

The Senator from Illinois scoffed at ANWR, saying it is only 3 percent of the world's supply. Do you realize how much that it is? That is huge. That is as much oil as Iraq produced.

Had President Clinton not vetoed the exploration in ANWR 10 years ago, that oil would now be flowing today. The Senator says it will take 10 years. Yes. Before you can complete your journey, you have to establish the first step. That is what we have to do here. Had we done that 10 years ago, that oil would be flowing today.

By the way, to characterize it as a wilderness area is a misrepresentation because as we should realize, this is an area expressly set aside for oil exploration by the Congress. It is not going into a wilderness area and cutting it out and then exploring in an area that was set aside for wilderness.

There are other increases in productivity in addition to ANWR. Increasing our deepwater production 100 miles offshore is virtually safe. Clearly we can eliminate restrictions on the 100-mile limit for deepwater drilling offshore. We could, if we wanted to, stop buying temporarily in this market today for the SPR, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. We could suspend the boutique fuel blends and reduce the ethanol mandate.

Those are short-term things that could be done. But again for the longer term, if you want to bring in more ethanol, eliminate or reduce the tariff on Brazilian ethanol; if you want to have more production, look at deepwater drilling and ANWR. Those are ways to actually add crude oil and, therefore, fuel to the equation rather than these ideas of not adding any oil whatsoever but simply make a political point.

The point was made that profits of the oil companies are up. As has been indicated, those profits are now being plowed back into production and to refinery capacity which is going to help us reduce the cost.

The Senator from Illinois said it is strange indeed that prices go up all over town when they go up. It is not strange at all. You don't have to have collusion between the oil companies for that phenomenon to be reflected because of the fact that the crude oil prices are the same for everyone. So if everybody's baseline price goes up, everybody is going to be raising the cost of gasoline at the fuel pump. The idea that there must be collusion or at least the inference there must be collusion, remember that the Government has been investigating this for years and, to my knowledge, has never found any evidence of collusion. As the President said, we will keep on looking for it. If we find it, obviously those people will not go unpunished.

Let us not try to point a finger of blame in an area where we know we are coming up with a dry hole. That isn't going to add anything to the production of crude oil and, therefore, do anything to increase the supply and, therefore, reduce the cost.

The bottom line is this: There are a lot of ideas about how to deal with the short-term cost of energy. Some of them are good. There are ways to increase the long-term supply and thus deal with the long-term cost. But until we are serious about the economics of the issue, rather than simply trying to come up with a bumper sticker solution, we are never going to be able to eliminate the cost to consumers. And that, after all, ought to be our primary responsibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

IRAQ

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, last evening, as most of us had departed with the understanding that the floor was about to close, our colleague from Illinois, Senator DURBIN, the distinguished whip of the Democratic Party, came over and proceeded to give what I felt was a very strong critique of all of those things in Iraq which in his judgment and, to some extent, the judgment of others sharing it went wrong. There was little or no reference to what went right and the progress that has been made in Iraq.

He concluded again with his own personal views with regard to Secretary Rumsfeld and what should be done with respect to his services in the future.

It is interesting. Yesterday, Senator BIDEN also spoke out with regard to his concept of this very difficult dilemma, facing not only the Iraqis but all those nations working to help the Iraqis form their government, as to how certain modifications should be taken with regard to the new government, namely three secretaries having their own say in this matter with an overall arching government on top. Senator BIDEN's commentary, in my judgment, was constructive, and was maybe a little too late to back up from where we are at this moment. But it was nevertheless a positive contribution to the debate and constructive, in sharp contrast to the comments of Senator DURBIN.

A lot of things have gone right in Iraq, not the least of which is the freedom of elections, the formation of a new government, the difficult process that their political structure went through in selecting a new prime minister, and making the commitments by that newly selected prime minister to finish within this month of May the appointments necessary to have a government in place and one that hopefully will work to establish and take upon itself the responsibility of full sovereignty of that nation. This was a ray of optimism, in my judgment, a ray of hope.

