

and more retirement plans under fire. United Airlines and others. Now they want to take Social Security and put it out there on the stock market, too.

Lastly, our incomes are down in America. We know that. What is the answer of this President? Cut overtime. A couple weeks ago the President put into effect administration rules that will take away overtime pay protection for over 6 million Americans. Before that rule was promulgated by the administration, they never had one public hearing.

Thanks to the Senator from Pennsylvania, we did have a couple of hearings—two or three—in the Senate, but that was after the horse was out of the barn. At least we had the hearings. Every time we had the hearings, it became clear the overtime rules were going to hurt working Americans; that they were not going to clear up, as they said, ambiguous rules that already existed; that, in fact, this was an assault on overtime. It was a way of allowing employers the ability to redefine what you do as a worker, to reclassify you, have you work over 40 hours a week, and not have to pay you overtime. That is what is happening.

Lastly, the income tax of this country is moving away from being an income tax. It is under this Administration becoming a wage tax. If you work and you make wages, you get taxed. However, if you have investment income, dividend income, and a bunch of other things such as that, well, under the President's plans, you will not have to worry too much about paying taxes anymore.

So what we will have in America is a work tax. If you work for a living and make a wage, you will pay taxes. You pay the full brunt of taxes. But if you are a very high income person, and most of your income is off of dividends, your taxes have already been sharply reduced and if the President's wishes come to pass, you do not pay much in taxes.

We are robbing our kids. We are hurting our elderly. We are making America weaker and weaker as every day, every week goes by in this crazy economic policy of this administration. I cannot think of any other word for it other than to say it is beyond the pale. I don't mind an administration that takes a chance, that has maybe a new economic theory to test. OK, fine. But when it proves, year after year after year that it does not work, why keep doing it?

Someone once defined insanity as doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result. Why do we keep trying the same economic policy year after year after year? We see the same results: higher unemployment, less family income, more people in poverty, higher deficits, higher debt. Yet the President says: Keep me as your driver, stay in the car, as we continue to make America weaker and drive over a cliff.

It is time to change course in this country. It is time to put our country

back on a fiscally sound basis in this country or else this country is going to be facing even larger deficits, bigger debts, more foreign countries buying more bonds. As the old saying goes, he who pays the piper calls the tune. I am afraid a country that owns all of our debt will call our tune and that will be the ultimate weakness for America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORNYN). The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, thank you.

(The remarks of Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. BAYH pertaining to the introduction of S. 2774 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry: Are we still in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Is it appropriate for the Senator from New Mexico to ask to speak at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 10 minutes.

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

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, across this land, our people are driving up to the gasoline pumps, and they are filling their tank. In the last 6 or 8 months, every time they filled up their tank, the amount went up, up, and up. It peaked for a while, but still, in some parts of America, it is \$2 a gallon, \$1.90, \$1.96.

Everybody understands that America has no energy policy. A few months ago, we had a blackout—remember—in the northeastern part of America, something a country such as ours should not have unless somebody intentionally and physically destroyed power lines or big connectors. But it happened because of overload, and it happened because we do not have an energy policy.

Natural gas, our most plentiful fuel and the one that is best for America's future, we thought we had enough for anything forever and ever. It turns out that unless we do something to increase our supply, it, too, is going to be in short supply. As a matter of fact, as tough as it is to admit this, unless we bring some huge new natural gas supplies on in America, this great land will go from dependence on crude oil to another state of dependence: dependence on foreign sources for natural gas.

We have solar. We have all the renewables. And at this time in our history,

they are stalemated. The reason they are stalemated is because they need an energy policy. They need the Energy bill that is sitting up at that desk. It has production credits that existed before for all the renewables, for clean coal and its development. All of those are in this bill. The Energy bill is up there at the desk.

Rising oil prices and the fact we have no energy policy is dangerous for our national security, for our environment, for jobs, and for the personal prosperity of our people and our consumers.

