

UConn cheer. I believe if I don't do it today, there will be objections raised under various Federal statutes. So here it is: U-C-O-N-N, UConn, UConn, UConn.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution and the preamble are agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 232) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 232

Whereas the University of Connecticut women's basketball team won its second national championship in 3 years by defeating the University of Oklahoma by the score of 82-70;

Whereas NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Coach of the Year Geno Auriemma's team finished the 2002 season with a perfect 39-0 record, becoming only the fourth NCAA Division I women's basketball team to go undefeated;

Whereas Sue Bird was chosen as the national women's player of the year;

Whereas Swin Cash was named the Final Four Most Outstanding Player;

Whereas Sue Bird, Swin Cash, Diana Taurasi, Asjha Jones, and Tamika Williams were selected as All-Americans;

Whereas the Huskies' 35-point average margin of victory during the regular season was the largest in NCAA Division I women's basketball history;

Whereas the Huskies dominated this year's NCAA Division I women's basketball tournament, averaging 83.3 points and a 27-point margin of victory en route to the championship;

Whereas the high caliber of the Huskies in both athletics and academics has significantly advanced the sport of women's basketball and provided inspiration for future generations of young men and women alike; and

Whereas the Huskies' season of unparalleled accomplishment rallied Connecticut residents of all ages, from New London to New Haven, from Hartford to Hamden, behind a common purpose, and triggered a wave of euphoria across the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate commends the Huskies of the University of Connecticut for—

- (1) completing the 2001-2002 women's basketball season with a 39-0 record; and
- (2) winning the 2002 NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Championship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set the speaking order. I would like to have up to 10 minutes to speak, after which Senator MILLER would like 10 minutes, after which Senator FRIST would like 15 minutes.

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

ENERGY SECURITY

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the need for an energy policy for our country. I have

tried ever since I have been in the Senate to get us to plan ahead, to lead our country to be self-sufficient in our energy needs. Unfortunately, the disagreements have been too great and Congress has not been able to come up with a plan that could be signed by the President.

Today we are not only talking about economic security, we are talking about something bigger, and that is national security. We must have an energy policy that begins to make our country self-sufficient because we can no longer allow 60 percent of our energy needs to be imported, especially from countries that may or may not be there for us.

I do not know what it takes for the American people to get it. Iraq has just said they are not going to export oil for 30 days. The United States uses 1 million barrels a day from Iraq and the world market. Every time a country says they are not going to produce, it takes that oil out of the world market and increases the price of gasoline at the pump and the cost to every factory to stay in business.

We are in a war. There is no question we are in a war on terrorism. We are in a war for the very freedoms on which our country was built. Religious diversity in our country has been the beacon in the world for tolerance and respect of people with different views. That has been attacked.

We are in a war, and when we are in a war, it means we must make sure our underlying strength is everything we can make it. Part of our underlying strength is a ready supply of energy. We must have a stable price for the energy we consume in our homes, in our cars, and in our factories to keep the jobs in our country.

We should have done this 6 years ago. We should have done it 4 years ago. We should have done it 2 years ago. But if we do not do it now, we are remiss in our responsibility as leaders of this country. The President has called on Congress to send him an energy package. We are debating an energy package that has been passed by the House. It is a balanced package. It increases production of oil and gas in our country. It has renewable incentives so that we will have wind energy and research into ethanol, soy fuel, and other products we can renew. It encourages the building of more nuclear powerplants which is a clean and safe energy. We will have more clean-burning coal.

There are so many opportunities for us to become self-sufficient, but until we have an energy policy, we will not be self-sufficient and we will be beholden to countries, such as Iraq, that are already cutting us off as I speak. We cannot allow any country, even a supposed friend, to have a veto over our economic stability which, in turn, is a veto over our national security. We cannot allow it, Mr. President. If we do, we are not the leaders of our country that we should be.

I am calling on the Senate to pass an energy bill. Even if it is not a perfect

bill, we need to pass an energy bill. I do not like the bill the Senate is considering. It has some big problems. We are trying to straighten out those problems, and we have made some headway. Some of the amendments that have been adopted have improved the bill.

