

the Kohl amendment in order prior to the vote.

Mr. REID. No objection.

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

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

CLEAN AIR AND GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I rise to make a few remarks about the rather stunning announcement we read this morning on the front page of a number of newspapers about President Bush's reversal of a campaign promise he made with great clarity in the course of the last year. That is the reversal of a very clear promise by the President to support efforts to reduce pollution, particularly carbon dioxide emissions from powerplants in this country.

On the campaign trail last year, then-candidate Bush made clear his support for legislation to reduce nitrogen oxide, sulfur dioxide, mercury, and carbon dioxide from powerplants, the so-called four pollutants. There has been a great deal of science, a great deal of research done over these last years with respect to the impact of these pollutants on the quality of our life on this planet.

On September 29, 2000, President Bush could not have been more clear. He said:

With the help of Congress, environmental groups and industry, we will require all powerplants to meet clean air standards in order to reduce emissions of sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide, mercury and carbon dioxide within a reasonable period of time.

Only 10 days ago, EPA Administrator Christie Whitman reaffirmed the President's position that he would support and seek legislation to cut global warming pollution from powerplants.

This is the second time in 2 weeks that a policy announcement by a Secretary in the Bush administration has been reversed by the White House only a few days after that policy announcement was made. I am referring to the prior policy announcement made by Secretary Powell with respect to the efforts to renew negotiations left off by the Clinton administration with North Korea. Two days after Secretary Pow-

ell said, indeed, that is what the administration would do, the President and the White House announced they would not, and the rug was essentially pulled out from under Secretary Powell. Now we see the same thing with Secretary Whitman. She announces that, indeed, she intends to enforce the President's campaign promise, and many groups around the country welcomed having a President of the United States who was prepared to offer leadership and to move us in the right direction.

Yesterday it became clear, all of a sudden, that the President was no longer interested in doing what he said, helping Congress and environmental groups and industry and, apparently, even his own EPA Administrator in that effort. It turns out that the President not only does not support it but he opposes it.

A lot of Americans will have their own judgments about what happens when people run for office and within a few months of running for office renege on the promises they make to the American people about why it is they ought to be elected. In a letter to Senator HAGEL and others, the President said:

I do not believe that the government should impose on power plants mandatory emissions reductions for carbon dioxide, which is not a pollutant under the Clean Air Act.

The White House has offered explanations for the President's flipflop by saying that the President did not understand that carbon dioxide emissions from powerplants is currently not regulated. Therefore, his pledge was misinformed, and the mistake.

With all due respect, I find that statement to be an inadequate explanation, not so much because the President didn't know the current implementation requirements of the Clean Air Act but because, despite that lack of awareness, he proceeded to make such a sweeping promise to the American people and to allow his EPA Administrator to continue that promise for a few weeks while in office.

The second reason for the President's reversal, the White House claims, is a "new" study by the Department of Energy that concludes that the cost of environmental protections is too great. Let me underscore that: The cost of environmental protections is too great.

I don't think that analysis properly balances the many different variables in how you arrive at the true cost because that cost has to be balanced, not just based on the exact cost of putting in the implementing technology, you also have to measure the downside cost to the United States of America, indeed to the globe, for not taking the kinds of steps we need to take.

Our country, I regret to say, has been the largest emitter in the world, growing at the fastest rate in the world in terms of energy use, and the least responsive in terms of the steps we should be taking to deal with this. This

country has to come to grips at sometime with the realities of the profligate energy policies we are pursuing that wind up using extraordinary amounts of resources relative to our population without the kind of balance necessary to create what is called a sustainable energy policy, a sustainable environmental policy.

I find it also troubling that this one study, called "Analysis of Strategies for Reducing Multiple Emissions from Power Plants," is deemed to be somehow a new revelation. The study was a request of the Department of Energy by former Congressman David McIntosh who, it happens, has been one of the harshest critics of environmental protections who has served in the Congress. The study is a classic case of bad information in, bad information out. Some would call it, with respect to the technology world, computers: Garbage in, garbage out. It purposefully restricts market mechanisms, and it assumes highest cost generation. As a result, its conclusions are entirely prefixed, preordained to come out with an expense factor that does not reflect where the technology is, where the state of the art is, or where the realities are economically.

I recommend that the President review a series of other economic analyses that embrace market mechanisms, that reflect real costs, and other kinds of environmental protections. This includes a different and more recent study by the Department of Energy that concludes that a multipollutant approach can reduce pollutions from large generators with net savings to the consumer.

I am not someone who comes to the floor as an environmentalist and suggests that the environmental movement has not on occasion pressed for a solution that may, in fact, demand too much too quickly, or sometimes, I agree, we have environmental rules that are not even thoughtfully applied. There are times when we require of small businesses the same meeting of standards as we require for large businesses. It obviously does not make sense to the economies of scale or the gains or the capacities of those businesses to perform.

I readily accept the notion that there are some places that we can do better, there are some ways in which we can harness the energy of the marketplace and use market forces to find solutions. I believe Republican and Democrat alike in past administrations have been negligent in being creative about reaching out to the private sector and putting the private sector at the table and asking the private sector for ways in which we could do things with least cost, least regulation, least intrusiveness from Washington, and harness the energy of the marketplace in finding some of these solutions.

Regrettably, even when that has happened, when companies have stepped forward and shown that there are cheaper ways of doing things, we now