allow greenhouse gas emission reductions. However, there are large uncertainties in underlying assumptions about population growth, life style choices, technological change, and energy alternatives.

Once again, the NAS says "there are large uncertainties in underlying assumptions."

The same is true, the NAS said, about future projections of CO₂ emissions. As the NAS stated:

Scenarios for future greenhouse gas amounts, especially for CO₂ and CO₄, are a major source of uncertainty for projections of future climate.

To bolster the point, the NAS found that actual CO₂ emissions contradicted the IPCC, stating that:

The increase of global fossil fuel CO₂ emissions in the past decade, averaging 0.6% per year, has fallen below the IPCC scenarios.

There are those troublesome words again: "Large uncertainties in underlying assumptions." "Major source of uncertainty."

The NAS also expressed clear reservations about the relationship between carbon dioxide emissions and how they interact with land and the atmosphere:

How much of the carbon from future use of fossil fuels will be seen as increases in carbon dioxide in the atmosphere will depend on what fractions are taken up by land and by the oceans. The exchanges with land occur on various time scales, out to centuries for soil decomposition in high latitudes, and they are sensitive to climate change. Their projection into the future is highly problematic.

Let me offer one final quote from the study before I turn to the media. Taking stock of the many scientific uncertainties highlighted in the report, the NAS issued explicit advice to guide climate research—advice, by the way, that alarmists reject:

The most valuable contribution U.S. scientists can make is to continually question basic assumptions and conclusions, promote clear and careful appraisal and presentation of the uncertainties about climate change as well as those areas in which science is lead-

ing to robust conclusions, and work toward a significant improvement in the ability to project the future.

I am concerned about the media. I will talk about that in a minute.

People are trying to say that the release of CO₂ is the cause of climate change. These people have to understand that historically it doesn't work out that way. We went into a time right after World War II when we had an 85-percent increase in CO₂ emissions. What happened there was that precipitated not a warming period but a cooling period. Again, that is too logical for some of the alarmists to understand. They want so badly to feel a crisis is upon us.

It is kind of interesting. There is a well-known author, Michael Crichton, who wrote a book, "State of Fear." I recommend that everyone read that. He is a scientist and a medical doctor who wrote this about how horrible things could happen with global warming. After he researched it, he came to the conclusion that it is a hoax. I recommend everyone read that book. It is very revealing. It is very accurate in the way the media and Hollywood are treating things.

It's not surprising that the media distorted and exaggerated the NAS report. The public was told that the NAS categorically accepted that carbon dioxide emissions were the overwhelming factor causing global warming, and that urgent action was needed. One factually challenged CNN reporter said the NAS study represented "a unanimous decision that global warming is real, is getting worse, and is due to man. There is no wiggle room." The New York Times opined that the report reaffirmed "the threat of global warming, declaring fearlessly that human activity is largely responsible for it." Of course, as the preceding quotes from the report show, this is not true.

This is the report we are talking about with all of the qualifications they have. Of course, the proceedings from this report show it is not true. It is an outrageous lie.

Unfortunately, the media wasn't burdened with any actual knowledge of the report. Rather, it seized on a sentence fragment from the report's summary, and then jumped to conclusions that, to be charitable, cannot be squared with the full report. That fragment from the summary reads as follows: "Temperatures are, in fact, rising. The changes observed over the last several decades are likely mostly due to human activities. . ." There's the smoking gun, we were told then and even now, proving a global warming consensus.

However, the second part of the sentence, along with much else in the report, was simply ignored. The second part of the sentence reads: "We cannot rule out that some significant part of these changes is also a reflection of natural variability."

And as we have seen, it is amazing how one could conclude that the NAS

"left no wiggle room" that "global warming is due to man." Dr. Richard Lindzen, a professor of meteorology at MIT, and a member of the NAS panel that produced the report, expressed his astonishment in an editorial in the Wall Street Journal on June 11, 2001. Dr. Lindzen wrote that the NAS report showed "there is no consensus, unanimous or otherwise, about long-term climate trends and what causes them." Yet to this day, the media continues to report exactly the opposite.

