people try each month to pay off the interest on their maxed-out credit card while still paying those huge and skyrocketing gasoline bills. Our people are deeply worried that the cost of paying for essentials is just going to keep soaring and they are going to fall off the economic tightrope I have described into a no-man's land where they cannot support themselves or their families.

On Independence Day, I was in Canyonville, OR, to speak at a wonderful supper honoring veterans that was organized by the Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe of Indians. In my talk, I reflected on how important it is for Americans to be independent of foreign oil, independent of those crushing and escalating medical bills, and independent of the economic insecurity that has kept so many unemployed for months and months.

After my talk, a veteran stopped me and said: Just do what is right for the country. Forget the politics. Country first. That, of course, is what our veterans have always done: country first. Do what is right. Never forget. That is what makes America so special.

I do not have enough time to outline a prescription for all of the economic challenges our country faces that involve solutions built on that veteran's prescription of country first. I do want to report that we have heard what that veteran has said with respect to health care and fixing health care in the Senate.

Sixteen of us in the Senate—eight Democrats and eight Republicans—have now come together behind legislation to rein in health care costs while providing quality care to all our people. With Senator BENNETT from the other side of the aisle in the lead for Republicans, we hold down health care costs by ensuring all our people are part of a large pool so they have more bargaining power in the marketplace.

We institute insurance reforms so it is not possible to discriminate against someone who has been ill. We lower the administrative costs of covering health services. We reform the Tax Code to take away the tax breaks for the Cadillac health care plans and use those dollars for middle and lower middle income folks who are hurting. We have written into our proposal the opportunity for employers who want to keep offering health coverage and for workers who want to take that coverage to always be able to do so. But we also offer to both employers and employees more choices, more alternatives to hold down costs because today, for too many employers and too many workers, there are no alternatives to these 15-, 20-, and 25-percent rate hikes we are seeing again and again across this country.

What our bipartisan group of 16 Senators does is, we modernize our health care system because in many respects some of the key features of our health care system in 2008 are not very different than those of 1948. Back in 1948, when there were wage and price controls, people would go to work somewhere for 30 years or so until you gave them a big steak retirement dinner and a gold watch. Today, the typical worker changes their job seven times by the time they are 35, and employers are having difficulty competing in global markets. That was one of the considerations in the Boeing-Airbus competition, that Boeing paid a lot more for health care than did Airbus.

Our group of 16 Senators has been able to get a favorable review of our proposal by the Congressional Budget Office, the agency that keeps track of the financial underpinnings of major proposals. They have found that our proposal is revenue neutral in the short term, so it will not take big tax hikes on middle-income people to fix health care. They found in the third year, as a result of what we do to change the incentives, change behavior, we actually start holding down the rate of growth in health care, and we start generating a surplus for the Federal Government.

Now, we understand as part of this legislation that both political parties have had valuable contributions to make with respect to the cause of fixing health care. Democrats have been right on the coverage issue because unless you cover everyone, those who are uninsured shift their bills to the insured and costs continue to soar. But those on the other side of the aisle have made a great contribution in terms of saying we must not discourage innovation; we must not discourage the availability of choices. There needs to be a role for the private sector.

So what our group of 16 Senators has said—and I note the presence of Senator SPECTER on the Senate floor. He has been an extraordinary advocate of improved health care services, and he and I have had many discussions on this topic and will have many more in the days ahead.

I close simply by saying, what our group of 16 Senators—this is the first time in the history of the Senate, going back 60 years to Harry Truman, where there has been a significant bipartisan group of Senators in favor of universal coverage—what our guiding principle has been in this effort, on a topic this big and this complicated—and it surely will go through a host of modifications and changes. In my committee, I intend to work very closely with Chairman BAUCUS and Senator GRASSLEY, two great leaders who work in a bipartisan fashion. We are going to have to work in a bipartisan fashion to fix American health care.

But given that litany of concerns I have described, with six or seven top issues being ones where the second word is ''bill,'' starting with ''gasoline bill''—we have to come together on a bipartisan basis to deal with those concerns. That is what Senator BENNETT and I have sought to do as part of our health care legislation. That is what we are going to have to do to tackle the premier economic issues of our time.

