

chart; 2,000 acres is it. There is a village already here for those who suggest somehow we are bringing a footprint in an area where there has never been a footprint. There is an airstrip, the old radar station. About 300 or 400 people live there. There are the kids going to school.

My point is, there are people up there—not very many—but they want a better way of life. This is a little social club. They want the same advantages you and I have: Reasonable health care, opportunities for their children, insurance. It all relates to jobs. They do not want welfare reform.

Some say we should not disturb their custom. Do we want to put a fence around those people? They have television. They know what is going on in the world. Their customs change. They maintain traditions. That is very important because that is who you are.

By the same token, they do not want to live as they used to. You and I know what a honeybucket is. A honeybucket is an indoor toilet, really a pail, as opposed to running water that you and I enjoy. They do not want to live that way anymore. They want schools, opportunities, and education. They support this. Yet there are some in the environmental community who would dictate how they prefer them to live, how they prefer them not to have jobs.

As we look at this transition of our culture and our people, recognize this is a very balanced area. If some are interested in more wilderness, I don't know whether that is possible or not. Clearly, we have wilderness. We have refuges. We have a development. We have a very small footprint.

I hope, with this brief explanation, more Members can reflect on the reality that this can be done right. We have the technology to do it. I have faith and confidence in this Nation's men and women who drive our energy resources.

We need an energy bill that provides today's resources to move us to tomorrow's promise, not shallow measures with empty promises that export our wealth and jeopardize national security, and ship our U.S. jobs overseas.

I recognize the public policy debate about how best to approach our energy policy is complex and will involve issues at the very heart of the extreme environmental agenda. I think we should frame this in a simple manner, in a manner the American people can understand. Is it better to have a strong domestic energy policy that safeguards our environment and our national security than to rely on the likes of Saddam Hussein and others to supply this energy—countries in the Mideast that are clearly unstable and will be for some time? The answer in my mind is clearly yes.

I know some in this Chamber suggest this energy bill is just politics, pure and simple. As far as another piece of the puzzle being laid out is concerned, we have heard all kinds of explanations of why this is bad. We have had broad

support for reducing our dependence on imported energy sources. We have had veterans groups come up and support it. The response has been: "False patriotism." I think that is inappropriate.

I refer to reality. Reality dictated a comment that was made by Mark Hatfield, the Senator from Oregon. I served with Mark for many years. He was a pacifist. He said: I'll vote for opening up this area, this sliver of the Coastal Plain, in a minute, rather than vote for a measure that would send American men and women overseas, in harm's way, to fight a war over oil in the Middle East.

As we look at the attitude of American veterans associations that support developing an oil supply here at home, I think we have to reflect on the comments of some of our Members who suggest this matter is really about false patriotism. They could not be more wrong.

I have been around here a long time. I have been around here long enough to know lots of people do things for their own reasons. What we cannot do is sell short the American family, the American laborer—America's future, if you will. Energy is not about politics. It is about families across the country wondering if their jobs will be there in the morning. It is about preserving the very independence of this Nation. I believe in a nation that is dependent on no one but God alone.

Our President has made it clear. President Bush has mentioned, from time to time, the necessity of having the Senate pass an energy bill. As recently as the State of the Union Address, he stated the urgent need for a national energy plan. He laid it down as one of his first proposals, with the Vice President. It is known. It has been publicized. It has been examined.

He knows energy is about jobs. He knows energy is about security. He wants to protect this Nation from what he calls a real axis of evil. When we apply that to Saddam Hussein, it sticks. To some extent it sticks in Iran. The very fact that we intercepted a ship filled with armaments for the PLO demonstrates that. Our President knows, as long as we are dependent on other nations for our energy, our very national security is threatened and our future is at stake. So we should make every effort, every responsible effort, to reduce that dependence.

Our challenge is clear. It is to deliver to this President an energy plan for our Nation and an energy plan for our Nation's future. I urge my colleagues to recognize the weight of this task before us as we begin the process. We should come together to have the courage to vote on the difficult issues and do what is right for our Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

BUSH TAX CUT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, yesterday the President's Council of Economic Advisers released a report claiming that the Bush tax cuts are responsible for keeping the recession more mild than it otherwise would be. They claim that the already passed tax cut has raised prospects for a solid recovery and that by the end of this year there will be 800,000 more jobs than there otherwise would have been.

The report of the Council of Economic Advisers is somewhat curious. It is obviously self-serving. It does make a fundamental mistake. It tries to suggest that the Bush tax cut, which centered on the reduction of income tax rates principally benefiting the highest paid and most affluent Americans, is the cause of the slight stimulus we have seen over the last few months when in fact, to be honest about it, it has been the proposed rebates championed initially by the Democrats, not part of the initial Bush proposal, that has provided some stimulus effect over the last several months.

That goes to the nature of, first, a rebate directly to a whole host of Americans across a broad income range. Those rebates typically were spent, and that seems to be the case in this situation.

The reality of the Bush tax proposals is that, first, they were not effective this year. Much of his tax cut proposal does not become effective until the following fiscal year. As a result, to make claims that his tax concept is a part of this stimulus effect is rather suspicious on its face.

To suggest, as I think is the suggestion, that this "tax plan" will lead to further stimulus of our economy is also suspicious. What it will lead to, which is already apparent, is increased Federal deficits. This year, because of the poor economic performance of the country, we have seen the Federal deficit materialize. But as we go forward, most of that deficit can be attributed not to adverse economic circumstances but to the tax cut. As we deny resources that are necessary to have this Government function and operate effectively in many different areas, we will see the deficit grow and grow.

