

want to live yesterday again. We want to look to the future. That is why we believe speculation is where we should be. We should also do something about domestic production.

Finally, there are other things. We are going to have a recess. The national conventions are coming. We have to come back in the fall and complete our work and that could take a significant period of time. But we also have to do something with renewable energy. That is one of the main things pending—renewable energy—and we have been prevented from doing that.

Why? Listen to this one. Because the Republicans do not want to pay for it. They want to continue, as we have done with the Iraq war, spending \$5,000 every second in borrowed money. We have been told by the House of Representatives—and I have a letter with 218 signatures on it—saying: Send us the bill for renewables, and send it quickly, but you cannot have it not paid for. You have to pay for it. We have two pay-fors. We are going to tax the hedge fund companies, but they agree it should be done because they are manipulating the system by going offshore playing around with their taxes. Even the hedge fund operators say: That is right, we should not be able to do that. But the Republicans are holding that up.

In answer to the energy problems of this country, Sun, wind, geothermal, biomass, that is where the future of our country is, as indicated by a staunch lifetime Republican by the name of T. Boone Pickens. Eighty-one years old, and he has suddenly become bipartisan. I am happy about that. I have great admiration and respect for T. Boone Pickens. T. Boone Pickens has said: I have made my fortune in oil, and that is not where it is. His words were: I don't want to leave this Earth thinking all I was interested in was making money. I want to change this country. What he wants to do is have a few years—5, 6 years—where there would be a bridge using natural gas, and then it would all be done with renewable energy. That is T. Boone Pickens, and he is putting his personal fortune on the line to do that.

Al Gore has done a wonderful job representing the problem. T. Boone Pickens has done a wonderful job of pointing out to the American people what the solution is. That is what we should be doing—not debating how many amendments will be offered. We want to do something on speculation. We want to do something on domestic production. That is a pretty good step forward for the American people.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

LOWERING THE COST OF ENERGY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I notice my good friend from Nevada did not mention T. Boone Pickens' views on whether speculation is a part of the problem. Republicans are perfectly happy to have a speculation component of the overall issue. But if we are in the business of quoting T. Boone Pickens, I had a chance to meet with him for an hour on Monday. He told me, without equivocation, he did not think speculation had anything to do with this particular runup. I do not know whether it does. I think most of my Members are in favor of transparency. We want to put more cops on the beat to make sure the markets are working properly. But if we are quoting Pickens, I am sure I will be safe in saying Pickens would not be voting for this bill that the majority leader thinks is the way we ought to go.

Right now in Lexington, KY, and Las Vegas, NV, and every other city and town across the country, Americans are hurting from high gas prices. Right now, there is a man watching his hard-earned paycheck go into his gas tank instead of his daughter's college fund. That man doesn't care about cloture motions or second-degree amendments; he wants Congress to do something. He wants us to act.

We have all heard the frustrations from constituents literally for months. They have made their feelings known. So we were surprised yesterday to learn about the intentions of our friends across the aisle when it comes to high gas prices. The majority leader told reporters that voting on more than one amendment per side—this is in some ways almost laughable—voting on more than one amendment per side on the No. 1 domestic issue facing our Nation is unreasonable.

Let me repeat that. Our friends on the other side are saying that having a real debate and considering good ideas from all sides is too much for the Senate to handle. They have apparently rejected the idea of finding a serious solution to high gas prices. Instead, they want us to take up a proposal that is designed to fail. They want us to try to fool our constituents into believing we are addressing this problem in a serious way, when everyone knows we are not.

It is no surprise that the Democratic leadership won't allow Americans' top priorities to be heard. It is the same reason they have been canceling hearings and markups all week. They don't want to choose between their Presidential nominee—whose position on bringing down gas prices is: No, we can't—and the demands of the guy at the gas pump who is watching his daughter's college fund shrink with every gallon he puts in the tank.

