

per barrel, pushing this overall figure even higher. Fuel costs are the second biggest cost for our nation's airlines.

The chief of the IATA said that each dollar rise in the cost of oil boosts the industry's total fuel costs by about a billion dollars annually.

Airlines, many on the verge of bankruptcy like United Airlines in my State, cannot afford this. Workers and retirees are impacted with wage and benefits cuts. United Airlines reported that their fuel costs soared \$200 million in just the first quarter of 2005.

And in this industry, where fuel makes up such a large portion on the companies operating budget, fuel efficiency is leading purchase decisions.

For instance, the next Boeing jetliner, the 787, is projected to be 20 percent more fuel efficient than its predecessors, key factor being cited by airlines like Air Canada and others who have placed orders for the new model.

The economic toll that rising energy costs has on the industrial sector is also large. For instance a \$1 increase in the price of oil costs U.S. companies and consumers about \$828 million in trucking costs each year.

And families are impacted too, making hard decisions as the money gasoline they pump into their gas tanks eats at a bigger portion of their paycheck.

I raise these issues because I think we can help move America in a direction whereby reducing demand will help to insulate our economy, our jobs and our national security from oil prices spikes brought on by either production quotas, infrastructure delivery implications or instability in foreign countries.

There is potential job growth if America embraces a new vision. For instance, a report completed by the Renewable Fuels Association estimated that doubling the production of ethanol could create 234,840 new jobs in all sectors of the U.S. economy—help communities grow and rejuvenate cities.

Advancing technological innovation can encourage our traditionally robust manufacturing sectors provide new parts and products that we will need to meet our goals. Cynics point to what we know, increasing fuel economy standards, visionaries embrace new ideas, advancing engineering design, alternative fuels, hybrids, hydrogen—and who knows what next.

Building new infrastructure or retooling factories are jobs that will be in America—not overseas. These jobs will provide stronger markets for goods and labor—reinvigorating some cities across the U.S.

Yesterday, Mr. Woolsey noted in our press conference that the U.S. borrows \$4 billion annually to buy foreign oil. If each billion spent abroad were spent in the United States, we could create 10,000–20,000 American jobs, many in rural communities.

Technological change and advancement has always been a recipe for success for America. From the Wright

brother's flier to the creation of the personal computer, we have created ways to advance and provide jobs for Americans while doing so.

But America needs to agree that we have to move in this direction. The Cantwell "40 in 20" Amendment establishes the goal that moves the U.S. forward.

Earlier on the floor today, I heard one of my colleagues say that it is not possible to reach the goal established by this amendment. First, how do we know if we do not try. Second, I challenge American's to do so—because it is our Nation's best interest.

The AP story yesterday noted that an energy analyst cautioned that, what is the so-called "global depletion midpoint"—the point at which roughly half of oil reserves have been tapped and production can no longer be increased—could come by the end of the decade.

For me, I believe that we have no choice but to turn around before it's too late.

In May 1961, President John F. Kennedy set the goal of landing an American on the moon. He did not prescribe to scientists how to get an American to the Moon; he set the goal, and provided the resources to meet that goal. Only nine years later, Neil Armstrong and Edwin Aldrin made the first human steps on the Moon. I know there were skeptics at the time—I wasn't one of them, but there were—thinking a man couldn't walk on the Moon. But we did, and we've done so much more since.

When American's are challenged they have proven that they can and will rise to the occasion.

I encourage each one of my colleagues to think long and hard about this amendment and what vision they have for America.

If you want an America whose economy is strapped to the whims of foreign governments and supply shocks of foreign oil, then vote no on this amendment.

If you believe that America's great thinkers, innovators, scientists and businesses cannot create the solutions that we need to reach this goal then you should vote no on this amendment.

If you believe that we cannot create more jobs by increasing domestically produced fuels, then you should vote no on this amendment.