The problem there becomes, in order to fund Federal programs, we must go into the debt markets. We must borrow

more money. That puts pressure on interest rates, and that helps retard our economic progress and our growth.

The notion that the Bush plan has materially aided and assisted our recovery or softened the recession is very dubious.

What is also unfortunate is that in the last few weeks, as we have debated a possible stimulus package, there have been several proposals, one of which would be broadening the rebate we enacted last spring to include those Americans who did not pay income taxes but paid a great deal of taxes in terms of payroll taxes and other forms of wage taxation. I don't know how many times I have been in the Chamber and heard Republicans assail that approach as being inappropriate, ineffective, and inefficient.

What is curious is that the one aspect of last spring's tax plan that helped the rebates through the income tax system is being not only trumpeted as a Bush proposal but that exact or closely similar approach extended to payroll taxes is being derided and criticized by Republicans in the Senate as being something unworthy of the Senate.

I disagree. Frankly, last year if we had adopted a proposal to cut taxes that was targeted to lower income Americans, that was broad to include not just rebates for income taxes but rebates for payroll taxes, we would have seen a much less severe recession than we are seeing right now.

In effect, what we have today is the Council of Economic Advisers not providing good economic analysis but providing political spin on the tax plan we passed last year. I hope when we go back and reconsider the stimulus package, we will understand what stimulates the economy and not what is appealing to the political winds of the moment.

Again, we are in the grips of a recession. There are multiple causes. The President's tax proposal as originally proposed certainly did very little, if anything at all, to help soften the recession. I hope that will become more and more apparent.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

USTR DECISION REGARDING THE CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today in joining the Secretary of Agriculture in applauding the decision that was reached by our U.S. Trade Representative this morning on the 301 investigation into the Canadian Wheat

Board and on durum wheat. I think Minnesota is a producer of durum, as we are in the Dakotas and in Montana. In her statement—and I associate with her words this morning—we support the immediate actions outlined in this decision, which will help us to move forward, removing the longstanding barrier in U.S.-Canadian relations. We are committed to working with the USTR in our country and, of course, with the WTO, and those trade negotiations should produce discipline which will lead to fundamental reform.

As you well know, that has been a bone of contention among grain producers in this country and, of course, with this Government and its relationship with Canada.

This morning, I heard a statement from a colleague who quoted a news article from a western producer in Canada, and by a secondhand source, that claimed the Secretary of Agriculture urged her Canadian counterpart to lobby Congress regarding the farm bill. I find that very unusual. In fact, I asked the Secretary this morning about that. I picked up the phone and called the Secretary and she denied making any such statement in its entirety. She did call the Minister of Agriculture in Canada, and he apologized for misstatements of his staff. Of course, I find that everybody is entitled to their opinion and everybody is entitled also to the facts. I would find it very unusual if another country got involved in the internal affairs of another. They usually do not do that, although we are now, it seems, at the end of the debate of the farm bill. That is not going to weigh in as it goes into conference. It is important legislation.

If there was ever a time for solidarity in agriculture, it is now. I say that to agriculturalists around the world because it seems as if we have gotten into this mindset that it is a right to have what we produce, when basically we have to figure out a way to make a living at it, one. Two, we don't like to see hungry people either, but quit putting up rules and regulations and deal with the market forces that would allow us to produce food and fiber in this country.

It seems in this community and in the agricultural community, if we want to take a shot at somebody, instead of using a straight line, we use a circle for firing squads. That usually isn't a very good situation. This morning, I again join the Secretary of Agriculture in this 301 finding. Now we will move on and try to deal with the situation with the Canadian Wheat Board. Living on the Canadian border is always a source of irritation whenever we have to move livestock and grain back and forth across the Canadian border. Of course, with the culture as it is in our State, and as it is in Alberta and Saskatchewan, our values are alike. Most of our problems are from east of the 100th meridian in understanding the situations we have to deal with in our production of food and fiber.

So I hope we can work this out and get away from misstatements or misguided statements and come together in the agricultural community and work together because I think the time has come that we are going to need some solidarity, especially from producers. I don't see processors having a hard time or purveyors having a hard time or any distributors of the food product having a hard time. But I know there are hard times when it comes to the production of food and fiber because we can't get a handle on our cost of production. We have to continue to think about that as Americans and think about the security that we have. Ours is about the only country in the world where you can have fresh lettuce in grocery stores in the wintertime in Minnesota.

It is a wonderful system in this country. You don't know how great it is until you travel around the world. Nonetheless, there are some misgivings about what it costs and the work that it takes to get the beans to the table.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

THE INNOCENCE PROTECTION ACT AND ANOTHER DEATH ROW MILESTONE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I rise to discuss two disturbing and shameful milestones for our Nation, one that we reached this past December and one that is fast approaching. The milestone we have reached: 100 people in the United States have now been exonerated through the use of DNA testing. The milestone that approaches: The 100th exoneration of a death row inmate.

We can no longer ignore the fact that innocent people can, and do, get convicted in our country, and in some cases they are sentenced to death. We need to focus on these cases. We need to learn from them. And we need to do something about them. This is not a matter of whether you are for or against the death penalty, it is a matter of common conscience for our Nation.

So let me turn, first, to milestone No. 1, the 100th DNA exoneration.

In December 2001, a man named Larry Mayes became the 100th person in the United States to be exonerated by postconviction DNA testing. Mayes served 21 years in Indiana's prisons for a rape and a robbery—21 years for a rape and a robbery—but a rape and a robbery he did not commit. For 21 years an innocent man sat behind bars.

How was he exonerated? Was it by brilliant lawyers? Was it by the justice system recognizing a mistake? No. It