

We need to make sure those tax cuts we provided are stimulating our economy and economic growth; make that economic engine go so we have a free market system which is working; and make sure those incentives are out there so Americans who work hard are justly rewarded and they can keep the benefits of their hard work in their own pockets and it doesn't have to be sent to the Federal Government for it to spend; they get to spend it themselves in their own communities to meet their own needs. That means less government. It means we can rely more on individuals to assume responsibility. We need to work to make sure we create opportunities for everyone.

That is the challenge we have ahead of us. Tax cuts are expiring. One of the challenges we are facing in the Senate is the budget deficit. We have to be sure we reduce the deficit. Our economy is responding to the tax cuts. I don't think anybody can say tax cuts didn't help. We have to keep our country strong for our security.

We still have challenges, we recognize that. But we have to face up to those challenges and not push them off to future generations.

I happen to believe you have to stand up to terrorism. We learned the hard lesson. We learned if you ignore terrorism, it doesn't go away. We learned that you have to stand up to the terrorists. If you do not, with each success the recruitment of terrorist groups goes up. We saw that. With each success, the terrorist groups get more money, they get better financing, and they are a greater risk.

I compliment this President. I am proud to be a part of a body which has over the last 4 years made a difference in this country. That is not to say we do not have a lot of challenges; we certainly have a lot of challenges. But we are off to a good start. We need to continue.

I look forward to working with this President for another 4 years because I think he has done a good job in leadership. I think this country needs him.

I think this Congress has some challenges ahead of it, and we need good, strong leadership.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, how much time remains?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is 18 minutes remaining on the Republican side.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I would like to be notified at the end of 5 minutes, after which I will yield the remainder on our side to the Senator from New Mexico.

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

#### COMMITMENT TO NATIONAL SECURITY

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, we just heard a wonderful talk by the

President of the United States. He talked about our commitment and reminded us once again that our commitment to winning in Iraq is everything. There is no alternative. The President talked about the commitment of winning the war on terrorism.

That means we must stabilize Iraq. We must begin to show the people in the Middle East what freedom, free enterprise, economy and jobs can do, and an educational system that includes boys and girls, giving them hope for the future.

He reminded us of the commitment we must make to see the war on terrorism through. This is not going to be a war that goes exactly the way it was planned. Name for me a war that did. Name for me a war that we said, Here is what is going to happen, and it happens just that way. This is war. We have been attacked. Thousands of Americans have been killed by fanatics. Nick Berg was assassinated on videotape in a brutal manner by terrorism. This will continue to happen if we lose our resolve. There is only one way that we can lose; that is, for America not to see this through.

It means winning the immediate war. It means stabilizing Iraq and Afghanistan. It means sowing the seeds of freedom and representative government in those countries to show how it can be done where people have not lived in freedom for years. We must see it through. But it means more than just the next year in which we have the big important war on terrorism that we see evolve before our eyes. It means we are going to have to stick with it for 25 or 30 years because it is going to take that long to show education can give children hope for the future, so you will not be able to brainwash a child to think life is not worth living, that the best thing one could do with their life is to give it up by killing other people in a suicide bomb.

The only way to warp children to believe a suicide bomb is their best hope in life is by failing to give them an education. An education gives them hope for a future, for a job, for a family, for a quality of life that is worth living.

The President of the United States is laser-beam focused. He is focused on winning the war on terrorism for the security of the American people and for the ability for freedom to live throughout the world. If America does not carry the beacon and the flag for freedom in the world, who will? Who has the capacity and the will to do it? If freedom dies in America, it will not flourish for very long anywhere else on Earth. That is why the President is so focused on the security of our country by finding and winning the war on terrorism.

We see people wringing their hands, asking, What can we do. We see the assassination of Nick Berg on videotape and we ask, What can we do to get out of this. We can make sure the violent death of Nicholas Berg is not in vain, that the hundreds of Americans who

have died in this cause do not die in vain, that they are dealing with an America that has the leadership to stand up for our country and our security and our freedom and see it through. That is what the President of the United States is doing for our country today. We must not lose focus.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by David Brooks from the New York Times.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 18, 2004.]

IN IRAQ, AMERICA'S SHAKEOUT MOMENT

(By David Brooks)

There's something about our venture into Iraq that is inspiring, painfully, embarrassingly and quintessentially American.