It is a sad commentary, given the propositions they made. Our friends across the aisle promised a year-and-a-half ago in their "Six for 06" pledge to lower gas prices and to free America from dependence on foreign oil, but

things didn't turn out exactly as planned. The fact is, a gallon of gas is now \$1.70 higher than it was when the new majority took over and promised to lower it. At a time when Americans are clamoring for them to make good on their pledge, they must muster the political will to do something about it. We should not be content to leave town after a couple of failed votes and a speculation proposal that no serious economist in America believes will have a significant impact by itself on the price of gas.

Let me reiterate. The Republicans believe we can strengthen the futures markets. Our bill would do just that—the Gas Price Reduction Act. If bad actors are out there, we would like to find them by putting more cops on the beat and by bringing greater transparency to the market, but we don't claim this provision alone will solve the problem. No serious person would claim that. The other side has made the astonishing claim that the speculation provision alone will lower the price of gas by 20 to 50 percent. Yet I have found no one—not the chairman of the Federal Reserve, not the 27-nation International Energy Agency, not even the most famous rich Democrat in America, Warren Buffett—to back up that claim.

Yesterday, our colleague, the junior Senator from Texas, asked here on the floor for any citation backing up such a claim. My good friend the majority leader came back to the floor to respond, but the only person he could name who had made this claim had been so thoroughly discredited here in the Senate that the Democratic chairman of the Senate's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations issued a stinging 11-page rebuttal of his recent testimony. In testimony before the committee, the majority leader's source—a lawyer, not an economist—claimed that "overnight," the speculation bill dealing with energy commodities would "bring down the price of crude oil, I believe, by 25 percent."

The committee's public response to this notion of an overnight reduction of 25 percent was blunt. Here is what the committee had to say:

There is no credible evidence that simply amending the Commodities Exchange Act to regulate energy commodities as if they were agricultural commodities will lead to lower energy prices.

So in other words, the one source our friends across the aisle point to when they claim their bill will lower the cost of energy by 20 to 50 percent is the subject of an 11-page, bipartisan rebuke which says there is zero credible evidence to support his claim.

Mr. President, I commend to my colleagues the report from the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Let me say it again: We, as do our friends, support legislation that keeps bad actors from driving up gas prices. We have addressed this in our own bill, the gas price reduction bill, but serious people understand that if this activity

is occurring, it is a small portion of the overall problem.

This leads me to a broader point. The price of gas at the pump is a serious national problem that requires a serious legislative response. We cannot solve this problem with timid, half-hearted measures. We need to act boldly, and that means we need to consider good ideas from both sides, as we have typically done when dealing with the biggest issues in the country. Now is not the time to be timid or to play political games that are designed to benefit a single party. Our job, it seems to me, is to help the man or woman at the gas pump who is making hard choices in order to keep his gas tank full. That is why it is so irresponsible to short-change this debate. Until we have acted boldly to cut gas prices and our reliance on Middle East oil, we will be ignoring the demands of the American people.

So it is time to be serious about this problem. No more unsupportable outlandish claims, no more relying on discredited testimony, no more canceling markups simply to avoid taking votes on a serious approach to lowering the price of gas at the pump.

We need to find more and we need to use less, and we need to start now. We need to consider good ideas from all sides, and we need to take seriously that energy is the No. 1 domestic issue facing our Nation. We simply can't go through a failed process, claim credit for trying, and then pack up and go home. Let's get serious. Let's open this debate to more than one good idea rather than bring it to a premature conclusion, and let's find a solution that incorporates increased domestic supply as well as conservation. We need to find more and use less, and the American people are simply demanding no less from us.

I see the Senator from New Hampshire is here.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, would the Republican leader yield for a question?

Mr. McCONNELL. I am happy to yield to my friend from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. As I understand the proposal from the Democratic leader, it would not allow an amendment, for example, on oil shale. As I understand it, the Democratic proposal suggests that we use the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. That would give us an estimated 3.5 days of oil. Were we to be able to extract oil shale, as I understand it, we would have the potential for 40,000 days of oil.

