

each other while he was in the private sector, but, of course, I having had the privilege of serving as Secretary of the Navy some many years before, we were sort of a band of brothers—those of us who are privileged to serve in the greatest Navy in the world, and particularly in the post as a civilian boss. We have worked together these many years.

I want the record to reflect the extraordinary qualifications of this nominee. The Navy will miss him. But duty calls so often. It did in this instance because the President and Secretary Ridge wanted to draw on someone who had a proven record of management capabilities. Gordon England exhibited that record while he was Secretary of the Navy. He will exhibit it as the hands-on operator of the management decisions in assisting the distinguished Secretary, Mr. Ridge.

I am very pleased with this nomination.

I want to mention just a few things about the distinguished career of this fine person.

He began his career with Honeywell Corporation working as an engineer on the Gemini space program before joining General Dynamics in 1966 as an avionics design engineer in the Fort Worth aircraft division. He also worked as a program manager with Litton Industries on the Navy's E-2C Hawkeye aircraft.

By coincidence, these are programs I worked on somewhat when I was Secretary, Under Secretary, and then, of course, while I have been here in the Senate serving now 25 years on the Senate Armed Services Committee.

He served as executive vice president of General Dynamics Corporation from 1997 until 2001 and was responsible for two major sectors of the corporation—first, information systems, and international.

Previously, he served as executive vice president of the Combat Systems Group, president of General Dynamics Fort Worth aircraft company. Before that, he served as president of General Dynamics land systems company producing land combat vehicles.

He has had this management experience, particularly in high-tech areas. Much of the Homeland Defense Department function will be going to the private sector, encouraging that private sector to design state-of-the-art and beyond—I stress “beyond”—technology to meet the many unknowns with which our Nation and other nations are confronted in this battle against worldwide terrorism.

Mr. England is a native of Baltimore. He graduated from the University of Maryland in 1961 with a bachelor's degree in electrical engineering. In 1975, he earned a master's degree in business administration from the M.J. Neeley School of Business at Texas Christian University. He served as a member of the Defense Science Board and was vice chairman of the National Research Council Committee on the Future of the U.S. Aerospace Industry.

It is an extraordinary record.

If I may say with the greatest respect to our President and to the new Secretary that his first Deputy, Gordon England, in the Department of Homeland Security, I think, can help avert what could come about as a tug of war between the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Defense as it regards budget matters. Both have the highest priorities, properly accorded by our President, and indeed I think the Congress. Homeland defense is just starting. As their cash flow and appropriations come in, I hope they will be adequate to meet the needs of this new Department. If they are not, I hope we can find other means by which to finance those requirements. They should be given top priority financially and support-wise because they will guard us here at home—augmenting what is in place already by way of the National Guard, the North Command and the other commands of the Department of Defense—many other things that are in place in bringing together the various and disparate agencies and departments and put them under this one head.

I am going to be ever watchful—and I think my good friend, Gordon England, likewise—to advise the Secretary of Defense and to advise the Secretary of Homeland Security. We cannot ever witness a budget war between these two strong and powerful and vitally needed Departments. Gordon England is eminently qualified to see that doesn't happen. Homeland defense starts beyond our shores in the forward-deployed positions of the men and women of the Armed Forces all over the world.

For example, on the battlefields of Afghanistan, we have made great progress.

I had the privilege just this morning of meeting with General Franks to talk about the progress he has made and the challenges that remain in Afghanistan. But he has, in large measure, achieved a goal of stemming the flow of terrorism from that troubled piece of land to other places in the world and will continue to fight that battle.

That is the clearest example I can give right now of where we have to stop terrorism before it comes to our borders. Hopefully, it can be interdicted there and certainly interdicted before it gets into hometowns in America.

Those two Departments must be adequately funded because they will work together to protect this great Nation.

I wish my old friend good luck, fair winds, and flowing seas, as we say in the Navy. He is eminently qualified to take on this position.

I thank the Chair.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

The Senator from Kentucky.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

CLEAR SKIES LEGISLATION

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, during his State of the Union speech, President Bush said that he has,

sent to us [Congress] his Clear Skies legislation that mandates a 70 percent cut in air pollution from power plants over the next 15 years.

What he did not say is that the present Clean Air Act, according to EPA, will do a better and faster job of reducing emissions than his proposal. It will do all that without eliminating vital air quality protections as proposed in the President's Clear Skies bill.

What he did not say is that the proposal's timeline does not work with the Clean Air Act's. It stalls and delays present State and general efforts to achieve air quality standards and it also ignores global warming.

Worse yet, the President's proposal would contribute to the premature death of tens of thousands of people who we could otherwise save by full and faithful implementation of the present Clean Air Act. Under his plan, there will be more areas struggling longer to achieve attainment of air quality standards.

In 2001, large power plants were responsible for emissions of 10.6 million tons of sulfur dioxide, SO_x and 4.1 million tons of nitrogen oxides, NO_x. That is 33 percent and 25 percent less, respectively, from 1990 levels. But that is still far too much pollution going into our air, our lungs and falling onto our land.

These acid rain and smog causing pollutants contribute heavily to premature mortality, asthma and lung disease. They also continue the acidification of ecosystems in New England and elsewhere.

In 2001, EPA advised industry that the Clean Air Act at full implementation would likely require an 80 percent reduction in SO_x and a 70 percent reduction in NO_x from today's pollution levels. EPA also said that mercury, a potent neurotoxic pollutant, would have to be reduced by 90 percent.

EPA said these reductions would have to occur in 2008 for mercury, 2010 for NO_x, and 2012 for SO_x. The President's proposal hits none of these marks, and still takes 6 more years to even get close to the necessary reductions.

The proposal falls significantly short of Clean Air Act requirements. Senators can see a comparison outlined in this chart.

The President's proposal also falls short by approximately 1.4 billion tons