

voices here that speak to these oil company executives about a new course of action.

Gasoline prices across America are intolerable. We can go through community after community, and you can see it when you go home, as I did this last work period, the Easter work period, back in the State of Illinois. People understand this one. They understand there is a failure in leadership. If we lament the fact that people don't get up and vote and don't seem to care about the state of our Government, it is because when they are in trouble, the Government is not there.

The simple speech made by the President yesterday is not the answer, but it is the beginning, I hope, of a dialog, a bipartisan dialog to move us in a new direction.

I hope the President not only invites the oil company executives in to tell them they are destroying the American economy but also invites people from both sides of the aisle in, in a bipartisan dialog, about a new direction. To give a speech on Earth Day about hydrogen-powered cars is an interesting, long-term concept. It is certainly not a near-term or medium-term answer to what we are faced with in America.

We have to have a new approach and a new direction when it comes to our energy. There are ways to do it. Lessening our dependence on foreign oil, an amendment offered by Senator CANTWELL of Washington to the Energy bill, was rejected on a partisan vote. It said: Why doesn't America set a goal of reducing our dependence on foreign oil by at least 50 percent over the next few years? It was rejected on a partisan basis. Everyone on the other side of the aisle voted against it. Why? In my mind, that is the beginning of energy independence and a stronger American economy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VITTER). Who yields time?

The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry: How much time do we have now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes remain on the majority side.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand I will get a part of that time, and I will yield part of that time to the Senator from Alaska when she arrives.

ENERGY

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today to talk candidly about rising gasoline prices and what we can do about them. I have been deeply concerned about our reliance on foreign oil and the rising cost of energy for many years. That was one of the reasons I gave up my post as chairman of the Budget Committee in the Senate to become chairman of the Energy Committee. I saw energy dependence and rising energy prices as a big problem for this great Nation, and I wanted to help solve it.

Last year, we passed a bipartisan policy act called the Energy Policy Act of 2005. It was the first comprehensive Energy bill in 12 years. It took Republicans and Democrats 5 years and a lot of hard work to get this bill passed. It is an excellent bill and one I am proud of. This bill fixed a lot of our energy problems, and in a year or two from now, it will fix a lot more. Let me highlight a couple of the remarkable accomplishments which our Energy bill has put before the American people.

We create a pilot program in seven Western States that will streamline the permitting process so oil and oil developers won't have to wait years to develop their leases. Some people wonder: Are we doing anything to help America solve our problems? One thing we must do is develop our resources where we have them and where we can. We cannot sit by and be naysayers about developing what we have that we can use, so we don't have to buy it from others.

In this bill, we require 8 billion gallons of ethanol be included in the gasoline by 2012. This provision will help ethanol displace 2 billion barrels of foreign oil over the next 6 years.

There are those on the other side who say the President proposed nothing to help the farmers of the United States and the ranching community. I just discussed with you what the Energy bill will do with reference to ethanol, and all of that creates a new market for the products of our farmers, makes them wealthy, gives them alternatives to sell their product so they can be used to ultimately go into the tanks of our automobiles in lieu of crude-oil derivatives called gasoline. We provide several incentives in this bill for new nuclear power that have prompted nine utility consortia to plan at least 19 new nuclear powerplants in the immediate future. We had zero, we are already moving toward 19, and some think it is 22.

The bill encourages wind, solar, and geothermal sources. Our incentives will bring more than 14,000 megawatts of wind energy that could be on line by the end of next year, which is enough energy to power roughly 5 million homes for 1 year. Those are the things we did. Those are the things that would have all been front and center had Katrina not hit us and taken away all of the positives we were thinking of and put us in that tank that came as a result of that enormous hurricane which we are still recovering from. But all of the things I am discussing are there, actually taking place, as the United States changes because of that new energy bill.

The oil and gas prices continued to climb after the Energy bill was passed, and a lot of that was due to the hurricane I have described. We still have two refineries that are down because of the storm. That accounts for 5 percent of our refining capacity. We have lost about 1.5 million barrels of oil per day because of damaged oil rigs. That is a

whopping 22 percent of our domestic production.

So for all of those who wonder: Did anything happen that could have caused the problems we are having that might have been otherwise? Obviously we can look at Katrina and say something very bad happened. We didn't have to have that. Things could have been better.

