

In sum, every Medicare beneficiary in the country, regardless of whether they are enrolled in an MA plan or remain in traditional fee for service, will pay \$2 extra per month to subsidize these extra payment rates.

Private fee-for-service plans, in particular, get a special deal that costs taxpayers and beneficiaries alike.

The law doesn't require these plans to sign contracts with hospitals or doctors, rather, providers are "deemed" part of the network. And plans can pay these providers 100 percent of traditional fee-for-service rates even as they receive 117 percent of that rate in reimbursement from Medicare.

They are also exempt from reporting quality measures that all other plans must report. In other words, they have a good deal. Too good of a deal.

Another, and just as obvious, example of how Medicare pays these plans too much is the double payment for indirect medical education, IME. So-called IME payments are intended to defray the higher patient care costs at facilities with graduate medical education programs.

But these payments are made twice: once to the facility itself, and again to Medicare Advantage plans, with no requirement that plans pass the IME funding along to teaching hospitals.

This bill will save taxpayers \$13 billion over 5 years by requiring private-fee-for-service plans to form provider networks and eliminating the double payment for IME to MA plans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BAUCUS. I ask unanimous consent to speak for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. BAUCUS. It will also require private fee-for-service plans to report on quality measures like other plans are required to do.

Some in the Senate, and many in the Bush administration, oppose any reforms to private fee-for-service plans.

They oppose protecting beneficiaries from private plans' unscrupulous marketing practices.

Just as regretfully, they oppose expanding access that poor seniors have to assistance with their out-of-pocket costs, and to evidence-based preventive services.

So now we in the Congress have a choice. We can protect private health insurance plans. We can leave low-income beneficiaries behind.

We can neglect our obligations to ensure that the Medicare program works for all seniors or we can do the right thing.

We can pass meaningful, bipartisan Medicare legislation that, yes, blocks the cuts to physician payments, which is absolutely crucial, but which does so much more, that brings much-needed relief to rural areas, improves quality, and cuts costs in the appropriate places.

That is what we ought to do. That is what America's seniors deserve.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of this balanced legislation.

Mr. BAUCUS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska). The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

ENERGY

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, as I have said before on this floor, I think it is time for us to get real about energy. It is time for us to get real about lowering gas prices.

The American people, as we all know if we have listened to our folks when we go back home, are suffering from record-high prices of gasoline.

Now, in response to the record pain at the pump, the American people deserve something more than legislative gimmicks that raise taxes, increase litigation or provide political favors. It is a startling place many of our Democratic friends now find themselves in. They seem to believe that for every problem there is a tax increase that can help.

If there is someone you do not like or want to take a shot at, raise their taxes. You have a problem that needs fixing, raise the taxes. We saw that with the climate debate last week. To address the issue of climate change, the bill proposed, and the amendment we did not adopt last week proposed, to raise energy prices \$6.7 trillion to lower energy demand and pay for new Government programs and spending.

With record-high prices for gasoline, climate sponsors wanted to raise gas prices a further 53 cents by 2030 and \$1.40 by 2050. This week brought a new attempt to raise taxes. Well, last week some quibbled about whether the \$6.7 trillion in higher energy prices was a hidden tax or a hidden fee. It did not make much difference to the people who would pay it. There was no hiding from the fact that a tax increase is what the Democrats proposed this week.

This week they proposed raising taxes on the exploration and development of new oil supplies. You know, folks back home cannot believe that. Those looking for new sources of oil for the American people would pay higher taxes to find and deliver that oil to us. I have a hard time believing that too.

But we folks from Missouri do not take words at their face value. We call ourselves the Show-Me State for a reason. You need to show us how raising taxes would help this situation. For me, personally, I have not ever seen a time when raising taxes on something lowered its price or produced more of it.

I think our minority leader pointed out the Los Angeles Times said raising taxes to deal with the oil supply was similar to a climatologist saying trees caused global warming.

Well, it is economics 101, folks. Raise taxes, you get less of it. You increase exploration and development and you

get more of it and you lower the price. In this case we actually have the experience about what President Carter did. In the mid-1970s, he pushed through higher taxes on domestic oil production.