I guess my question to the Republican leader is if we are going to have a comprehensive energy policy, shouldn't we at least take up the issue of whether the restrictions which have been placed on the ability to use oil—which restrictions have been offered by the Democratic Party—shouldn't an amendment on that issue be allowed, as well as an amendment on drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf?

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I say to my friend from New Hampshire, of course. That moratorium was installed by this new majority last year to shut down this promising new source that we have right here in our country, some have estimated as much oil as the entire reserves in Saudi Arabia times three.

Mr. GREGG. I appreciate the Republican leader's answer on that.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

Mr. McCONNELL. I believe I have the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. REID. The Senator was not talking.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I also have a question for the minority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KYL. I am trying to understand basically the differences between the proposals that have been put forth by the majority leader and by the minority leader in terms of unanimous consent requests. As I understand it, they basically boil down to the following, and I wonder if the Senator could confirm this for me.

What the majority leader has said is there could be either one amendment—or possibly two, I am not clear—but that they would pit the two sides against each other; that is, a Democratic proposal and a Republican proposal.

What I believe the minority leader has suggested is that we engage in what Senators call the regular order, which is a process of debate and proposals for amendments which would try to build a bill with amendments that could actually be adopted by both sides—or by Members on either side, let me put it that way—rather than simply having two party positions, neither of which could win 60 votes, would fail, and therefore we would end up with nothing. What the minority leader is suggesting is a process by which both Democrats and Republicans could offer ideas—pieces of the puzzle, as it were—that could appeal to Members on both sides in such a way that a bill could eventually be built and passed to actually do something about this energy crisis and the high cost of oil; is that correct?

Mr. McCONNELL. I think my friend from Arizona is correct. What I proposed to the majority leader and to the Senate—to which he objected, unfortunately—was that we proceed on this measure related to the subject that is most on the minds of the American people in a way entirely consistent with the way we have dealt with energy in the past when it wasn't the No. 1 issue in the country.

Last year when we were on an energy measure, the way we proceeded involved 15 days on the floor, it involved 16 rollcall votes and the adoption of 49 amendments. I say to my friend from Arizona, at that time gasoline was way too high, but it wasn't nearly as high as it is now. It was \$3.06 a gallon; now it is about a dollar a gallon higher. That was in this Congress.

In 2005, when our party was in the majority, we passed an energy bill, and we spent 10 days on the floor. At that time gas was \$2.26 a gallon. We had 19 rollcall votes, 57 amendments were adopted, and we passed the bill.

So if we were treating the subject of energy in a credible way consistent with Senate traditions in 2005 when it wasn't the No. 1 issue and in 2007 when it wasn't the No. 1 issue in the country, my thought is why in the world would we be trying to do something less than that—something that doesn't give all Senators, many of whom have good ideas to propose on both sides of the aisle, an opportunity to craft a proposal that gets at the No. 1 issue in the country. That is what my unanimous consent request would have allowed. I proffered it a while ago. It was objected to. It would have allowed us to have energy-related amendments only, I would say to my friend from Arizona, that we would rotate from side to side—a Republican amendment and then a Democratic amendment—and we wouldn't put a sort of arbitrary timeline on ending the discussion prematurely before we had dealt with the problem.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from New Hampshire—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader has the floor under leadership time.

Mr. GREGG. I was wondering if the Republican leader would entertain another question.

Mr. McCONNELL. I would be happy to yield to my friend from New Hampshire for a question.

Mr. GREGG. The Republican leader has made the point that we need to have a good piece of legislation, something that can be bipartisan in the area of drilling. Hopefully, we can also have an equally bipartisan effort in the area of oil shale.

Isn't it also likely we could probably have a bipartisan amendment on the issue of how we bring more nuclear power online, and shouldn't that be considered as part of any energy solution, because it addresses the environmental concerns which the Democratic leader spoke of so well relative to making sure we have clean energy? Shouldn't that also be part of any package such as this? Isn't it also totally reasonable that we could allow these types of amendments and do it in a fairly orderly way and in a quick way within this week, and certainly within next week, which is a small amount of time and certainly a reasonable amount of time, considering the fact that the American people continue to pay such extraordinary fees at the gas pump and expect us to act?