Let me talk about the global unrest and the rising global demand that has driven up the prices of oil across the globe. Oil is a global commodity. Nobody knows what a barrel of oil is worth as it comes out of the ground. Nobody knows what it is inherently worth. Let me say to my fellow Americans, I regret to tell you, it is worth what somebody will pay for it. That sounds strange, but that is what it is. It comes out of the ground, it is gathered up, and when it finally gets on a ship, somebody buys it. And what do they buy it for? They buy it for what they think it is worth, and they bid it, and that is what it is worth. So oil is worth what people pay for it. Regrettably, they are paying more and more because they are worried about the world situation and whether oil supply is credible, whether it is going to remain reliable. So they bid it up higher and higher.

Problems in producing nations such as Venezuela, Nigeria, and Iran have sharply driven up this price, along with this great, new, voracious appetite on the part of China and India. They are entitled—they are entitled, just as we are—to use this oil, and they are buying it up, bidding it up, causing the supply and demand to have the impact I am describing with all of you here this morning.

There are some things we can do to try to ameliorate this problem, and, yes, some of them are very difficult. Most of it we can't do much about, unless we either wean ourselves off foreign oil, which will take several years to do, or dramatically increase our own production of oil. I regret to say there are too many on the other side of the aisle, not everyone but most on the other side of the aisle here in the Senate and in the House who refuse to acknowledge that we must produce more of our own wherever we can.

Let's talk about what we can do.

President Bush proposed four things yesterday, and I endorse every one of them. Every one of those is now out there for the market to look at, for everyone to look at, and they have already had a positive effect. He wants an aggressive investigation of fraud and manipulation. We mandated a similar investigation in the Energy bill, and I absolutely support what the President called for—an ongoing investigation into the manipulation or cheating that might be taking place. Let's get on with it. Let's put the resources in. Let's make sure the American people feel comfortable that it is taking place. We are doing it. Whether it proves anything, we will have to wait and see.

The President wants to do another thing. He wants to repeal certain tax breaks that are in the Energy bill. He says they are unnecessary for oil companies. I agree. Actually, I thought they would do some good, but the President has convinced me and many of us, under his leadership, to repeal those tax items that are in the bill. I am happy to take the lead, along with those who write the tax laws, and see if we can repeal and eliminate the deep-water drilling tax relief that is in the bill.

The President also recommended and announced that he will temporarily halt the filling of SPR, a move I hope will free up about 12 million barrels of oil this summer, meaning we won't use it for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. So it will be available to those who are purchasing oil to be used as we have been describing it here: for the marketplace to put in refineries and be used by the great demand that is worldwide.

If we had developed ANWR—and I note the presence of the junior Senator from Alaska on the floor—if we had done that 10 years ago, if we had passed ANWR legislation—we did pass it. Had the President of the United States not vetoed it—and that was President Bill Clinton who vetoed it—then what we would have had available is at least 1 million barrels of oil—American owned—that we could use every day, and it would be added to the inventory that is out there for the world to use, and for the United States it would be a dramatic reduction in the amount of oil we would have to buy from others.

We have to wake up. There is nothing to be damaged. You can go look at ANWR and see what we would be doing with new drilling, new approaches to drilling, if we would get that done. It is regrettable that we won't produce our own and we will sit and talk and blame, and in particular, the other side will blame the President and blame Republicans. These Senators understand that today's gasoline prices are driven ever increasingly by long-term speculation on global production. They understand that a strong signal on supply can drive prices up today and down tomorrow. They know a vote to develop ANWR will have an immediate impact on oil prices, which in turn will have an immediate impact on gasoline prices.

Look at what happened to the energy markets yesterday after the President announced his four-prong plan. Energy prices fell. Yet these same Senators fought against ANWR, fought against OCS production, and have consistently fought against new energy production almost anywhere, production they know will ease our price and supply problems.

We have worked in the committee and marked up, gotten ready for a vote, Lease Sale 181 on natural gas, a bill that will develop oil and gas 100 miles off the coast of Florida. Democrats have threatened to filibuster the bill when it comes to the floor. It

shows there is no desire to produce even what is our own.

The Massachusetts delegation continues to block the Weaver Cove liquefied natural gas facility, a facility proposed for Fall River that would provide 400,000 mcf of natural gas per day. That is enough to ease the price and supply pressure for most of New England.