Around the world, we are seeing increased demands for energy, increasingly thin reserves of fossil fuels, and increased instability of oil-producing countries. Demand for oil is growing. The price goes up and down, not so much because of supply but because there is no assurance of supply—interruptions, revolutions—and so America sits by and we look at it all, and I guess we would all like to say somebody else is to blame.

I hear in the campaign that nobody wants to talk too much about energy. One of the candidates said we have to stop being dependent on foreign oil. I am not standing here saying that Energy bill at the desk does that because we are already 60—and going up—percent dependent, and I defy anybody to have a plan to get rid of that. I guess if you want to order Americans to get rid of all their cars and buy little ones that get 100 miles to a gallon or 60, you might do something. But nobody will vote for that.

Is my time running out?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 7 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

So here is what we have to do. We have to look at ourselves and say: What can we do to produce all kinds of new alternative fuels that will give us a chance to prove to the world that we are not going to sit by and do nothing? We are going to say we are going to do something big about natural gas. This bill says some of the available outer continental gas, which is not environmentally precluded, can be gotten. We are going to say there is a huge supply from Alaska. Not the one everybody objects to. I should not say everyone. Some do, but I don't. But other natural gas can be brought to the central part of America, to Chicago, and in a few years it will provide another great source.

We have language in this bill that will stabilize electricity, in terms of regions. It will put in some standards. Yes, from everything we understand, it has a real chance of doing two things: encouraging investment in electricity, which we need desperately; second, seeing that we do not have any blackouts in the future.

Frankly, for the past 21 months—not alone but with other people—we have worked to develop a consensus on an energy bill. The other side, the Democrats, have insisted, because they filibustered the Energy bill, that we get 60

votes. Actually, the bill at the desk has been recrafted, so it seems to us it should get 60 votes.

It is not so good that we have to get 60. Americans used to think that 51 votes would win, right? They look at television and they say: What do you mean you lost that bill? You got 58 votes.

If we are filibustering, we need 60. We took out the portion of this bill that was most objectionable, and it is not in there anymore. I am not going into detail about it. Everybody in here knows it has to do with a piece of legislation that was in the original bill that held certain companies harmless from a fuel additive that was prescribed, mandated by the Federal Government, and OK'd by the Federal Government. Then when it got out in the field, if people caused it to leak or dropped it on the ground, it caused damage. So people want to make the companies that did it liable. In this body we don't want to say to those companies, "You are OK." So we took that out. It is not in there.

The House of Representatives has done their thing. After we passed the bill big in conference, within 48 hours they passed it. It came here. We got 48 votes. As everyone knows, we had to try to fix it. We did. The Senator occupying the chair helped. He did a yeoman's job helping us, as did many other Senators. We tried to bring it up. Senators said: We will filibuster again. If we don't filibuster, we have scores of amendments to add to it.

Let me tell you, the Energy bill could do the following. Anybody who is interested in jobs ought to be for it. It would create more than 800,000 jobs. It would revitalize rural America by encouraging renewable fuels such as ethanol. It would increase the production of renewables of every kind—wind, solar, geothermal, and the like. It would build an Alaskan natural gas pipeline, encourage production of domestic natural gas besides Alaska, and domestic oil.

I am not overstating the oil. We can't produce ourselves out of dependence, but we can produce more than we are producing.

It can strengthen the future of the nuclear energy option, promote clean coal technology, promote hydrogen—which the President said we start with a \$5 billion program because hydrogen may indeed be the fuel of the future; promote energy efficiency, increase our research and development in various technologies.

On electricity, I have stated it in generalities, but let me be very precise. It establishes mandatory reliability rules for the electricity grid and promotes investment and expansion of the electricity grid.

We have labored for years. There has not been an energy bill in 12 years. I don't know how comprehensive it was, but it was hard to get done, and it did a lot of things. Now we have many sound concepts in this bill. If we can reach agreement to limit debate to an

agreeable, reasonable number of amendments—I suggest anything reasonable. Come down here and say 10 amendments on each side and then vote. I would like to try that. I will bet there are some on the other side who would object.