But if you want a different America, one where your children or grandchildren can don a lab-coat instead of a flack-jacket; where energy solutions can create jobs, protect the environment and safeguard public health and believe that America's economic prosperity and national security are our highest priority, I encourage you to vote yes on the Cantwell energy security amendment.

In keeping with the bipartisan nature of this bill to date, I encourage all my colleagues to pass this amendment and move America toward an energy independent future.

The Cantwell amendment moves us in the right direction, reducing our de-

pendence on foreign oil and reducing our dependence on the nations that supply that oil.

Critics have come to the Senate floor and said: Well, she does not spell out how to do it. This bill spells out many ways that we could move toward less dependence on foreign oil, and because it is a good bipartisan bill, I am looking forward to supporting it.

These things which I have noted are already existing technology that can be used to move us toward this goal. For those of us who have a positive, optimistic view of the creativity and freedom in America, the Cantwell amendment sets us on a goal that America should achieve on a bipartisan basis.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting the amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, during Senate vote No. 139, pertaining to amendment No. 779, I was necessarily absent. Had I been present, I intended to vote "yes." I ask that the RECORD reflect this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed as if in morning business.

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

#### JOHN BOLTON NOMINATION

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today in an attempt once again to resolve an intelligence-related issue with regard to the nomination of Under Secretary John Bolton to be the U.S. Representative to the United Nations. As my colleagues are probably aware, for some time I have been engaged in an effort to assist my colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with some concerns they have with regard to Mr. Bolton and his request for U.S. person identities that are contained in certain intelligence reports.

The last time I came to the floor of the Senate, I spoke at length about Mr. Bolton's requests. After reviewing the actual reports and examining the process whereby he was provided the information that he sought, it was apparent to me that Mr. Bolton's requests were not only appropriate but very routine. As far as I was concerned, that was the end of the matter, and I so indicated in my response to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator LUGAR, in a letter.

Based on statements by some of my colleagues, concerns about Mr. Bolton's requests for identities have apparently expanded to include whether the Under Secretary sought these identities to exert some form of retribution against certain Government officials. Although the Foreign Relations Committee's minority views and statements made by minority members seem to indicate that the universe of these officials, or their concerns about

these officials, is very small, it is now very clear that this universe is indeed expanding, if not exploding. In fact, in a response I received from the distinguished ranking member, Senator BIDEN, and Senator DODD, we have gone from the innermost planets in our solar system of their concern to include the entire Milky Way. I have informed my colleagues that I could not support such a request because it appears to be more of an effort to preserve this issue, this stalemate, this what some people call a filibuster, than an effort to resolve it.

I also informed Senators BIDEN and DODD, however, that I could recommend a more focused request that is consistent with their public statements in their minority views. I believe that such a request could be a basis for moving this process forward, a goal I hoped we all shared to get the process moving.

In the interest of moving forward, I urged my colleagues to reconsider the scope of their request. The response quite frankly was, no, thank you. That is probably the nicest way I can put it. I believe their bottom line is now: Give us all of the names we have now put in play or no deal.

As members of the legislative branch, we have all been in the position of requesting information from the executive branch and being told no. That is not pleasant. That is not what we would like to hear from the executive branch. But we do understand—I think, I hope—that there are limits to what we can demand and expect to receive. That is just a fact of life as we negotiate the separation of powers between the two branches of Government.

My colleagues know full well that an absolutist will inevitably lead to a stalemate, and that is what has happened. That is why we tried to work in good faith to address our concerns while recognizing each branch's responsibility and their prerogatives.

In my experience, a middle ground is usually achievable. It may take time, but usually we can achieve it. In this case, I believe the administration was willing to meet my colleagues halfway. In other words, if they would provide a reasonable list of names based on actual findings by the committee, perhaps they could be assured that those names were not contained in the reports and their concerns would be simply allayed, while at the same time it would permit the executive to preserve its prerogative to control the dissemination of very sensitive information.