Another example is if you don't want to produce energy that is our own, then you ought not be complaining about the fact that the price continues to rise because of shortages in global markets. Instead, today some on the other side propose a tax holiday. I find it interesting that it is Democrats who want to temporarily repeal the gasoline taxes since it was they who voted over the years to increase that same tax.

I can support the idea of a holiday. I like the idea of helping American families keep some of their money they are spending at the gas pump. But we use that money to build roads and mass transit. The Federal Government is going to have to make up those revenues somewhere. So let me propose this idea: Let's let the oil companies make up the difference. That is what we ought to do.

Anyway, I suggest we are on the right track. The President's suggestions are good suggestions, and we can come up with some more. But in the meantime, we ought to tell the American people the truth: There is no quick fix, and it is easier to blame than it is to have solutions. Let's look for the solutions and then we will all get a chance to judge who is doing the most to help America move toward energy independence.

I believe I have some additional time, and I yield it to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VITTER). At this time all time has expired on the majority side.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes to be added on this side and on the other side as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished chairman of the Energy Committee who has taken such a leadership role on the issue of achieving energy independence for this country.

We all had an opportunity to go home over the past couple of weeks, and I think it is fair to say that without question, in every State across this country, the No. 1 issue our constituents are talking about is energy prices. With the crude oil prices passing an all-time high of \$75 a barrel last week, I think it is fair to say we can anticipate that the prices will go higher and higher.

It seems we all want to blame someone. Americans want to blame someone—anyone—for the high prices. They want to blame the oil industry companies that have been showing record

profits. They want to blame the filling station operators and accuse them of price gouging. They want to blame the oil commodities traders for bidding up the price of crude. They want to blame the Congress for allowing and perhaps encouraging these prices. Quite frankly, it is hard for us not to accept some of the blame. But what Americans don't want to accept is that these prices we are seeing are the result of nearly 20 years of incoherent energy policy.

The reasons for the price increases are many, and we have heard the chairman discuss many of them. But the biggest goes back to the lessons we learned in high school economics about the law of supply and demand. Today the world consumes 80 million barrels of oil a day. The U.S. is responsible for a quarter of that. Right now, our oil producers collectively around the world have the ability to produce at most 81 million barrels daily. So the demand is bumping dangerously close to maximum current supply, and that demand for the oil is booming.

We talked about China. China last week announced that its economy grew more than 10 percent last year, and its demand for fuel is rising an equivalent amount. Developing nations are outbidding industrial nations for oil, and the trend continues. Demand for fuel in the Asian Pacific region is likely to grow at over 3 percent annually for the next 25 years, nearly 5 times the growth rate of fuel use in North America and 4 times the rate in Europe.

In addition to the demand side of the picture, the supply side is down. Six percent of the Nation's oil production remains offline as a result of the damage from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. We have often talked about the world's supply. The world's supply is uncertain, given the unrest we are seeing in Nigeria, the political events in Venezuela, rhetoric from Iran, supply disruptions that plague Iraq.

We here in Congress also have a place in this equation when we look to the supply side. It was 6 years ago that Congress passed the requirement that said by June 1 of this year the Nation's refineries must reduce the sulfur in diesel fuel from 500 parts per million to 15 parts per million, and refiners have spent the money, more than \$8 billion, to comply. The changes are this: They are going to cut the diesel exhaust pollution by 90 percent. But it does take more fuel to make a similar amount of diesel, and it is costing the refineries more money to comply with the ultralow sulfur diesel rules.

Last year we were talking about MTBE and what to do about it. We didn't provide for an organized phase-out of MTBE, which means the refineries are rushing to acquire ethanol to replace MTBE in gasoline. What this does is causes a host of different price pressures, from the added costs of building new tanks to store the ethanol to the crush of finding railroad tank

cars to move the ethanol from the Midwest to the Northeast and down into Texas, where it can be blended into the gasoline.

Since it requires a special base form of gasoline, the ethanol-to-MTBE switch makes it difficult for us to import gasoline from overseas to relieve these price pressures, because outside of Europe there are few foreign refineries that can actually make this base form. So that means tighter fuel supplies that cannot readily be remedied by imported product.

We talk about the cost to us as Americans. According to the Energy Information Administration, we are already paying about twice as much for fuel today as we did in the summer of 2002. On the whole, our country is spending \$212 million more per day for gasoline than we did last year, a half billion dollars more per day than 4 years ago. It is incredible.