Mr. McCONNELL. I say to my friend from New Hampshire that under the consent agreement I proffered, to which there was an objection lodged by the majority leader, such an amendment would have been entirely appropriate, and as he suggests, entirely

consistent with the subject that I know my good friend, the majority leader, cares deeply about.

He brought up in the Senate a climate change measure back in the first week of June—something he obviously felt was important. We spent a number of days on it. Many people feel nuclear power is one of the best solutions to the climate change issue, an entirely relevant subject to energy, and would have been permitted under the consent agreement that I offered earlier.

So I think the point is well made, that it is the kind of amendment you would normally expect in the Senate on the biggest issue in the country to be offering, debating, and voting on.

I see my friend from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Would the distinguished minority leader yield for a question?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I have been listening to the colloquy and the questions and the urging all of us have been making to have an open amendment process.

I wonder if the Republican leader, the Senator from Kentucky, is aware that we actually have a vehicle that would increase production, and the process could be done immediately, and that is through the appropriations bills that have been steadily marked up by the Appropriations Committee. But is the leader aware that the markup for Thursday was canceled?

It was canceled because the Interior appropriations bill, which has the moratorium against offshore drilling and shale production, is in that bill, and there was going to be an amendment offered by myself and Senators DOMENICI and BOND to take that moratorium off so that we could do something for the American people to bring the price down and start production and use our own resources. But that markup was canceled. I wanted to see if the leader was aware of that and what possible reasons could there be for not having the opportunity, again, to address this issue of production.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I might say to my friend from Texas that I was surprised to learn that not only was the meeting canceled, the rationale for canceling the meeting was announced by the chairman as being precisely what the Senator from Texas suggests, which was the avoidance of having to vote on the question of offshore drilling.

The last two surveys I looked at—one is a Fox survey and one a CNN survey—indicated that over 70 percent of the American people believe we ought to move in previously off-limits offshore areas to increase American production. I was surprised to see that the chairman of the committee doesn't want to allow a vote on that. It strikes me that there is a lot of dodging and weaving going on here to try to avoid voting on the things the American people are clearly asking us to do.

I thank the Senator from Texas for raising that issue. Does she have another question?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I would just say that the Appropriations Committee and this Senate have had a tradition of bipartisan participation, and there is a great bipartisan bill for the Interior to be able to go forward, and we have the chance to address the issues of the congressional moratorium in a bipartisan way. There is no other bar to being able to let the States explore on the Outer Continental Shelf, and the States that have oil shale reserves, to be able to open those, and that bipartisan spirit has been in the Appropriations Committee.

So I just saw that we have this opportunity on the Senate floor right now to work all weekend, with amendments, deciding what the majority of the Senate wants to do. We have something that is an opportunity that I hope we will take, and that is to let the American people see the debate and let the American people decide if we have some proposals that would increase production, and would that in fact bring down the price of oil and gasoline at the pump right now.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The appropriations process has certainly been used in the past to achieve the opposite result. I believe the process was used last year to put a moratorium on going forward with the development of oil shale, much of which is found in Utah. I see our friend from Utah. So it is not at all inappropriate, it strikes me, for the appropriations process to consider the other side of the equation, which is to actually provide additional domestic production.

It is pretty clear what is going on here, I say to my friend from Texas. There is a great effort to avoid having the Senate go on record on the issues that are on the minds of the American people, that they believe—I think correctly—would take us in the direction of moving toward energy independence, which is something that clearly has not been accomplished.

Mr. President, this is an important debate which I and most of my Members think we ought to continue to be on for many days, and to try to achieve an accomplishment for the American people that would make a difference. I don't think we should be afraid of this issue. That is what the Senate is here to do—grapple with the big issues confronting the country. This is the biggest one. It is time that we dealt with it.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what the American people are now watching is what has been taking place for 18 months. The Republicans said they wanted a vote on drilling. We offered them a vote on drilling. They cannot take yes for an answer.