No other nation would have been hopeful enough to try to evangelize for democracy across the Middle East. No other nation would have been naive enough to do it this badly. No other nation would be adaptable enough to recover from its own innocence and muddle its way to success, as I suspect we are about to do.

American history sometimes seems to be the same story repeated over and over again. Some group of big-dreaming but foolhardy adventurers head out to eradicate some evil and to realize some golden future. They get halfway along their journey and find they are unprepared for the harsh reality they suddenly face. It's too late to turn back, so they reinvent their mission. They toss out illusions and adopt an almost desperate pragmatism. They never do realize the utopia they initially dreamed about, but they do build something better than what came before.

This basic pattern has marked our national style from the moment British colonists landed on North American shores. Overly optimistic about the conditions they would find, the colonists were woefully undercapitalized, underequipped and under-skilled. At Jamestown, there were three gentlemen and gentlemen's servants for every skilled laborer. They didn't bother to plant enough grain to see them through the winter.

But they learned and adapted. Settlement companies were compelled to send more workers, along with axes, chisels, scythes, millstones and seeds. Eventually the colonies thrived.

Centuries later, it was much the same. The guides who aided and fleeced the pioneers who moved West were struck by how clueless many of them were about the wilderness they were entering. Their diaries show that many thought they could establish genteel New England-style villages in short order. They leapt before they looked, faced the shock of reality, adapted and cobbled together something unexpected.

And it is that way today. We are tricked by hope into starting companies, beginning books, immigrating to this country and investing in telecom networks. The challenges turn out to be tougher than we imagined. Our excessive optimism is exposed. New skills are demanded. But nothing important was ever begun in a prudential frame of mind.

Hope begets disappointment, and we are now in a moment of disappointment when it comes to Iraq. During these shakeout moments, the nay-sayers get to gloat while the rest of us despair, lacerate ourselves, second-guess those in charge and look at things anew. But this very process of self-criticism

is the precondition for the second wind, the grubbier, less illusioned effort that often enough leads to some acceptable outcome.

Today in Iraq local commanders seem to be allowed to try anything. We are allowing former Baathists to man a Falluja Brigade to police their own city. We are pounding Moktada al-Sadr while negotiating with him. There is talk of moving up elections so when an Iraqi official is assassinated, he is not seen as a person working with the U.S., but as a duly elected representative of the Iraqi people.

Some of these policies seem incoherent, but they may work. And back home a new mood has taken over part of the political class. The emerging responsible faction has no time now for the witless applause lines the jeering jackdaws on left and right repeat to themselves to their own perpetual self-admiration and delight. Even in a political year, most politicians do not want this country to fail.

There are, for example, members of Congress from both parties who feel estranged from this administration. They feel it does not listen to their ideas. But in this troubled hour, they are desperate to help. If but a call were made, they would burst forth with intelligent suggestions: about Iraq, about political tactics, about getting additional appropriations.

Remember, the most untrue truism in human history is that there are no second acts in American life. In reality, there is nothing but second acts. There are shakeout moments and redundantly, new beginnings. The weeks until June 30 are bound to be awful, but we may be at the start of a new beginning now.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time do I have?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is 12 minutes remaining.

#### HIGH ENERGY PRICES

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, again this morning I will talk about energy. I hope I have an opportunity each week until we come to our senses and pass an energy bill to remind the American people one of the reasons gas prices are spiraling, one of the reasons we are skeptical about our future is the tremendously high price of crude oil.

That will never be reduced until America makes a commitment, until the people of the world and the producers of oil understand the United States of America is not going to sit by and do nothing. We are going to have a comprehensive policy with one objective. That is to produce more alternatives that can be used by the American people to satisfy and supply their energy needs. That means we want to do more to produce natural gas, not sit idly by and let the demand increase and soon be dependent on foreign countries for natural gas.

The occupant of the Chair comes from a State that has an abundance of natural gas. But we have to bring it to the lower 48 States. The Energy bill which we propose, that the other side of the aisle for the most part defeated, had a powerful provision which will bring natural gas from Alaska. It also

had a provision that will get the maximum amount of natural gas from our sources in America.