As that veteran said to me just a couple of nights ago in Canyonville, OR, putting country first is what public service and public service in the Senate is all about.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for up to 20 minutes in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to seek recognition on the issue of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, which will be the order of the business of the Senate later this week, and I have an amendment pending there. But before proceeding to that important subject, I would like to make a comment or two about what has occurred on the Senate floor already.

At the outset, I compliment my distinguished colleague from Oregon, who has played such an important leadership role in the Senate generally since coming over from the House, working with him on many items, and taking a very close look at an innovative approach to health care coverage for all Americans. There is no doubt about the need to have that coverage. The question is how we do it, maintaining the essentials of the free enterprise system to avoid the bureaucracy of the so-called Clinton plan from 1993, which put a great bureaucracy between the doctor and the patient.

What Senator WYDEN has proposed, along with Senator BENNETT, on a bipartisan basis, is very carefully considered—with a significant number of sponsors on both sides—is a good way to proceed, and my staff and I are taking a very close look at that important proposal.

Just on a personal note, while Senator WYDEN is a westerner, and some might say I am an easterner, we were both born in Wichita, KS, which may not be a mark of great distinction but worth a 20-second notation on the floor of the Senate. Somebody listening in Wichita this afternoon—my Aunt Rose—watches fastidiously, so I want to give a little salute to the hometown.

WORKING TOGETHER

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I was pleased to hear some of the comments by our leaders earlier on a conciliatory note after the fireworks a week ago Thursday before we adjourned. The fireworks over the Medicare bill I think vastly overshadowed the fireworks a week later on the Fourth of July. I am glad to hear them talk about working together.

If there is one point of virtual unanimity in America today, it is the

American people are sick and tired of the partisan bickering in Washington, DC. When they talk about coming together on energy and the high prices of gasoline, every Member has to hear it everywhere because that is such a prominent item of great pain and suffering in America today: the high cost of gasoline and the high cost of heating oil when winter comes, especially for the seniors who have the choice of either heating or eating. I believe there are some things that can be done in the short term, difficult as so many of the items are. I have spoken before about the issue and do not intend to speak at length today. But I am encouraged by what Senator REID and Senator MCCONNELL have had to say.

One item which could be acted upon immediately, which could have some immediate impact, is the effort Senator KOHL and I have made for many years now to take away the antitrust exemption for OPEC oil-producing nations. Right now, they have a sovereign immunity. But there is nothing sovereign about what goes on in fixing the prices of oil in the international market—fixing the prices by having the OPEC countries get into a small room, lower production and increase the cost because the supply is lower and the demand is greater.

While we certainly ought to undertake conservation measures, as we finally did, raising the miles per gallon last year to 35, and with many other items we could make on conservation, we could have a significant and short-term impact upon supply by taking away the antitrust exemption, which we can do under the case law. It is a commercial transaction. It passed the Senate by a big vote. More than 70 Senators voted for it in the past. It is on the agenda. It has been voted out of the Judiciary Committee. The OPEC countries say they shouldn't be subject to the antitrust laws. Well, they find it very profitable not to be. They say it wouldn't do any good because OPEC is paying now for all of the production it can undertake, but 3 weeks ago, Saudi Arabia made an announcement that they were going to increase production. The speculation behind that announcement was that they were concerned about measures which were being undertaken by the United States and other countries to respond. In the long term, their interests might be best off if they increase production. Well, I think if they were subjected to the antitrust laws, we would put them to the test.

There is no earthly reason they should not be subjected to our antitrust laws. That has not moved forward because of some concerns that there ought to be some companion legislation on drilling. Well, that is something which ought to be considered—not carte blanche and not necessarily in broad, sweeping terms but on a case-by-case basis.

I have a very strong record in my tenure in the Senate on environmental protection, but if you take ANWR, I was convinced 20 years ago when I made a trip there that ANWR could be the subject of very substantial exploration with adequate concern for environmental protection. ANWR has a footprint about as big as Philadelphia International Airport, and there are ways of drilling down with a single hole proliferating underground. I saw the caribou there. I saw the other drilling in the area. I saw how the caribou and other environmental concerns could be protected. Too often, when the matter has come up on the floor—and it has come up on many occasions—we can't get to the 60-vote threshold; 56, 57, something in that range. It becomes a battle by competing forces who are dug in and entrenched.