What a disaster that was. Oil companies reduced their U.S. domestic operations and went overseas. The result was a greater U.S. dependence on oil from the Middle East, which continues today. Why our friends on the other side of the aisle would want to return us to the days of Jimmy Carter, I do not understand.

It may feel good to some people to propose hurting American consumers by putting a tax on the oil industry or on the executives, it may sound good, but it winds up hurting the American people. The Democrat bill failed to get support. It contained other provisions that would hurt consumers as well.

One section would allow the Department of Justice to sue, to sue those countries for their membership and participation in OPEC. Now, that is a feel-good provision as long as you do not think about what would happen. How can anyone doubt that an OPEC country facing the prospects of U.S. lawsuits—if we could have jurisdiction over them, and I question that—would stop selling oil to the United States and take their oil someplace else, such as China.

Again, the Democrat bill would hurt suffering Americans by driving oil supplies away from the United States for fear of litigation.

Speaking of litigation, we sure didn't hear much from supporters of the bill about the \$1.6 billion in tax breaks for trial lawyers hidden in the legislation to extend renewable energy tax credits. Section 311 would allow trial lawyers working on contingency \$1.6 billion in tax breaks. Apparently, the suffering of trial lawyers is more important to some in the Democratic Party than the suffering of the American people paying record prices at the pump. The tax breaks for trial lawyers is one section before the tax provisions before film and television producers. Section 312 modifies tax deductions for domestic film and television production. It gives special tax treatment for U.S. actors, directors, and producers.

Obviously, I support tax breaks for U.S. workers. But why does the Democratic Party think tax breaks for American actors are more important than price relief for moms and dads suffering record gas prices?

Why does the party on the other side think tax breaks for Hollywood film producers are more important than price relief for American truckers suffering record diesel prices?

At the same time the Democratic bill is giving tax breaks to trial lawyers in Hollywood, they are blocking the American people getting new oil supplies they need to bring gas prices down. I am a cosponsor of a bill entitled "The American Energy Production Act of 2008." If enacted, this legislation

would produce up to 24 billion barrels of oil from U.S. domestic sources. The bill would allow environmentally friendly access to roughly 10 billion barrels of recoverable oil in northern Alaska.

I challenge anyone who opposes opening access to Alaskan oil to read the bill and see all of the environmental requirements it contains. I challenge them, if they haven't done so, to go to the North Slope of the Bering Sea and see the drilling going on at Prudhoe Bay 45 miles to the west of ANWR. They have been drilling there. They drill in an environmentally friendly way. They have to put the roads in in midwinter, when it is 200 degrees below zero. They are rock roads. They don't disturb the environment. As a matter of fact, the caribou love them. The caribou herds are flourishing. The wolves are great. The flowers are just as good as they are elsewhere. The mosquitos are just as big as they are in the lower part of Alaska. That drilling is being done without environmental damage.

About 30 miles to the east Canada is drilling. Several hundred miles to the west Russia is drilling. They are producing significant amounts of oil. Oil drilling in Alaska or exploration in the deep sea or recovering oil from shale would take advantage of the latest, most modern, environmentally friendly drilling and development technology. Today we have modern oil rigs that can drill down and then virtually sideways far beneath sensitive surface areas needing protection. Oil rigs at sea are now so safe they can withstand hurricanes without spilling a drop of oil.

There are thousands of oil rigs off the coast of Louisiana. Did anyone hear a report about an oil spill after Hurricane Katrina? No. Because it didn't happen.

This is the kind of environmentally protective technology we would use to open oil reserves in the seabed off America's coasts. Experts know of at least 14 billion barrels of oil off our Atlantic and Pacific coasts so far out to sea they couldn't be seen from shore. There may be many more. There are much higher estimates. This number is probably an understatement because they have not even mapped many of these areas and explored for oil reserves. We also have a massive supply of oil in oil shale in the mountains of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. The shale is so thick with oil one can smell and feel it in the rocks. With oil at \$10 a barrel, it was too cheap to make oil shale affordable in the 1970s and 1980s, but prices at even half of today's level would be enough to unlock U.S. oil reserves in shale: roughly 2 trillion, it is estimated, barrels of oil, and that is seven times the reserves of Saudi Arabia.