What do we do about it? The chairman of the Energy Committee noted some of the steps, and noted some of the steps the President has advanced. But our first effort today is to conserve, to increase our conservation and efficiency efforts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

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

Ms. MURKOWSKI. We must do the simple things first. Conservation, efficiency, make sure the tires are inflated, our cars are in tune, drive less, reduce the air conditioning—those small things that will make a difference. We have to move quickly to increase our fuel efficiency, continue to expand the use of renewables such as wind, geothermal, biomass, oceans, solar—all of those that are available. But we must increase our domestic supplies of oil and natural gas, and the first place we start is up in ANWR. We have the ability to do it. We have demonstrated that we can. Opening ANWR would produce up to 1 million barrels a day of additional oil for 30 years to meet the world demand and drive the prices down.

People are saying it is not going to make a difference today, and they are correct. But we didn't get to this place in 1 day. What we are anticipating is the need down the road. Anyone who thinks in 5 or 10 years there are not going to be anymore hurricanes or supply disruptions or production impediments is fooling himself. So let's plan for the future. Let's plan for our own domestic energy security by doing what we can in this country. The first place to start is by opening ANWR to limited oil exploration and development, and doing it in an environmentally sensitive and balanced manner.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, 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. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I understand the remaining time on the Democratic side is not needed and may be yielded back.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield back the remaining time on the Democratic side.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At this time, morning business is closed.

MAKING EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2006

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 4939, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4939), making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Gregg modified amendment No. 3594, to provide, with an offset, emergency funding for border security efforts.

Harkin/Grassley amendment No. 3600, to limit the compensation of employees funded through the Employment and Training Administration.

Reid amendment No. 3604, to provide, with an offset, emergency funding for border security efforts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I yield to myself 15 minutes.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, there will be a rare opportunity about noon on the Senate floor. There will be a chance for the American people to have for themselves a handy list of big spenders, something they can put on their blogs, something they can put in their newsletters, something they can speak about at the dinner table, something they can read to friends. There is always a lot of talk around here about who is responsible for the fact that the Federal Government is spending more money than it ought to. We are about to see a good example of who is responsible for that, if things go true to form, because we will have two amendments before us at noon. One is by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, Senator GREGG, and one by the distinguished Democratic leader, Senator

REID. Both of them are border security amendments.

There will not be very many votes in this body, I suspect, against border security. I want to speak about border security because the Gregg amendment takes very important steps to maintain our current level of security on the border, which is a minimum level of security. I am proud to cosponsor that. And the Gregg amendment pays for it by taking money from other parts of the President's budget. That is the Gregg amendment.

The Reid amendment, as I understand it, which we will be voting on side by side, does identically the same thing on border security the Gregg amendment does, except it pretends that money comes out of thin air, that it grows on trees, that it comes from nowhere. It is the thing we see time and time again around here, whereby someone comes up with an essential, good idea but with no way to pay for it. So we print the money, make it up, and the runaway spending goes on and on.

I wish to talk this morning a little bit about those two issues—first, border security, the subject of the Gregg amendment and why I believe it is essential that we adopt it as part of the supplemental appropriations bill that is before us. I also want to talk about the difference between how it is paid for so the American people can get ready to make their handy list of big spenders because those who vote for the Reid amendment will be on a handy list of big spenders because that amendment is not paid for.

Let me start with the Gregg amendment and the condition of border security. Americans are angry about border security, or the lack of it. They have a right to be angry about border security, or the lack of it. That is not the responsibility of the Governor of the State of Arizona or the Governor of Texas or the Governor of California. It is a Federal responsibility. Immigration is our job. Border security is our job. It is a Washington job and it is a job that has been neglected for a long period of time.

At least to the credit of the majority leader, he has forced this Senate to deal with this issue and we are in the middle of it and we ought not rest nor go home again until we deal with the issue of border security. There are a lot of other issues that do not have to deal with immigration. How many temporary students do we want here in the United States? We have 572,000 of them today. They are an important part of our country, contributing to our standard of living. When they go home, they usually spread our values and our good will better than any foreign aid ever has. We have about half a million people who are here each year and we give them new temporary worker status. It is important to have them here as well, because in a vibrant, growing economy, we need more workers. We have an important debate to have about what to do about the 10 to 12 million people