I think it is an item the Congress could consider in some greater detail and on a selective basis move in the immediate future to try to increase our own capacity. You don't have to go completely on offshore or completely on shale or completely in any direction, but some studied analysis and some careful consideration, trying to leave the entrenched battle lines which have characterized this body and the House on this issue for so long, would be very salutary and I think could lead to a better result. At least that is one man's opinion, having been there, having looked at it, and having heard people on both sides over the past two decades.

The subject of Medicare is very much a lead topic. It is the lead story in the New York Times this morning, and it is the lead story all across America. It would be my hope that the leaders could yet come to a resolution of the issue on some sensible terms without having a ''gotcha'' vote; without moving forward, as the majority leader did a week ago Thursday, on predicting how many Democratic Senators there would be and making it a test case and having a political cost on the vote, but to try to work it through to get legislation finished so that doctors do not get a 10.6-percent cut. I believe there is widespread support in both bodies not to have that cut go into effect and to alleviate the concerns of seniors that doctors will stop taking Medicare patients because of that cut, which is so excessive—legislation which has been pending for a long time. Each year, the cut comes up, and each year, the cut is rescinded.

The core problem on this issue really arises from the difficulties caused by the procedure known as filling the tree. We have seen, in the course of the past two decades, a new procedure adopted where the majority leader utilizes his primacy—that means his ability to get recognition—to offer an amendment and then to offer a second amendment before any other Senator has a chance to offer an amendment, and then no other Senator can offer an amendment.

When the Medicare bill first came up 2 or 3 weeks ago, I talked to Senator REID and said that I would support cloture if the procedures of the Senate were honored and an amendment could be offered. He said he would do that. I voted for cloture.

When the bill came up a week ago Thursday, there was no opportunity to offer an amendment because the House of Representatives had passed a Medicare bill and left town. They do that from time to time. They pass a bill, send it over, and leave town. They present an ultimatum to the Senate: Take it or leave it—a rather convenient way to have a de facto amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

The Constitution provides for a bicameral legislature. For those who don't know that highfalutin word, that means there are two bodies. All grade school children know you have to pass a bill in the House and a bill in the Senate, and then it goes to the President for signature or veto. But when the House leaves town, suddenly it becomes a unicameral legislature—a constitutional amendment, all in one fell swoop by buying airplane and railway tickets. Well, I am not prepared to accept that kind of an edict from the House of Representatives or the majority leader or anybody, and it would seem to me that processes were being shortcut. It took the unusual step of writing to the President and urging him to use his constitutional authority to recall the House of Representatives into session during the week of July 4th. I didn't have much expectation that it would be done, but the House ought not to leave town and leave us without recourse to offer amendments, which is our right under the Constitution, and to send it back to the House for their concurrence, and that could be done yet. It is my hope we will move in that direction.

This business of filling the tree is of recent origin. Going back to the 99th Congress in 1985 and 1986, Senator Dole used it five times. Senator BYRD used it in the next Congress three times. In the next Congress, Senator Mitchell didn't use it at all. Then, in the 103rd, for 1993 and 1994, Senator Mitchell used it nine times. Then Senator Lott picked it up a few times in the intervening years until the 106th Congress, when he used it nine times. Then Senator Frist used it nine times in the 109th Congress. So far, Senator REID has used it 12 times. That process precludes Senators from offering amendments. That is not the way the Senate has been designed to run.

I was concerned about this and made an extensive statement on global warming and in February of last year, some 18 months ago, introduced a rule change and wrote to the chairperson of the Rules Committee and the ranking Republican urging that that rule be taken up so that the Senate can work its will on preserving the right of Senators to offer amendments. Were that to be done, then when the effort was made on cloture, it wouldn't be summarily dismissed if there was a fair chance to offer amendments.

There has been a major development on the very important issues relating to warrantless wiretapping in an opinion issued by the Chief Judge of the

U.S. district court in San Francisco on the constitutionality of the Foreign Intelligence Act. The case handed down last Wednesday—some 56 pages, very complicated, very important—is on the issues which are being raised in the debate which we are going to have later this week on FISA. This is the same judge who handed down another very extensive opinion on the litigation involving the 40 telephone companies that are being sued in his court, issued on July 20, 2006, some 29 pages. This case is now under appeal under the state secrets doctrine.