As I noted earlier, raising uncertainties or questioning basic assertions about global warming is considered "nonsense." I wonder if the same applies to the NAS. For on just about every page of the 2001 report, the NAS did exactly that.

But for the alarmists, global warming has nothing to do with science or scientific inquiry. Science is not about the inquiry to discover truth, but a mask to achieve an ideological agenda. For some, this issue has become a secular religion, pure and simple.

Dr. Richard Lindzen has written eloquently and powerfully on this point, so I will end with his words: "Science, in the public arena, is commonly used as a source of authority with which to bludgeon political opponents and propagandize uninformed citizens. This is what has been done with both the reports of the IPCC and the NAS. It is a reprehensible practice that corrodes our ability to make rational decisions. A fairer view of the science will show that there is still a vast amount of uncertainty—far more than advocates of Kyoto would like to acknowledge—and that the NAS report has hardly ended the debate. Nor was it meant to."

This is Dr. Lindzen. No one will question his credibility and his background.

We know the economic damage that will be done to America. We have all talked about the report on the economics survey. That survey showed how much energy would increase, should we have to comply with the Kyoto Treaty. It shows it would cost the average American family of four \$2,175 a year. So we know how expensive that is. That is all documented.

You might say, Wait a minute. If this is true, if the science is not established and there is that much economic damage to the United States, why are we doing this? I think the answer to that could be given from quoting two individuals. One is not exactly an American hero, Jacques Chirac from France, who said:

Kyoto represents the first component of an authentic governance.

Then some of you may have heard of Margo Wallstrom, the Environmental Minister of the European Union. She said:

Global warming is not about climate. It is about leveling the economic playing field worldwide.

I hope the first pillar has been discredited, and next week we will start with pillar No. 2 in hopes that we can have a wake-up call for the American

people—that these same alarmists who were concerned about global cooling two decades ago will quit worrying so much about their own agenda and start looking at the science.

I feel an obligation as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee to look at the science. Certainly the Presiding Officer is a valued member of that committee. We have a commitment to look at sound science, as unpopular as it may be.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEMINT). The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I was pleased to hear the thought-provoking comments of the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee. I thank him much for the work he has done there. Some of the things he said reminded me of an analogy to a totally different situation. When somebody was misusing some scientific facts, the comment was, They used the facts like a drunk uses a light post—for support rather than for illumination.

But I look forward to reading the book “State of Fear” by Dr. Crichton.

We appreciate the ongoing discussions that we will have.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced, along with Senators INHOFE, VITTER, WARNER, VOINOVICH, ISAKSON, THUNE, MURKOWSKI, OBAMA, LANDRIEU, GRASSLEY, HARKIN, TALENT, CORNYN, COCHRAN, DOMENICI and COLEMAN, the 2005 Water Resources Development Act, S. 728.

The programs administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers are invaluable to this Nation. They provide drinking water, electric power production, river transportation, environmental protection and restoration, protection from floods, emergency response, and recreation.

Few agencies in the Federal Government touch so many citizens, and with such little recognition by many, I might add, and they do it on a relatively small budget. They provide one-quarter of our Nation’s total hydropower output, operate 456 lakes in 43 States, hosting 33 percent of all freshwater lake fishing. They facilitate the movement of 630 million tons of cargo valued at over \$73 billion annually through our inland system. They manage over 12 million acres of land and water; provide 3 trillion gallons of water for use by local communities and businesses; and they have provided an estimated \$706 billion in flood damage within the past 25 years with an investment one-seventh of that value.

During the 1993 flood alone, an experience which I witnessed firsthand, an estimated \$19.1 billion in flood damage was prevented by flood control facilities in place at that time.

Our ports move over 95 percent of U.S. overseas trade by weight and 75 percent by value.

Between 1970 and 2003, the value of U.S. trade increased 24-fold, and 70 percent since 1994. That was an average annual growth rate of 10.2 percent, nearly double the pace of the gross domestic product growth during the same period.

Unfortunately, the American Society of Civil Engineers has issued a grade on our navigable waterways infrastructure. They gave it a D— with over 50 percent of the locks “functionally obsolete” despite increased demand.