The price of gas in California this week averaged \$2.27; in San Francisco, it hit \$2.79; in Brooklyn, it was \$2.49. Each time our citizens pump a gallon of gas in their cars, they should remember a majority of the Senators in this body, led by the Republicans, has been trying to pass a comprehensive energy legislation package. They are blocked each time by a filibuster led by the other side of the aisle, the Democrats, who, for some reason, find an excuse on every energy bill we propose. Either this must be changed, that must be changed, or this must be added—until we end up with nothing.

Fellow Senators, the Energy bill is not a silver bullet to lowering the price of gasoline. It does, however, set forth a plan for the future. The Energy bill will increase domestic oil and natural gas production that helps balance supply with our growing demand. The Energy bill does a number of technical things. It removes a 2-percent oxygenate mandate that will make it easier on refineries to make gasoline that can be traded between regional markets. The Energy bill addresses the proliferation of boutique fuels. There are a number of State-specific gasoline reformulations that make refining more challenging and make marketing inefficient. We can go on and on.

This bill provides basic research in hydrogen power. Many ask, How are we going to get ourselves off of this tremendous demand for gasoline and crude oil derivatives? One is hydrogen power. How do we do that without an energy bill that sets a policy of spending the research money on hydrogen power with the automobile manufacturers to come up with a solution?

We try, as part of a comprehensive energy bill, I said, try as we may—we cannot satisfy the other side of the aisle. I wonder if they really want an energy bill. I am beginning to think it is their way or no way. They might even think the President of the United States might be helped too much with an energy bill. I hope that is not true.

The benefits are being denied to the American people. Some people want to kick the political football around and they hope they can score a touchdown. We are actually going to score in higher energy prices—and higher energy prices hurt the economy. I am a football fan. But that is one touchdown I don't want to see scored.

Right now we are focusing on high gasoline prices. High gasoline prices are tied to the price of oil. What has been making the price climb? We know there is huge demand in the world led by China, which is gobbling oil like you would think there was no end to the supply. In addition, there is a risk factor being built into the price because of terrorism and the vulnerability of oil production. There is a risk factor that is causing those who produce and sell it on the world market to not go rock

bottom but to go as high as they can because they are afraid of terrorism.

We have to be hopeful that the cartel and those who are producing oil, who are listening to our President, some of whom have been friends of America, we are hopeful they will see the light of day, that this price they are forcing on the world is not good for them, either; it is bad for their friends; it is bad for the world. Ultimately, it is not good for the producing countries.

Our President is taking a leadership role with reference to the energy-producing countries. He is trying to cajole, to talk to them, to work on them so they will increase production and hopefully bring down the price of oil. Some want to embarrass the President by offering resolutions directing him to do what he is doing. Some want to use the Strategic Petroleum Reserve as if that reserve, which is there for emergencies, could, in fact, help with these high oil prices. The last time we tried, it affected gasoline prices by 1 cent. Do we want to reduce the emergency oil we have and then find in a few months the terrorists do something and we are short of oil and then we have a real problem because of it? SPR was for that kind of situation.

Perhaps people forgot the last time Iran cut a little bit of the supply to the world, America was affected in a dramatic way. That caused us to build SPR so we could never be immediately cut off and immediately forced to have our economy disrupted by a challenge from outside. Why do we want to risk that when the consequences will be very little?

Maybe some think they can blame an economic downturn, because of high energy prices, on President Bush. They will not succeed. President Bush's economic policy has brought America from a recession to a vibrant, growing economy. Its gross domestic product increases are the highest in 20 years—not 2 years, not 5 years, in 20 years. So they are not going to deny that by filibustering an energy bill.

But I can tell you, the purpose of debating in the Senate is to let the American people know who is responsible for what. And I don't know what to do. We have tried everything with reference to getting an energy bill. Maybe we ought to ask the Democrats to sit down and talk about what they need. I am not sure we could get anything out of that because I am not sure they know. Because it seems to me anything we try just cannot get anywhere because one group or another, principally on the other side of the aisle, seems to find fault; and there we go, we get nothing done.

Now, we have some who want to investigate the oil companies because of the prices. I have, in this statement, a list of the investigations that have occurred and who has done them. They are powerful, neutral bodies that have done them. They did one for California because their prices went skyrocketing. Nobody can find collusion or