Why should we be begging OPEC or Saudi Arabia for more oil when we have seven times the oil Saudi Arabia has in that one area alone?

Opponents say no. They give us the NIMBY treatment—not in my back-

yard. Unfortunately, they don't limit themselves to blocking action in their backyards. They limit everybody else's backyard as well.

We had a classic vote in the Appropriations Committee in May—unfortunately, a straight party-line vote—whether to lift the moratorium and allow the preparation for environmentally friendly exploration and development of shale oil. Fifteen of my Democratic colleagues voted no; 14 Republican Senators, including me, voted for opening it. We failed. In Alaska, the people fully support opening northern Alaska to further environmentally safe oil extraction. It is the elected representatives of other States far below to the east of Alaska who want to thwart the will of the people of Alaska.

The people of Virginia fully support opening oil reserves in the deep ocean off their shores, but elected officials from California and other States from the West want to thwart Virginia's desire. The people of Utah support opening the oil reserves under their mountains, but it is the interest groups in Washington, DC, and other States that are thwarting the people of Utah.

The people of my State don't understand why we are blocking access to U.S. oil reserves. They don't understand why we are withholding new supplies needed to get prices down. They don't understand why we are denying ourselves the relief we need and deserve.

In my State we mine lead. Lead has environmental problems. We have to deal with the environmental problems, and we do. There is only one simple reason we mine for lead. We have 90 percent of the lead in the United States, and it is needed for technology. But at the same time on energy, we in Missouri are working hard to develop new, clean sources of fuel and ways to reduce energy demand.

Kansas City, MO, is a national leader in hybrid cars and the advanced vehicle batteries they need. We have a Ford plant where Missouri autoworkers assemble the Escape hybrid SUV. We also have a GM plant where they assemble hybrid SUVs and sedans. In the Kansas City area, we have an advanced battery manufacturer producing the next generation lithium-ion batteries. They use a polymer technology to improve performance and safety. Our military is taking advantage of this technology now, and someday it will go into our automobiles. Trying to stay one step ahead, we are also working on the next generation of hybrid cars. Right after these remarks, I intend to go outside to the area we call the swamp, just northeast of the Capitol, to see a plug-in hybrid Ford Escape brought to town for the Department of Energy.

Plug-in technology would allow us to begin to travel the first 40 miles of every trip on electricity, without burning a drop of gas. Many families and commuters in the city could go the entire week back and forth to work burning no gasoline. Rural folks and farm-

ers could drive their trucks with plug-in hybrid technology into town and around the farm. Then, when they need to haul a load great distances, the traditional engine would automatically kick in.

I introduced an amendment to the climate bill last week which would have helped workers, the environment, and costs for Americans by starting the U.S. domestic manufacturing supply base for hybrid batteries for automobiles. Hybrid cars are more expensive than traditional cars because their hybrid batteries are made in low quantities in Japan, Korea, and China. Not surprisingly, those firms favor their Japanese and Korean auto manufacturers, and whatever is left comes to U.S. carmakers. The answer to this problem is mass U.S. production that will produce hybrid batteries in high volumes and cause prices to fall, putting thousands of U.S. workers in good manufacturing jobs in Missouri and across the Nation. It would be a win/win situation—good for the environment, reducing oil demand; good for consumers who need cheaper cars that burn less gas; and good for workers needing good-paying jobs at home.

I introduced an amendment that would have provided Federal funds. Unfortunately, that amendment, like others, was blocked from consideration by climate bill sponsors. I will continue to fight for a commonsense proposal, and that is what we need. We need to get past gimmicks, charges, and countercharges, taxes, ranting and railing and lawsuits. The American people need fundamental relief for a fundamental problem: prices are high. There is too much demand, not enough supply. It is economics 101, as I said. We need a comprehensive solution that provides the American people with more supply and less demand and also with more environmentally clean solutions.

Last year we addressed demand through higher, newer, aggressive but achievable CAFE auto efficiency standards. Yet, as we have seen, demand strategies have not stopped the record increase in prices. We need to address supply—billions and billions of barrels of oil on our land, under our land, off our shores, in our mountains. That is what the American people need—not gimmicks, not increases in taxes, not more litigation, not tax breaks for trial lawyers or Hollywood.

