

minutes from 2:15 to 2:30. I think we should be in recess when Mr. Bremer is here.

The point is, if the leader intends to put us in recess until 3:30, could we extend the caucuses another 15 minutes?

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I would rather talk to Senator COCHRAN before making decisions about this afternoon. As the Democratic leadership wants to do, I want to progress in an expeditious way but at the same time give people the opportunity to do policy lunches and debate. We also have an all-the-Senate briefing this afternoon. But before locking down any understanding, I will first check with the floor managers on the particular bill. That would be appreciated.

AMERICA'S ENERGY POLICY

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise to speak to an issue we will be addressing next week, as I mentioned earlier, and that is the Energy bill. As I mention daily, or almost daily, on the floor, I am very pleased with the productive debate we have had to date on this very important bill and want to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the Energy Committee, our distinguished colleague from New Mexico, Chairman DOMENICI, for his work on moving this Energy bill forward because it is important to every American.

We have made solid progress. We have locked in an agreement which limits the number of amendments to the Energy legislation. We have reminded people, again almost on a daily basis, to continue working, even though we have other activity on the floor, to narrow those amendments, to continue the discussion, to work out agreements so that we can use the time most efficiently on the floor next week. I am confident that because of that, we will be able to pass this crucial legislation next week.

It is imperative that we do so. America's economic future is at stake. It is our responsibility to pass this bill. The House of Representatives has already passed an energy bill. The President has clearly stated he wants the Congress—specifically the Senate—to address this issue, and now is the time for us to act.

I mentioned the economic interests because when a lot of people think energy, they think directly about whether it means gasoline or whether it means paying their utility bills, but it also—and this is why I mentioned it—has a real impact on our economy.

Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan came to the Hill last month specifically to talk about the energy policy. The price of natural gas for July delivery is 150 percent what it was just a little over 2, almost 3, years ago. Meanwhile, natural gas storage levels are at their lowest in almost three decades. In these meetings, Chairman Greenspan warned that the volatility in the price of natural gas could even-

tually affect and contribute to erosion in the economy. We simply cannot afford that. We have a responsibility to respond, and indeed we have that opportunity next week.

American industry is caught between regulations limiting the supply of natural gas and regulations encouraging its use. The result: Rising gas prices, with some industries cutting jobs or being priced out altogether, and consumers getting hit with rising electric bills. We simply must diversify our sources of energy, and we must do so in a way that lessens our dependence on foreign sources for this energy.

The fact that almost 60 percent of our energy sources come from overseas is simply too much. It is unacceptable today. America's energy policy should be consistent with our foreign policy in that it has the principles of independence and security at its foundation. By increasing America's domestic production of clean coal, oil, gas, nuclear, solar, and other renewable energy sources, we increase not just our energy supply but also our national security.

By passing a comprehensive energy package, we will be creating the needed jobs. The Energy bill will create at least 500,000 jobs and will save even more. The Alaskan pipeline, for example, will create at least 400,000 jobs. The hundreds of millions of dollars in research and development of all sorts in new technologies will not only benefit the environment but will create new jobs in fields such as engineering, math, science, and physics.

I am committed to getting a comprehensive national energy bill passed. While some people are talking of a weak economy, warning of a weak economy and increasing unemployment, we are taking action on the Senate floor to make our economy strong. We will do so in this Energy bill, as we did with the Jobs in Growth Act, which indeed provides immediate tax relief to millions of American families, to businesses, and to our States.

As we all know, checks of up to \$400 will soon be sent to 25 million taxpayers starting even later this week. A family of four making \$40,000 will see their taxes reduced by over \$1,100 this year, and of the overall \$350 billion stimulus and growth package, nearly \$200 billion, fully 60 percent of it, will be injected into the economy in the next 18 months. This injection of money and resources is the input we need to grow our economy, to create jobs, to create investment, to provide States with the resources they need to maintain essential government services and to reduce unemployment.

We will be able to amplify that legislative success by securing our energy supply. A strong, productive energy policy is crucial to our efforts to strengthen our economic and national security.

As I mentioned, we will return to that Energy bill on Monday. I look forward to addressing the remaining

amendments over the course of that week. We will be able to deliver to the American people energy that is cleaner, more abundant, and more secure. Energy is fuel for our economy, as well.

Together with other issues we will be addressing—tax reform, medical liability reform, and many other issues we are addressing in the Senate—we will secure and strengthen our economy and protect its future growth.

I make these comments only as a prelude to what will be a very important week next week as we address energy policy for fulfilling our responsibility.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be a period of morning business until the hour of 11 a.m. with the time equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I come to the floor to acknowledge the schedule the distinguished majority leader has enunciated and to respond to a couple of remarks he has made.

I share his view that we ought to do all we can to address the question of energy policy in this country. I certainly recognize its priority as we consider all of the competing issues we have to address. I have indicated to him on several occasions that I was very concerned about the decision he has made to limit the amount of debate on the Energy bill to a matter of a couple of days. We will start on Monday and obviously the scheduled recess is to begin on Friday. We have a lot of amendments. If I recall, it is over 320 amendments pending. Frankly, I don't know how one can accommodate the amendments contemplated in that brief period of time.

In the last Congress, we voted 88 to 11 to pass a comprehensive Energy bill, but it took 144 amendments and 8 weeks of floor debate to reach that accomplishment. We spent significantly less time debating the Energy bill this year. In total, we have spent about 9 days, with 24 amendments, and only 12 rollcall votes.

We have not addressed the many issues remaining. I am told not 320 amendments but 382 amendments are currently pending, including a renewable portfolio standard to require utilities to generate 10 percent of their electricity from renewable sources by the year 2020. It was in the Senate bill last year but dropped in the conference. That is very critical to a number of Senators.