Because of their tremendous impact on the issues which we are going to be considering, interested parties may review Chief Judge Walker's opinion in Al-Haramain Islamic Foundation v. Bush online at: http://www.cand.uscourts.gov/cand/judges.nsf/61fffe74f99516d088256d480060b72d/35760d9e4cc920758825747a0082f983/$FILE/Al_Haramain%20Order%20Following%20Remand%207-2-08.pdf and his decision in *Hepting* v. *AT&T*, located at 439 F.Supp. 2d 974 (N.D. Cal. 2006).

Mr. SPECTER. The core of Chief Judge Walker's opinion is a very important holding, and that is essentially that the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act is the exclusive way to have wiretapping and that the President exceeded his constitutional authority in putting into effect the terrorist surveillance program.

This is what Chief Judge Walker had to say:

> Congress appears clearly to have intended to, and did, establish the exclusive means for foreign intelligence surveillance activities to be conducted. Whatever power the executive may otherwise have had in this regard, FISA limits the power of the executive branch to conduct such activities.

The Supreme Court of the United States candidly ducked the issue in the case coming out of Detroit. The Federal judge there had held the terrorist surveillance program unconstitutional. The Sixth Circuit reversed on the ground of standing, but, as demonstrated from the scholarly dissenting opinion on the standing issue, there was ample grounds to have granted standing. It is really a very flexible doctrine.

Then the Supreme Court of the United States denied certiorari and in effect ducked the case, really avoiding deciding the most important constitutional confrontation of our era on the President's authority under article II and the congressional authority under article I. But now the fat is in the fire again, as of last Wednesday, with Judge Vaughn's opinion.

Then you come down to the issue of standing, which is still to be determined, but this is what Judge Walker had to say about that:

> Both plaintiff amici hint at the proper showing when they refer to ''independent evidence disclosing that plaintiffs have been surveilled'' and a ''rich load of disclosure to support their claims'' in various of the multidistrict litigation cases.

So that when you have Judge Walker, who has the consolidation of the 40 cases picking up this issue, there is strong—well, it is more than a suggestion or a hint; it is a pretty extensive statement that there is a rich load of disclosure to support the claims of standing.

The business about the court stripping is always problemsome. But it is especially problemsome in the context of an ongoing case that is about to reach fruition, where such extensive consideration has been given and a decision may be imminent. It is very unseemly on our doctrine of separation of powers for the Congress to step in and grant retroactive immunity.

This is especially problemsome, as I see it, because we are being asked to grant retroactive immunity where there has not even been an on the record disclosure of what we are immunizing. You have the allegations as contained in the litigation—the allegations of data mining—but you have a program where most of the Members of Congress have not even been briefed on it. Yet we are asked to come in and grant retroactive immunity.

It is especially problemsome, as I see it, because we could maintain the program and still not subject the telephone companies to liability in a couple directions. The telephone companies have been good citizens. When this matter came up several months ago the first time in the Senate, I proposed an amendment to substitute the Federal Government as the party defending. The party can take over the litigation in the shoes of the telephone companies, with the same defenses, no more and no less than the telephone companies have, no governmental immunity, no sovereign immunity but State secret doctrine, if it applied. That way, you don't foreclose the courts from acting.

There is another alternative, which is my pending amendment—scheduled to be argued and voted upon this week. Our legislation does not give it to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Courts but to the district courts generally. But all there has to be is a showing that there was a request made in the proper form by the administration to the judge for carrying out this program, whatever it is. That is under our bill. Well, my amendment would broaden that to give the court the jurisdiction to decide constitutionality.

In a sense, that has already been foreclosed by what Judge Walker said last Wednesday in finding the terrorist surveillance program unconstitutional. The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 not only covers warrantless wiretapping, but it covers pen registers and it covers trap-and-trace devices. So presumably—and this is all a matter of presumption because we don't know exactly what the program is—it would cover whatever program there is at issue in this legislation.