If there were any time in the entire history of this Iraqi confrontation situation and the Iraqi war when the new leaders of Iraq need support, it is now. I daresay the constructive criticism of many—I led a codel with Senator LEVIN a few weeks ago, and other codels have gone through. The Secretaries of State

and Defense have been through. Ambassador Khalilzad has done a remarkable job in encouraging the Iraqi leadership to move forward with this new government. That has been done.

Now is not the time to stop all the constructive debate but to stop those remarks and debate which can be pulling back from the gains we have made, showing less than full support to the Iraqi people for their courage and their new government.

I have studied each of the generals individually. On the whole, I personally believe it was a constructive contribution to the debate. Others may differ. Somehow, I believe throughout our history our senior uniformed officers—and, indeed, others, including enlisted men—have come forward at times to provide their own perspectives which are contrary to the policymakers in charge of that period of history.

I commend all who are participating in the constructive debate. It should go forward at this time. This Nation is at war. At the very minute we are privileged to be in the Senate exercising freedom of speech and debate, young men and women in our Armed Forces are in harm's way, subjecting themselves to life at risk and, indeed, giving their lives and limbs. We must be ever mindful of the suffering of their families.

Now is the time to show our strongest resolve in Iraq. The President has made a decision as to the leadership he desires, including Secretary Rumsfeld. He has that right as Commander in Chief under the Constitution. He has exercised that unequivocally and stated his views. It is now a matter for all to respect that judgment of the President and move forward.

I personally have worked with many Secretaries of Defense; three I served under in the Department of Defense. Every one in the last 30-plus years I have worked with—except one, coincidentally; when Secretary Rumsfeld was Secretary of Defense I was taking 2 years of my life preparing to try and get elected to the Senate, so with that one hiatus I have worked with them all, I have established a satisfactory, hard-working relationship with Secretary Rumsfeld.

Our committee is now in the midst of its markup and prepared to bring to the Senate its annual authorization bill. This is the most intense work period between our committee and the Department of Defense.

I conclude by saying think first of our troops and their sacrifices that they have made, the risk they face each day, and our goals to try and support the formation of some type of democratic government of the choosing of the Iraqi people and their leadership. Progress is being made every day now. Now is the time to stand steadfast in our support of our troops, the coalition forces, the Iraqi elected leaders, and the people.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TIMBER

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I intended to speak in reference to an amendment I was to call up for the supplemental, but because we are in morning business I will speak in morning business.

My amendment would be objected to as out of order, as being inconsistent with the supplemental emergency bill. However, I am here to talk about an emergency in rural Oregon in timber-dependent communities.

For 100 years, there has been a relationship between the Federal Government and rural communities that has been absolutely indispensable to our country and to those communities. The deal was this: In those States where the Federal Government owns much of the land—in my State it owns more than half of the State of Oregon—there would be multiple uses of public lands. They would be managed as to their resources consistent with environmental law.

In the case of the State of Oregon, there would be the result of timber products, wood products, to build countless millions of homes. There would be jobs for people and there would be the types of jobs that would create tax revenues that would allow local communities to have services.

In addition to that, there is what are called timber receipts. Local communities would get 25 percent of the timber receipts from the harvest of public timber. This has been absolutely indispensable to the life of these rural communities.

That deal changed in the 1990s. To show you how devastating this change was to my State, we had the listing of the spotted owl. We had the Endangered Species Act go into effect. President Clinton and Vice President Gore pursued a forest policy that took a harvest of roughly 8 billion board feet a year down to less than 1 percent of that in many national forests. As a consequence, by the end of the 1990s, our schools were closing. They operated 4 days a week. Counties had no money because many of them have lost up to 60 percent of their operating budgets.

At the end of the Clinton administration, the Congress, with President Clinton, recognized the damage, the devastation, being done to these communities, so we passed, in 2000, the Secure Rural Schools Act to bridge the gap between what had been, the gridlock that existed, and the hope for a brighter day when there would be a predictable, sustainable level of forestry.

