

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