Why would they object? Is not 10 amendments enough for anybody to get their ideas to change this bill considered and get on with voting on it? I think it is. But let's hear something positive. I hope we can try that. Then at least Americans will know we tried. Americans will know, as we said, we need a policy to move forward.

Energy is a complex and multifaceted problem. To approach it as a single-issue problem is very small thinking and not the best way to move this country forward. The Energy bill is about big thinking, forward-looking principles that would guide us to better technologies, more secure energy, more secure resources that deal with energy and the safest operation of our energy assets. I suggest the Energy bill is a good place to start, and we ought to start soon. There is no other way.

I know my time is quickly running out, but I want to close by saying to the Democrats, to the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. BINGAMAN: Why don't you let us vote? There are many Farm Belt Senators. You would think they would be for this bill. They should be. I spoke of ethanol. It is in here. Some people don't like it, but at least it is a product. It is energy that is produced here. It is renewable to a great extent, and the farmers of America would very much have another serious crop.

Add it all together, I can't understand why those on the other side, the Democrats, would like to kill it. At least during this week, next week, and the week after, those concerned about renewables—clean coal, natural gas—everything I have spoken about today, they are going to know it wasn't the Republicans, it wasn't the President. It is those on that side of the aisle who do not want to let us do anything.

Mr. President, I hope I am wrong. I hope after all these months we will see something positive happen. If not, we will keep insisting that we ought to vote and get something done.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFFEE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE DEFICIT

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the new deficit numbers came out today from the Congressional Budget Office. They show that we will now run the largest deficit in the history of the country—

some \$422 billion. That is nearly \$50 billion more than last year, and it should alarm every Member of this body and certainly every Member of the Congress. We are headed in a direction that is utterly unsustainable.

When the President was asked about this in a recent interview on NBC, the questioner said this to him:

Let me ask you about deficits. This year, \$445 billion, ballpark. Do you think that's pretty good?

The President said:

Yes. I do. I do.

When you are running the worst deficits in the history of the country, to think that is good news I find unusual. This is not good news. It reminds me a little of the captain of the *Titanic* when the ship is going down saying: Well, there is good news here because the ship is not sinking as fast as I thought it would.

We can't continue with deficits of this magnitude. This President ran on the promise that he was going to be fiscally responsible. But look at his record compared to the previous three Presidents: President Reagan ran a large deficit; President Bush 1 ran large deficits—in fact, the largest deficit in history in his final year; under President Clinton, we had deficit improvement each and every year. We climbed up out of the red ink, and for several years—in fact, 4 years—we were deficit free. Now President Bush took over, and each and every year the deficits have gotten worse. In fact, we can all recall that he inherited a substantial budget surplus—\$127 billion. Then each and every year the deficits have gotten much worse.

One of the things that is most alarming and ought to concern people the most is that the amount of deficit this year—\$422 billion—is not the amount by which the debt will increase. I think there is a lot of confusion.

I taught economics classes at the universities in my State during the break. I find there is a lot of confusion between the deficit and the debt. The deficit, of course, is the annual difference between what we raise and what we spend. That is the annual difference. The debt is the accumulation of all the deficits over time. But it is also true that the deficits printed in the newspapers badly understate how much the debt is increased. The biggest reason for that is they leave Social Security in the calculation. Of course, Social Security is supposed to be separate, it is supposed to be apart, and even by law Social Security is supposed to be separate. But that is not the way we have it treated in the newspaper. They put everything into one pot. When you do that, you hide the fact that they are going to borrow this year nearly \$150 billion from Social Security. That gets added onto the debt, but it doesn't count as deficit.

It is kind of a bizarre way we do accounting here in Washington. There is no other institution in the country that would be able to do what we do