We have had statement after statement by people who say drilling is im-

portant. But remember what Senator MCCAIN said. The Republican nominee for President, JOHN MCCAIN, said drilling wouldn't make any difference; it is only psychological. Think about that. They have been talking for weeks about drilling.

We say: OK, let's have a vote on drilling.

They say: No, we don't want a vote on drilling, we want the open amendment process.

That is a buzzword for: Folks, we are not going to do anything.

If they want a vote on shale, I thought that would be part of their amendment. If they want a vote on shale, we will give them a vote on shale. They want a vote on nuclear. We could limit the time on those three amendments. We are happy to do that if they want a vote on drilling, shale, and nuclear.

Of course, Mr. President, everybody knows, as Senator MCCAIN has said, these are only psychological things. We know that shale would take at least 15 years, even if we started doing something about it yesterday. We know that, regarding nuclear, there hasn't been a new nuclear plant built in 40 to 50 years, and there likely would not be in the near future.

These are only ploys by the Republicans to avoid voting on what they said is the best thing. They go through all this stuff about the appropriations process. The appropriations bills are going nowhere because of George Bush, the President. Remember, last year, he had us where he wanted us. We had to do everything he wanted because, otherwise, we would have to deal with him in January after a CR. Well, we will not have to deal with this guy anymore; after January 20, he is gone.

To suggest that in some way I have said we are only going to have one amendment—I didn't say that. We made a unanimous consent request asking them to do what they said they wanted. They said they wanted drilling. OK, drill. Vote on that. We believe our domestic production is much better than theirs.

Now, let's talk about a few other things, Mr. President. These are the words of my Republican counterpart: "Timid, half-hearted, bobbing and weaving." Talk about bobbing and weaving—we give them what they want and they say no.

Now, on speculation, we have done this before, and we will do it again.

Economist Mark Zandi said speculation is driving up oil prices.

Gary Ramm of the Petroleum Marketers Association of America blamed speculation for driving up oil prices. He did that less than a month ago.

The Acting Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission said the oil markets are "ripe for those wanting to illegally manipulate the market."

The former Director of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission's Trade Division, Michael Greenberger—

now a professor at the University of Maryland Law School—said speculation is one of the big problems with the energy problem. He also said the price has gone up 20 to 50 percent because of speculation.

The Japanese Government said speculation added \$30 to \$40 to the cost of each barrel of oil last year.

Consumer advocate, Mark Cooper, testified that speculation on energy has cost the American people \$500 billion in the last 2 years.

Now, let's take one of the pals of the Republicans. ExxonMobil Senior Vice President Stephen Simon testified that "the price of oil should be about \$55 a barrel." It is speculation, Mr. President.

So the Republicans are where they have been for 18 months. They still have their nose out of joint because we are in the majority. It is a slim majority. They have done everything to slow down, stop, or disguise their stalling.

We have said we think we should do something about speculation. Now they say it is no big deal. We are willing to vote on what they think—and they have been saying it for a month—is the most important thing to do: drill off the Outer Continental Shelf. We are saying: Good, draw up your amendment and let's vote on it.

Now they say oil shale, and now—it is remarkable—they are back-talking about nuclear. If you want to talk about the only thing that uses more water than coal, it is nuclear. There isn't enough water in Nevada to have a nuclear powerplant. It is in the West. That is why they are usually on oceans or rivers because they need huge amounts of water.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. REID. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. So the record is clear, I ask the Senator, we want to consider the impact of speculation on energy prices and whether it is raising the cost of a barrel of oil and the cost of a gallon of gasoline—we believe it is—and we want to put in more regulators to watch this industry, add more transparency, more computer capacity, make sure there is more disclosure from markets around the world.

We want to limit the trades to commercial trades that really have value to businesses rather than just speculators, as the leader said, clicking a mouse and moving around millions of dollars. And we want to offer this as an amendment.