I urge my colleagues, it is time. Let's get real about our energy strategy so we can provide Americans the real relief they deserve and we ought to be providing.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

MR. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 14 minutes 21 seconds.

MR. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator

BROWNBACK follow my time with 5 minutes.

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

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the most important issue on the minds of my constituents in Georgia and, I know, folks all over the country; that is, skyrocketing gas prices. I hear from hundreds of Georgians every day who are struggling to fill their gas tanks to get to work or to take their kids to school or to run their necessary errands. They want to know what Congress is doing about these out-of-control gas prices.

Nobody disputes the fact that the United States is dependent on foreign sources of oil, and nobody disputes that this problem has been in the making for any number of years. We currently import more than 60 percent of our oil and, over the past 30 years, we have reduced our domestic exploration options and left our refining capacity stagnant. But we can do something to provide relief to American families who are really feeling the pain at the pump. If we can do something about it, the obvious question is, Why aren't we?

Let's look, first, at what the Democratic response has been to high gas prices. Yesterday, we voted on a so-called energy bill proposed by the majority. The two highlights of this bill to address skyrocketing gas prices are, first, sue OPEC. The Democrats want to sue the individuals we are doing business with as a means of lowering gas prices. This is hard to understand. Second, the Democrats propose to put a windfall profits tax on big oil companies that are certainly achieving big profits in today's market in the petroleum industry.

I had a group of businessmen from Georgia in my office yesterday. They were small businesspeople, but they were all from the same industry.

I said: OK, let me ask you this. If the Federal Government walked into your office and said, we are going to put a windfall profits tax on you; we are simply going to raise your taxes by an extraordinary amount, what would be your reaction?

They said: It is pretty simple. We would do two things. First, we would try to reduce our profits below a point where we would not be subject to a windfall profits tax, and that means we would decrease production. The second thing we would do is, if we had a tax that we had to live with, we would pass it on to our customers.

Again, to think that a windfall profits tax on oil companies is going to decrease the price of gasoline is somewhat foolish.

What has been the Republican response? Where should we go? There are very clearly four separate issues that need to be addressed with respect to the issue of skyrocketing gas prices. The first one has just been alluded to by Senator BOND from Missouri; that is, we simply need to take advantage of additional resources we have inside the

United States. We, as Republicans, have sought to do that.

On May 13, less than a month ago, Senator DOMENICI and Senator MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to expand exploration in the ANWR region of Alaska and to authorize drilling in offshore coastal waters currently subject to a Federal moratorium—in other words, deep-sea exploration. This amendment was defeated. Mr. President, 43 Republicans voted for the amendment; 48 Democrats voted against the amendment.

So once again, as is known throughout the country, Republicans are consistently advocating—and have for all of the 14 years I have been privileged to serve in the Congress—exploration for more domestic oil in this country to alleviate our problem, while the Democrats continue to oppose measures to explore domestically.

Now, of the four things we need to do, certainly exploration for more oil is one of those. We do have a lot of capacity in this country that has simply gone unexplored over the years. There is deep-sea exploration available to us. There is oil in the ANWR region of Alaska, which we have consistently sought to explore, as well as now we know that in the Rocky Mountains of our great country, we have a greater resource of oil than exists in Saudi Arabia. It is simply imperative that we explore more from a domestic standpoint.

Secondly, supply and demand dictates the price of everything in our economy. We simply have to improve our oil companies to provide more gasoline to Americans. We are seeing today more people driving to the gas pump than ever before in the history of our country simply because of the increase in the population. Our economy has done pretty well in the last several years. People are traveling more than ever before. We must have the capability to provide the kind of supply that is demanded by Americans.

Thirdly, we have to continue down the road of researching and developing more alternative fuels. Historically in this country, we have shied away from that. We have seen the development of ethanol primarily in one region of our country, the Midwest. But when you get to the Northeast or the Southeast or even, for the most part, the far West, you simply do not see a supply of ethanol. It is concentrated in one part of our country. But that is changing. It is changing now, and we are seeing more production facilities built in all parts of the country.