Recently, a story in the Wall Street Journal warned of the current condition. It begins:

The nation’s freight-bearing waterway system, plagued by age and breakdowns, is saddling the many companies that rely on the network with a growing number of supply disruptions and added costs.

While some consider it an anachronism in the age of e-commerce, the system remains vital to a broad swath of the economy, carrying everything from jet fuel and coal to salt and the wax for coating milk cartons. The network stretches 12,000 miles, mostly through the nation’s vast web of rivers, and relies on a series of dams and locks, which are enormous chambers that act as elevators for moving barges from one elevation of water to another.

Much of the infrastructure was built early in the last century. It’s showing the effects of time and, according to some, of neglect. Old equipment takes longer to repair, and it’s more vulnerable to nature’s extremes.

The bipartisan bill is one that traditionally is produced by the Congress every 2 years. However, we have not passed a WRDA bill since 2000. The longer we wait, the more unmet needs pile up, the more complicated the demands upon the bill become, making it harder and harder to win approval. For some, the bill is small; for others, it is too big; for some, the new regulations are too onerous; and for others, the new regulations are not onerous enough.

Nevertheless, I believe we have struck a balance here, largely on a bipartisan basis, that disciplines the new projects to criteria fairly applied while addressing a great number of water resource priorities.

With the new regulations, we have embraced a commonsense, bipartisan proposal by Senators LANDRIEU and COCHRAN, similar to the bipartisan House agreement that requires major projects to be subject to independent peer review, and requires, if necessary, mitigation for projects be completed at the same time the project is completed, or, in special cases, no longer than 1 year after project completion. This compromise will impose a cost on communities, particularly smaller communities, but it is not as onerous as the new regulations proposed last year which ultimately prevented a final agreement from being reached between the House and the Senate.

The commanding features of this bill are its landmark environmental and ecosystem restoration authorities. Nearly 60 percent of the bill authorizes such efforts, including environmental restoration of the Everglades, coastal

Louisiana, Chesapeake Bay, Missouri River, Long Island Sound, Salton Sea, Connecticut, the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers, and others.

Additionally, we have included the previously introduced bipartisan proposal to modernize the aging locks on the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers, designed 70 years ago for paddlewheel boats.

We should do simply for the future what our predecessors did for the present and build the systems designed to improve our competitiveness, our standard of living, and environmental protection. It does not happen overnight and we have experienced far too much delay already. We spent 12 years and \$70 million to complete what was supposed to be a 6-year, \$25 million study.

Without a competitive transportation system, the promise of expanded trade and commercial growth is empty, job opportunities are lost, and we will be unprepared for the challenges of this new century.

A lot of people don’t appreciate the fact that one medium-sized river barge tow carries the same freight as 870 trucks. That should speak pretty significantly for the efficiency and environmental protection of water transportation.

Eighty years ago, leaders in this Nation wanting to build a better tomorrow made investments in our productive capacity to help our producers ship goods and hire workers. At that time, investments were expensive and controversial. Some even said the investments were not justified. The Corps said they were not satisfied.

But Congress decided otherwise, that it was a better idea to shape the future rather than to try to make unsound predictions of the future.

Eighty million tons of annual cargo later, it is clear Congress was right in that judgment. In the last 35 years, waterborne commerce on the upper Mississippi River has tripled, but the system is not suited to this century. It is a one-lane highway in a four-lane world economy. If we fail to act, we lose and our foreign competitors win, outsourcing jobs by Government paralysis.

Last year, the United States Department of Agriculture chief economist Keith Collins predicted corn exports through the Gulf would grow 45 percent in 10 years. We asked him why he wasn’t making a 50-year prediction, which was asked of that ridiculous 12-year, \$70 million study. He said nobody in their right mind could make a prediction 50 years in the future and it was taking a lot of assumptions to make a 10-year prediction. But we cannot see the exports grow, we cannot get revenue for our farmers, we cannot strengthen our rural communities and improve our balance of trade if trade is constrained by the transportation straitjacket we currently have.