I am told the electricity title is now the subject of a redraft. We have not had the opportunity even to see this title yet. I understand it is being drafted; it is going to be one of the most critical parts of the debate. The longer we go without having had the opportunity to see it, the more difficult it will be to address it ultimately when it is brought to the floor. It is an understatement to say electricity policy is complicated. All one has to do is look at the experience over the last few years in California to know how challenging and how complicated those issues involving electricity are.

Last year's bill included a comprehensive framework to address global warming. The current bill eliminates those provisions. We think that also is a very important issue.

There are many other issues, including hydroelectric dam relicensing, nuclear power subsidies, the Indian energy programs and policies that remain unresolved, and of course the energy tax package that passed out of the Finance Committee has yet to be included in the Energy bill.

That is a lot of work to do in a matter of a couple of days. I hope we could take it up this week so we could be sure we can address all of these issues in a timely way, in a way that would accommodate a good and full debate. Even if we took up the Energy bill this week and spent the next 2 weeks debating it, we would still be approximately a month shorter in the overall consideration of the bill than we were last year. Last year, we spent 2 full months. We have spent a little more than a week debating the bill so far this year. We are far short from the time dedicated, devoted to the issue of energy policy last year. If we cut what remains of this month in half and limit the debate to a matter of a few days, I am very concerned about our ability to complete the work. I am very concerned about the ability to address in a meaningful way many of the outstanding issues that still remain.

The distinguished majority leader also noted that he would hope that this Energy bill would add to the economic portfolio we have attempted to address this year. He mentioned the checks that will be going out later this week. I am still troubled—in fact, I would hope the whole Senate is troubled—by the fact that 6 million families with 12 million children were left out when this bill was signed into law. These families will not receive child care tax credit checks. We have attempted to come to the Senate on several occasions to address this inequity. On an overwhelming basis the Senate has committed to addressing the inequity. Yet our House colleagues and this administration have not engaged and have not weighed in on their behalf to allow this work to be completed.

We will look for ways to address that particular issue this week, next week, whatever length of time it takes because it is inexcusable that we would

literally carve out those who would benefit most. It could generate the most economic activity were they included as we had originally intended. That, too, is an issue of great concern.

We have to be concerned about the economy. We have lost, now, 3 million jobs since this administration has taken office. We have to go all the way back to Herbert Hoover to find a time when any administration has lost jobs. In every administration since Herbert Hoover we have actually allowed the economy to grow to a net gain of jobs being realized. This is now the first time in some 70 years where that is not the case. Many believe that, in part, is a result of the horrendous fiscal policy we faced. We are facing indebtedness now in this fiscal year of some \$400 billion. Take away Social Security and it is over \$550 billion, and that fiscal policy alone has resulted in this devastating economic circumstance we are facing.

We will have a lot of discussion, and there is a great deal of work to be done. First, on the economy; secondly, on fairness within the economy especially for those working families whose incomes were dramatically affected by the carveout, intentionally, of many of our Republican friends as they wrote the tax bill but on energy, as well.

I hope we could begin sooner than next Monday so we could address these issues in a meaningful and constructive and bipartisan and comprehensive way.

I will certainly talk to the majority leader about this more directly and personally as the occasions arise.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. Yes.

Mr. REID. To put this in proper perspective, the distinguished Democratic leader is aware, to complete this bill in 5 days, would require us to handle 77½ amendments a day. That has never happened in the Senate and never will happen in the Senate. If we go to a 4-day week, which we usually do here, coming late Monday nights, that would mean 95 amendments a day.

I say to the distinguished Democratic leader, if we were fortunate enough to be able to get Senators not to offer half of those amendments, and worked a 5-day week, we would still have to do 38 amendments a day, which never has happened and never will happen.

I know this bill, to me, is very important in the sense it is in an alternative section that I think is quite good. I would like to finish the bill. But it is not going to be finished when we have 382 amendments pending, and we only have 4 or 5 days to complete this bill. It just is humanly impossible under any sense of one's ability to understand the Senate or even one's imagination.

So I very much appreciate the Senator being here for those of us who want an Energy bill. We want one with some debate or we will not have an Energy bill. We have too many important issues that simply have to be debated. So I extend my appreciation to the

Senator for recognizing we cannot do approximately 77 amendments a day.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, the assistant Democratic leader makes a very compelling argument. No one knows the management of the Senate floor better than he does. He is here every day, and he is right. You can't deal with 15 or 20 amendments a day, much less 70 or 80.

I think it minimizes, in some ways it demeans the debate about energy policy in this country. To say about important issues such as the ones we have outlined again this morning on renewable fuels, on conservation, on nuclear energy, on electricity, on taxes, that we are going to have debates about those extraordinary policy questions and condense them somehow in a matter of a few hours as we debate energy policy that could affect us for the next generation—that is not the way to legislate, certainly not the way to manage an important bill such as this.

These issues deserve attention. They deserve our careful consideration, and they will simply not have that if we wait until next week to address these issues. So, again, I thank the Senator for his calculations about the management of these amendments. I hope we could entertain this bill a lot sooner than next Monday to accommodate that very problem.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding the distinguished majority leader's time is not part of morning business. Is that right?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REID. I am sure, if the Republican leader were here, he would acknowledge that morning business should be divided fairly. The Democratic leader's time has been calculated as in the Democrats' half of the morning business; is that right?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that for fairness, the Republican leader's time be calculated as in morning business, along with that of the Democratic leader. That way the time will be divided fairly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Illinois.

MISLEADING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last week there was a historic meeting of the Senate Intelligence Committee, of which I am a member. Director Tenet of the Central Intelligence Agency came before us. There has been a lot written and said about that meeting of the Intelligence Committee.

I think what is important is we reflect on what has occurred since that meeting because I think it speaks volumes about where we are in America when it comes to the issue of being