President Bush and the Congress pursued the Healthy Forests Initiative and

this President has fully funded the Northwest Forest Plan that was the product of President Clinton but never delivered on the timber that it promised in the hopes of bridging the gap for these communities.

But still, after all of that effort, 6 years later, we find that only a small percent of what was done 20 years ago is available to these communities in terms of timber harvest. As a consequence, this secure rural schools fund is about to expire.

I suggest this is a very real, present danger, even an emergency, that is appropriate to this supplemental. We ought to include it. These are Federal decisions that have been made. They have been made by an administration in the 1990s. They have been made by Federal law, the law that passed by this Congress. They have been made by courts that have enforced that law and have locked up our forests and now have us in a bind that is truly an emergency.

This is a Federal obligation. I need to use every tool as a Senator that I have available to me to try to remind this Senate, this Congress, of the obligation it has. We cannot abandon these communities. We cannot abandon these people. We have to find a way to continue to get back to a management level that is consistent with environmental law, that allows for multiple uses of the land, the harvest of timber, the employment of our people, the production of wood products, the receipt of timber taxes, so that schools can remain open, streets can remain paved, counties can be safe because they have police protection.

This is not inexpensive. The annual cost of what we did to bridge this gap was \$500 million a year. Oregon is responsible for 20 percent of the merchantable timber in this country. We are not alone in terms of the benefit that came from this secure rural schools fund. California received \$380 million over the last 6 years; Montana, \$63 million; Mississippi received \$38.8 million to keep their rural timber-dependent communities together body and soul.

We cannot walk away from this until we find a day where we can get back to a deal that is sustainable in terms of environmental policy, timber production, and the employment of our people. Heaven knows we need the timber. We are now a net importer of timber in this country. Yet what do we do with our own timber? Our policies are in gridlock and our forests are burning.

Three years ago, there were 500,000 acres burned in southern Oregon, larger than the State, I am told, of Rhode Island. Yet that timber still stands rotting, a moonscape that, frankly, ought to be allowed to at least be salvaged in some degree.

Until we come to a day where we have a policy that we in the Federal Government agree upon, we cannot abandon these rural communities.

I will at the appropriate time propose my amendment and hope it is not ruled out of order.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his comments and his leadership on these issues that are so important to our forestry owners and people throughout the States who depend on incomes from those jobs.

I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to call up amendments at this point.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

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:

McCain/Ensign amendment No. 3616, to strike a provision that provides \$74.5 million to states based on their production of certain types of crops, livestock and or dairy products, which was not included in the Administration's emergency supplemental request.

McCain/Ensign amendment No. 3617, to strike a provision providing \$6 million to sugarcane growers in Hawaii, which was not included in the Administration's emergency supplemental request.

McCain/Ensign amendment No. 3618, to strike \$15 million for a seafood promotion strategy that was not included in the Administration's emergency supplemental request.

McCain/Ensign amendment No. 3619, to strike the limitation on the use of funds for the issuance or implementation of certain rulemaking decisions related to the interpretation of "actual control" of airlines.

Warner amendment No. 3620, to repeal the requirement for 12 operational aircraft carriers within the Navy.

Coburn amendment No. 3641 (Divisions IV through XIX), of a perfecting nature.

Vitter amendment No. 3627, to designate the areas affected by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita as HUBZones and to waive the Small Business Competitive Demonstration Program Act of 1988 for the areas affected by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita.

Vitter/Landrieu modified amendment No. 3626, to increase the limits on community disaster loans.

Vitter modified amendment No. 3628, to base the allocation of hurricane disaster relief and recovery funds to States on need and physical damages.

Wyden amendment No. 3665, to prohibit the use of funds to provide royalty relief for the production of oil and natural gas.

Santorum modified amendment No. 3640, to increase by \$12,500,000 the amount appropriated for the Broadcasting Board of Governors, to increase by \$12,500,000 the amount appropriated for the Department of State for the Democracy Fund, to provide that such funds shall be made available for democracy programs and activities in Iran, and to provide an offset.

Salazar/Baucus amendment No. 3645, to provide funding for critical hazardous fuels