When the price of gas at the pump goes up 14 cents in the last 14 days, we cannot sit here and twiddle our thumbs. We cannot do it in good conscience. It is time for the Senate to get to work.

There will be an amendment pending in the next 15 to 30 minutes. We need to complete that amendment and go to the next one. It is very important. Part of the bill will give tax incentives for the small drillers, the 15-barrel-a-day drillers, to stay in business so we will have stability if the price goes below \$15 a barrel. These are small business people. They are not going to reopen a well if they do not have some floor to help them stay in business and avoid the cost of closing that well. That is the reason many of the wells, that were closed when prices were \$11 a barrel, have not been reopened.

If we can get all of the marginal wells pumping in this country, we will equal the amount we import from Saudi Arabia every day. If we drill in a very small part of ANWR, we can equal the amount we import from Iraq every day. That would be a significant step toward our stability.

ANWR is an area the size of the State of South Carolina. Part of it has vegetation and is a wildlife preserve. The part we are talking about drilling is 2,000 acres, about the size of Dulles Airport. We are talking about the size of Dulles Airport and the State of South Carolina. I think sometimes when I hear the environmentalists debate this issue, they do not know about the new techniques for drilling. We do not drill all over an area anymore. We used to have an oil well about every 50 feet. We do not do that anymore because we have technology that allows us to go down lower and spread out to get the oil without damaging the surface at all.

We are talking about a very small area that can be drilled, and it happens to be an area that does not have vegetation. Two-thirds of the year it is ice, and the road will not ever hit the dirt because it is an ice road. We will not harm the caribou. There was a study that came out from the Department of the Interior that indicated there would be harm to the caribou, but they were not talking about the bill we are going to address. The assumptions the Department made in the report are not in the bill that the House passed. It is a totally different issue. They assume we will be drilling in other parts of the refuge which we will not.

We will be sensitive to the environment. We should also protect the national security of our country. We can do both. Do we want to protect jobs and security in America, or do we want to be beholden to foreign countries for

our energy needs which could shut down factories, lay off workers, cause lines at the gas pumps, and cause economic hardship in this country? That is our choice, and the choice is before us today: Are we going to choose to be self-reliant, like the greatest country on Earth at war, or are we going to rely on imports from countries that have already said they are going to cut us off? It is a no-brainer, Mr. President. It is a no-brainer. We must look out for the interests of America. If we are going to be the beacon of freedom in the world, this is part of our ability to protect that freedom.

We can do no less than pass an energy bill, go to conference, and work out with the White House the differences we have. Let us put the partisan differences aside and let us make sure America has a balanced energy policy. This includes conservation, renewable energy, electricity deregulation, more production in our own country of oil and gas, and lessening the liability for nuclear powerplants, so we will once again be able to build nuclear powerplants for clean energy.

The United States is not going to walk backward on protection of the environment. We will never do that. We are going to protect the environment, and at the same time we are going to protect the national security of our country, if we do the right thing.

I hope my colleagues, who have come back from 2 weeks at home, have seen the prices rise at the pump, have seen the moms in SUVs who are taking their children to school in carpools saying: My gosh, I cannot afford to fill up my tank and pay \$150; I cannot do it.

No one says: Well, do not have an SUV. If they have five or six children and they are car-pooling, they are saving a lot of money because they are doing something that would take two cars to do. They are also looking out for the safety of their children by having heavier vehicles.

The time is now. We have the opportunity to pass an energy bill and put one more piece of our homeland security in place. It is our responsibility, and I hope the Senate will step up to the plate and do the right thing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Georgia is recognized.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG LEGISLATION IS NEEDED TO HELP AMERICA'S ELDERLY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there is a little family restaurant in my hometown of Young Harris, GA, that is called Mary Ann's. It is where the locals gather, and often some tourists, to enjoy the north Georgia mountains. It is a good cross-section of folks: Blue-collar laborers who build houses and cut timber; teachers from the little junior college up the street where I once taught, and may do so again;

young folks determined to eke out a living without having to move to Atlanta; retired folks who did go to the city to find work and then came back home as soon as they could.