And then we have the amendment pending by Senator BINGAMAN, which I am working on with him collaboratively, which picks up the obligation of the inspectors general of the various intelligence agencies to review the program and then to send it back to Congress 90 days later to see if we will uphold it when we know something more about the program. Certainly, today, it qualifies as a pig in a poke. We don't know what it is for which we are asked to grant retroactive immunity. So another alternative would be the proposal that Senator BINGAMAN has introduced, which I have cosponsored, which would call for the decision at a time when Congress at least knows a little something about what it is we are voting on.

In essence, I submit that we have come to a very serious situation where, in the future, historians are going to look back at the period from 9/11 to the present time as the greatest expansion of executive authority in history. The Congress has been totally ineffectual to restrain that. The National Security Act of 1947 requires that both intelligence committees be fully briefed on programs such as the terrorist surveillance program, which was violated by the President and the executive branch. Briefings were not made until piecemeal, and finally they needed the confirmation of General Hayden. It has been longstanding tradition for the executive branch to tell the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the ranking member about this. It came as a surprise to me by reading the New York Times one Friday in December of 2005, when we were arguing the PATRIOT Act on the final day and expected to pass it, and the legislation blew up in our faces when that was disclosed. Some Senators said they intended to vote for the PATRIOT Act but didn't do so when confronted with the secret program that the administration had not disclosed. But the administration violated the statute and had no recourse. The administration violated the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act and could not get a review by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case coming out of Detroit and the Sixth Circuit.

Then you had the hesitancy of the Supreme Court ruling on habeas corpus. In Rasul, Justice Stevens's opinion goes at great length to trace the constitutional common-law basis for the right of a writ of habeas corpus, starting with John at Runnymede, which was 1215. There was an alternative analysis of the statute on habeas corpus. The case gets to the District of Columbia Circuit Court, and they ignore the citations of constitutional authority and say: Well, Congress changed the statute and that governs, flying in the face of a Supreme Court direction and order from a superior court. And then the Supreme Court danced around Boumediene for a long time. First, cert was denied, and then in an unusual petition for reargument, taking five votes, granted cert because of the ineffective and insufficient procedures of the combat status review board.

So you have a long history of ineptitude—total ineptitude—by the Congress and more than ineptitude by the Congress, complicity in passing the Military Commissions Act and facilitating a free hand by the administration in changing the legislation on habeas corpus. That should not have had an impact on the ultimate result because habeas corpus is a constitutional right, and the Supreme Court finally got around to saying so when confronted with the totally insufficient procedures on the combat status review board. So we have another chance when the FISA legislation comes up. We have a lot of guidance, from what Chief Judge Walker has had to say.

It is understandable that the Congress continues to support law enforcement powers because of the continuing terrorist threat. No one wants to be blamed for another 9/11. My own briefings on the telephone companies' cooperation with the Government—and I speak in terms only of reports and allegations because it is not a matter of record—my own briefings on the telephone companies' cooperation with the Government have convinced me of the program's value, so that I voted for it, even though my amendment to substitute the Government for the telephone companies was defeated in the Senate's February vote. Similarly, I am prepared to support it again as a last resort, even if it cannot be improved by providing for judicial review.

However, since Congress has been so ineffective in providing a check and balance, I will fight hard this week—starting today with this speech—to secure passage of an amendment to keep the courts open. When the stakes are high, as they invariably are when Congress addresses civil liberties and national security, Members frequently must choose between the lesser of two imperfect options. Unfortunately, we too often back ourselves into these corners by deferring legislation until there is a looming deadline or a congressional recess. Perhaps that is why so many of my colleagues have resigned themselves to accept the current bill without seeking to improve it.

I ask my colleagues to look to Judge Walker's opinions as guidance as to what we ought to be doing to back him up on what he has done, in a courageous way, in taking the bull by the horns and declaring the terrorist surveillance program unconstitutional and setting the path for standing.

Although I am prepared to stomach the bill if I must, I am not ready to concede that the debate is over. Contrary to the conventional wisdom, I don't believe it is too late to make this bill better. Perhaps the Fourth of July holiday will inspire the Senate to exercise its independence from the executive branch now that we have returned to Washington.