But there is an unintended consequence that nobody thought about. We have 101 ethanol-producing facilities online in this country today. We have another 100 ethanol manufacturing facilities that are scheduled to come online in this country in the next 14 to 18 months. All but two of those facilities are producing ethanol from corn. The unintended consequence we have seen due to the high demand of

corn for energy production is an increase in food prices. Corn, wheat, soybeans, peanuts, or other commodities have simply increased in price because of the demand for corn; therefore, farmers are planting more corn and less of the other commodities. That is the unintended consequence.

I am very proud of the fact that in the farm bill we just passed we addressed the issue, that we ought not to incentivize the production of additional ethanol from corn. But what we have done in that farm bill is to provide funding for research—grant money as well as loan money—as well as funding for the construction of additional ethanol and biodiesel facilities to be resourced not with corn but with cellulosic-based products.

The Presiding Officer comes from a part of the country where corn can be grown in great quantities and great quality, I might say. But in the southeastern part of the United States, because of our hot weather and our soil is not as rich and our rainfall is not as consistent as the midwest part of the country, we cannot grow corn the way it can be grown in the Midwest.

But there is one thing we can grow like nobody else; that is, a pine tree. What we are seeing in Georgia today is the construction of an ethanol-producing facility that is going to be resourced with pine trees. It is one of two facilities that are under construction in the country today where cellulosic products are, in fact, going to be used. So I am very proud of the fact that in that farm bill we have sought to incentivize additional production of ethanol from cellulosic-based products.

The fourth thing we have to do—Americans have been very spoiled. We are used to getting in our car and going where we want to go when we want to go, and when the time comes when we have finished our business and want to move on, we are used to getting in our vehicle and moving on, by ourselves for the most part. That simply has to change. We have to implement conservation practices from a personal household standpoint like we never imagined we would have to do in this country.

From a political, legislative policy-making standpoint, we have put some measures in place that are going to dictate to the automobile manufacturing industry that they have to develop automobiles that get higher miles per gallon. That is good. But we also have to implement some personal measures to make sure we truly do have conservation practices in place.

I had a constituent say to me just the other day: SAXBY, I don't understand this issue of why we are not exploring for more oil domestically when everywhere I go, people tell me, why aren't we exploring for more oil that we know we have in America? He said: What you ought to do is call for a national referendum on this, and let's see what the American people, by and large, think of this issue.

It is difficult, frankly, to do that, although I think it is a very good idea. I would like to know what the masses in other parts of the country think. I certainly know what they think in my part of the world. But there is one thing very similar that I think should be considered.

I note that just yesterday, the American Solutions for Winning the Future announced that over half a million Americans have signed a petition online urging Congress to immediately start exploring for oil domestically to lower gasoline prices. Now, here is the way the petition reads:

We, therefore, the undersigned citizens of the United States, petition the U.S. Congress to act immediately to lower gasoline prices (and diesel and other fuel prices) by authorizing the exploration of proven energy reserves to reduce our dependence on foreign energy sources from unstable countries.

According to American Solutions' resource data, 81 percent of the American people support the United States using more of its own domestic energy resources to combat the rising cost of energy. I cannot say that I am surprised by that statistic, but I think it further underscores how Senator DOMENICI's bill is a commonsense plan for lowering gas prices for Americans, and doing it now.

Another commonsense solution Republicans have offered, which I have supported, was proposed by Senator MCCAIN. This would provide an immediate Federal gas tax holiday. What does this mean to our American consumers? Well, here we are going into the summer when travel certainly increases. If this bill passed, as soon as tomorrow, if it got to the President's desk and he signed it, each and every American could be paying 18.4 cents per gallon less for gasoline and 24.4 cents per gallon less for diesel fuel.

The Democrats promised leading up to the November 2006 elections that if you send the majority of Democrats to Congress, we are going to address this issue of gasoline prices, we are going to get prices under control. Well, at the time Senator REID became majority leader, at the time Congresswoman PELOSI became the Speaker of the House, the price of a gallon of gasoline in this country was \$2.33. Today, average prices have increased by \$1.71 cents per gallon over that last year and a half.

We all know summertime is the time when families take an annual vacation. Americans generally drive more during this time of the year. Giving a temporary gas tax holiday until Labor Day is a pure short-term policy and will benefit Americans only in the short term, but I think it is another way we can provide immediate relief to American families.