There is also a percentage of people from States such as New York and Michigan who dreamed of retiring to the sunshine of Florida, and did. Some found it a little crowded and then came on up to our area in north Georgia. We call them halfbacks. They retired to Florida, then moved halfway back home. Nothing wrong with Florida, mind you. They just enjoy the beauty of our mountains.

The point I am making is this is a great cross-section of folks, usually equally divided between Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. It is where I do my focus groups, for free—or not exactly for free: sausage, a biscuit, and a cup of coffee.

I suggest to both parties in Washington who pay those enormous sums of money for focus groups and polling that there is a much cheaper way to do it, and I swear I believe it is just about as accurate.

Anyway, the point I want to make is over the recess I was in Mary Ann's a lot, and I processed a lot of information on the cross-tabs of my brain, you might say.

One day, an old timer, so thin he was mostly breath and britches, followed me out into the parking lot. That is where you can have real private conversations, usually with one leg propped up on the bumper of a pickup. We have known each other all of our lives. He stared deep into my eyes and he said: ZELL, I am worried about Hoyle.

Hoyle Bryson is my uncle, kind of like a father since my dad died when I was a baby. Hoyle has always lived next door. When I was a little boy, he played professional baseball in the minor leagues at far-away and exciting places such as Tallahassee, FL; Tarboro, NC; Portsmouth, VA. Most of his life he was a hunter and a trapper and worked as a lineman for the Rural Electric Association. He is 88 years old now, has lived alone for over 20 years since his wife died. Once, a strong mountain man, he now has diabetes, prostate cancer, recently had angioplasty, and this week was bothered with a kidney infection. That once strong body is gradually growing weaker.

So I am worried about Hoyle. I am worried about Hoyle, even though he still makes his own garden and keeps a passel of hound dogs, as he always has.

I took him to the doctor a few weeks ago and stopped back with him at the drugstore to fill his prescriptions. They came to well over \$100 and will only last him a couple of weeks.

Hoyle, as do most of our elderly, lives below what statistically is known as the lower poverty level threshold. This is the group that is hurt most by taxes and especially by rising health care costs. They are a valuable human re-

source that we must be, as my mountain friend said, worried about. It is not always pleasant and uplifting to see this segment of our society. They make us sad. Many of us—too many—even refuse to see them. We refuse to see them because we fear we may see ourselves to be the lonely elderly waiting, waiting for someone, anyone, to knock on their screen door and, as John Prine sings, say, "Hello in there."

The elderly are waiting for something else, too. They are waiting for us to do something about their needs. So far, they have waited in vain, each day growing older and weaker and many dying.

Do you know who we in Washington are like? We are like those people in the biblical story of the Good Samaritan who passed by the man in the ditch and refused to help him. We are no better than they are.

Our elderly have always been the backbone of our society, and if we do not give them some help soon, this Nation is going to get a permanent curvature of the spine.

Twenty-five centuries ago, Plato said it best: States are as men are. They grow out of the character of man—and woman, I might add.

If we in the Senate are to be called civilized, decent, God-fearing and God-obeying, we who are so richly blessed must meet this stark question of human need. We must have a meaningful prescription drug benefit, and we must have it soon.

I say to my fellow Senators, let us get our priorities in order. Sure, it was important to pass campaign finance reform, to try to take big money out of the political process. But is there anyone who would argue it is more important than a prescription drug benefit?

Election reform, we are going to get back on that. I am for it, too. We need to make the process easier, and we need to make it fairer. Fast-track trade, let's debate it. It is important.

These important time-consuming, well-meaning pieces of legislation that will tie this body in knots and run out the clock, are any of them close to dealing with the clear human need of a prescription drug benefit for our elderly?

If someone tuned in to the debates in this Senate since Christmas, they would conclude we care more about the welfare reform of the caribou than we do about the welfare reform of our elderly. This is a life-and-death issue about our fellow human beings, for goodness' sake. It is not about the fragility of the tundra in some far away isolated place only a very few people will ever see. It is about the fragility of a human being's last days on Earth.

There is absolutely no reason, no reason except cheap political gamesmanship, that we can't have a prescription drug benefit before election day—no good reason, no acceptable reason at all.

There are 11 prescription drug bills pending in this Senate today, all of