I thank the Chair and my distinguished colleague from North Dakota for his patience—if he has any. Senator DORGAN customarily does.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I wish to speak in morning business, and I ask unanimous consent to use the remaining time in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENERGY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the issue of energy. I understand the urgency of the need to get our energy policies right. We have a very serious problem, I think, in a range of areas. Energy policy is something that affects everybody. They pull up to the gas pump to fill their tanks and wonder how they are going to be able to afford it. If you try to run an airline, you try to stop the hemorrhaging of red ink because of the enormous cost of jet fuel. If you have a trucking company, you are trying to avoid going bankrupt because of the cost of diesel fuel. If you have a family farm, you are trying to get the money together to fill your fuel tanks for the summer and fall harvests.

There is so much that is damaging our economy, as the price of gasoline has gone to $4-plus a gallon and the price of oil is bouncing around $140 a barrel. I wish to talk about that. I understand, as a Member of this body, that old saying is that ''when all is said and done, more is said than done.'' I understand how people feel about that. Democracy is painfully slow and, yet, in this case, we face something that is urgent and needs, I think, some haste and speed. I know there are others who look at the legislative bodies, or politics generally, and see windbags in blue suits, and they think there is a lot of discussion and precious little action. I will talk a bit about this issue of the need for action.

We get up in the morning and we, generally speaking, reach for a switch and turn it on and there is light. We might—those of us who need to—plug in an electric razor and shave in the morning. We might decide to have breakfast and turn on a stove and fry some eggs. We could go out to the car and put a key into the ignition and start the engine. There are so many different things we do every single moment of the day that we don't think about, but it represents the consumption of energy—an unbelievable amount of energy, in the form of oil, natural gas, electricity, and coal.

Now, let me describe for a moment where we find ourselves. This great country of ours—and there is nothing like it on the face of the Earth—has an unbelievable appetite for oil. Sixty to seventy percent of our oil comes from outside our country. We stick straws in the Earth and suck out oil from the planet every day. We suck 85 million barrels a day out of the planet Earth, and 21 million, or one-fourth, is destined to be used in the United States of America. That describes to you how much of an appetite we have for oil.

We use a substantial amount of the Earth's oil. Seventy percent of the oil that we use is used in vehicles. So that consumes a substantial amount of our oil.

The runup in price has had such a dramatic impact on this economy and on American families. I want to describe a bit about that today.

Some would say the price of oil has increased because it is supply and demand. Right? Greater demand, less supply; therefore, a higher price. But that is not true. I would like someone to name for me one thing that has happened in the past year with respect to supply and demand that justifies a doubling of the price of oil. You can't do it. I will stand here for 3 days. You can't do it. Nothing has happened in the last year with respect to supply and demand that justifies doubling the price of oil. If anything, exactly the opposite should have been the case. We are using less fuel in the United States right now than we did in the equivalent period a year ago. We drove about 5 billion fewer miles. That means demand is down. Supply is up.

The closing month inventory of crude oil for the first 5 months of this year has supplies increasing. If supplies are increasing and demand is down, what should happen to price? It should go down. But the fact is, the price has gone up like a Roman candle, just up, up, straight up.

As I have indicated, the OPEC countries are blissfully happy going to the bank to deposit our money in their bank accounts. The big oil companies have a permanent grin. They love depositing our money into their bank accounts. Everybody loves it except the consumer who is paying through the nose for gasoline—$4, $4.50 a gallon for regular gasoline.

There are a lot of things that need to be done in energy. We need to produce more, yes. We need to conserve more, certainly. We need more efficiency in all the appliances we use. We certainly do that. And we ought to have a national commitment toward renewable energy sources. We ought to do that, all of that.

I support drilling offshore. I am one of four Senators who helped open what is now lease 181 in the Gulf of Mexico. That is now open, and that is good. Hurricane Katrina came through the gulf—we are never going to have a bigger wind than that through the gulf—and those offshore platforms withstood. There was no oil leakage in the gulf as a result of that hurricane.

We can get those resources, in my judgment. Some say the hood ornament is ANWR. We have to drill in ANWR in Alaska. It is one of the few pristine areas put away for future generations in legislation signed by Dwight Eisenhower.