

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