Let me just say that signals intelligence and intercepts is in the highest compartmented criteria in regards to intelligence information. So this is very sensitive.

Once again, I think that the middle ground, unfortunately, proved very elusive. I am sympathetic to my colleagues' desire to see information they deem necessary to their consideration of Mr. Bolton's nomination. I do not believe, however, that they should be

imposing their standard on the entire Senate. The last cloture vote clearly demonstrated that a clear majority believes that the Senate does possess the sufficient information to vote on Mr. Bolton's nomination, and vote we should.

With that said, I am prepared to go one step further, in one last good-faith effort, to try to alleviate the concerns expressed by my colleagues across the aisle. Because my colleagues would not share their list of names with me, I have taken what may be viewed as the somewhat unorthodox step of compiling a list of names that I believe do actually reflect the universe of individuals who fall within the parameters set by my colleagues' public statements and their minority views.

I am not doing this with temerity. I am trying to make a good-faith effort, and I hope people appreciate my intent in the doing of this. I want my colleagues to know that I have done this in a sincere effort to move this process forward. I do not in any way wish to substitute my judgment for my colleagues', but I do hope we can reach some sort of an accommodation. So I have submitted my list of names to the Director of National Intelligence, John Negroponte, and he has assured me that none of them are among the names requested by Under Secretary Bolton.

The names I submitted included Carl Ford, Assistant Secretary of State for Intelligence and Research, his name is not in the intercepts; Christian Westermann of the INR, State Department intelligence branch, not in the intercepts; the individual known as Mr. Smith, not in the intercepts; Rexon Ryu, State Department official, not in the intercepts; Charles L. Pritchard, special envoy for negotiations with North Korea, not in the intercepts.

There were two other individuals referenced in the minority views whose names have not been made public, and I will not do so now. However, I did submit their names, and they were not in the intercepts. I am more than willing to share the two names with my colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee, but I will not discuss them publicly.

Finally, the Foreign Relations Committee's minority views also referenced two other unnamed individuals. I understand, however, that the committee itself is not aware of who these people are, and therefore it is highly unlikely that those names would be part of anybody's list. They were certainly not on mine.

I strongly believe this compromise represents the best middle ground and should more than satisfy the concerns of my colleagues. These are the names that were mentioned in the minority views. These are the names that were mentioned in regard to the people who were interviewed. These are the names that have been referred to in the press and the media over and over again. That is what this universe is about.

I am very hopeful that this should more than satisfy the concerns of my colleagues, unless, of course, they are not interested in being satisfied, and if that is the case, there is really nothing further anybody can do to move this process forward.

I believe it is high time that we vote on this nomination, up or down, whichever way the chips fall. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take the next step, whether they are in favor of Mr. Bolton's nomination or not, whether they are for him or they are opposed. We have made some strides recently, it seems to me, in moving nominations to a vote. It seems to me we should continue that trend with Mr. Bolton's nomination and get on with the business of the Senate.

I hope I have been helpful. I hope people do not take my actions in the wrong way. I am acting in good faith in the very best way I know how to reach a compromise to alleviate the concerns of my friends across the aisle. I hope that has been the case in regards to my remarks this evening.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR JIM EXON OF NEBRASKA

• Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, with the passing of former Senator Jim Exon on Friday, a giant oak in the forest of public service has fallen. Political historians will remember him as a dominant force in Nebraska politics across nearly 3 decades, serving two terms as Governor and three as Senator. Those of us who were privileged to be his friend remember him, first and foremost, as a man of enormous decency, integrity, and common sense. We remember his quick mind; his slow, gravely voice; his Midwestern directness and unpretentiousness.

Here on the Senate floor, I am privileged to sit at the same desk that Senator Exon used during the last of his 18 years in the Senate. I inherited it upon his retirement in 1996, and I have always considered it a special honor to carry on where he left off.

Of course, for people in Iowa, Jim Exon was a next-door neighbor. Over the years, Iowans got to know him well