I ask the majority leader, did we say to the Republican side: You can offer your own version of the speculation amendment, and you can try to strike ours, if you wish. Offer yours. But we are giving you the opportunity to offer your amendment, in your terms, with your substantive suggestions, and we will vote on each one of them. Is that the offer on the table to the Republicans?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to my friend, they are not seriously trying to

solve the problem. They are stalling, as they have done for 18 months. My friend, the Republican leader, said—to answer the question of the senior Senator from Illinois, the assistant leader—that no serious person has suggested that speculation has anything to do with the price runup.

Talk about a serious person. Glenn Tilton is running a company that we have all heard of, United Airlines. United Airlines is trying to hang on without going bankrupt. Is this just some corporate executive who has an idea that the price of oil is too high? He is also a former president of Texaco and formerly the vice chairman of Chevron, so he has a little background.

He said speculation is a big problem. My friend, the Democratic whip, attended a meeting where he desperately told us we needed to do something about speculation. Does he remember that meeting?

Mr. DURBIN. Yes. I ask the majority leader, if we believe that speculation on energy prices is part of the problem, and we have a measure to try to address it, and we say to the Republicans "offer your version of it," are we stopping them from the substance of the amendment that they offer? Are they able, under our proposal, our suggestion, to put whatever they want into their version of the amendment?

Mr. REID. We have been saying that for weeks. Certainly, since our bill has been on the Senate floor, it has been clear—and I have said it on the floor many times—if they don't like our speculation bill, come up with a better one.

Mr. DURBIN. We have also offered to the Republicans to put together their Energy bill, to include in their Energy bill what they think is important. Day after day, in press conference after press conference, they say drill, drill, drill—which they could include in their Energy bill. We have heard talk about oil shale. We have not objected to them putting a provision for that in their bill.

Senator GREGG said, "Let's bring in nuclear power." If we said to them, write your own bill, bring it to the floor, and we will debate it and have a vote, with the same number of votes on both sides, and let's see who prevails, have we restricted the Republicans in anything that they include in their Energy bill in the proposal we have given to them?

Mr. REID. I say to my friend that we have not stopped them from doing anything. We have oil shale as part of our proposal. Senator BINGAMAN put that in as part of his bill. So I relish the debate of our proposal and theirs. I suggested 2 hours. If they want more time, that would be fine. But they want to live yesterday. They want to live yesterday forever. The status quo isn't even good enough for them now.

Mr. DURBIN. The last question I ask the leader is—

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Democratic

whip—the Republican leader took a lot of time, and I have no problem with that. So I ask unanimous consent that the Democratic whip be allowed to finish his question.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. This will be my last question. I wanted to do a calculation. When we talked to the Republicans 2 days ago, they suggested that at that time they had 28 amendments they wanted to offer. We are hoping to wrap up this session without stopping for the weekend by going 10 straight days.

I heard from the Republican leader that in a previous debate over the span of 15 days of debate on the floor of the Senate, there were 19 rollcall votes. If I do the simple math here of 28 separate Republican amendments to start with 2 days ago, there is no way in 10 days we could finish this debate on the Energy bill before the August recess.

I ask the majority leader, does the math work in terms of opening this to as many amendments as people can dream up and actually finishing within 10 days?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to my friend, that is what they want, and in the process housing is gone, it is a casualty; the Lou Gehrig registry is gone; the Reeve paralysis bill is gone; we don't do anything about LIHEAP to help the disabled and old people who are going to freeze this winter, and we don't do anything about renewables. But this would be in keeping with the 83 filibusters that have taken so much time, 83 Republican-led filibusters.

They are not serious about this. We have tried. We have told them: Here is what we will do. They cannot take yes for an answer.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

STOP EXCESSIVE ENERGY SPECULATION ACT OF 2008—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 3268, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to the bill (S. 3268) to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, to prevent excessive price speculation with respect to energy commodities, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 4 p.m. will be equally divided, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the next 30 minutes and alternating in that fashion thereafter.

The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I sat and listened to this exchange, and it is