This is an issue that ought not to be partisan in nature. It is an issue all Americans are feeling every single day. It is an issue we as policymakers should address. It is an issue that cries out for strong leadership in Wash-

ington today. We need to see that leadership come forth out of this body. We need to see the American people given some relief and given a long-term solution to this issue of gas prices; otherwise, the next generation is going to be looking at much higher energy costs than what we are looking at today.

With that, Mr. President, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on the Republican side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleagues' comments, from both Missouri and Georgia, and I agree on the energy issues. I have been traveling across all of Kansas, going to all 105 counties. I have been in nearly 70 so far, and the dominant issue by far is the price of energy. People want to get these prices down.

The key to supply and demand is to get more supply as fast as we can. Work on demand as far as being conservation-minded but not to increase taxes. Increasing taxes—things such as a windfall profits tax—does not get you another drop of fuel. It only raises the price. I do not know of anything we have increased taxes on where you end up getting it for less price. It just does not work that way.

So I support my colleagues' statements on that, and I hope the American people are looking at that issue and seeing that here is a way of increasing production but not raising taxes. What the Republicans have put forward is an increase-energy-production bill, and what the Democrats have put forward is an increase-energy-tax bill. I hope people can decide which of these will likely get them lower prices. It is production, it is not increasing taxes.

AIR FORCE TANKER CONTRACT

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I also wish to inform and talk briefly to my colleagues about a major GAO study that is going to be out next week. It is about the bidding for the tankers for the U.S. Air Force.

The GAO will announce the results of its review of the Air Force tanker contract next week. The GAO does not have authority to sustain or overturn the Air Force contract by itself. The GAO only reviews if and when the Air Force followed its own rules. Congress has the final say on this issue because only Congress can consider all of the relevant issues. Still, it is a major report that is going to be coming out on this issue.

I have been very disappointed in the Air Force granting this tanker award to primarily a foreign builder, primarily to Airbus and EADS, which will build the biggest part of this tanker plane. I am disappointed for three major reasons:

One is that I think the merits themselves of the contracting process were not followed by the Air Force.

Second is the heavy subsidization by European governments of Airbus's plane. The base plane has had heavy subsidies of which the U.S. Government, by another arm—the U.S. Trade Representative's Office—is suing the European governments and Airbus and EADS, its parent corporation, for this. We are likely to see that case report out soon.

Third, I think all the contractors should be subjected to the same rules, including things such as the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, which U.S. companies are subject to, and I believe all foreign competitors and bidders should be as well.

First, regarding the GAO, we need to look inside the process the Air Force used to award the contract. At the base of this, what is very puzzling to me is why the Air Force put so much stock in getting a bigger Airbus plane in this bidding process when they had been happy and desirous of the size of the plane Boeing had put forward. If they wanted a bigger plane, they should have put that forward in the bidding process.

Plus, I put this forward: At a time when airlines are looking at the cost of running their airplanes and fuel costs, why is it that the Air Force would look at a bigger plane instead of a smaller plane that is more fuel efficient? That is what all the airlines are looking at. Why would we not look at the same thing? Plus, in looking at the bigger plane, I do not believe a realistic assessment of the military construction needs at the bases throughout the United States and the landing needs throughout the world has been looked at because you are going to have to increase landing space, you are going to have to increase hangar space for the larger airplane Airbus is putting forward. That is in the GAO report.

On the foreign trade subsidies, the Air Force says it cannot consider foreign subsidies when it looks at the cost of contract proposals. As a result, the GAO will not review that issue either. But the United States is currently suing the European Union for subsidizing the same company to which the Air Force has awarded this new tanker contract. We expect that ruling on this WTO case very soon. We anticipate getting somewhere—if we win this case—a \$4.5 billion judgment against Airbus and EADS for this same frame they are now being rewarded by the Air Force for with a \$35 billion contract. So they subsidized the civilian aircraft, militarized it, and put it into the military building field. We sued them on this for an illegal international subsidy. We are giving them a contract here for \$35 billion on the same subsidized plane. Only Congress can decide this issue, but I submit this is not the way we want to encourage other governments around the world to operate.

Then a final issue is on foreign corrupt practices. The Air Force considers