

McCullough's interest in John Adams and knowing of John Adams' influence upon the Framers of the country, I have been interested in trying to get an appropriation for an appropriate monument to John Adams. I understand that David McCullough is also supporting and promoting that idea. I am very much for it.

I thank Senator KENNEDY for what he has said about John Quincy Adams. John Quincy Adams suffered a stroke on February 23, 1848, as he spoke in Statuary Hall. He was a vigorous opponent of America's entry and participation in the Mexican war. He was making this very emotional speech, and he had a stroke. He was taken to the office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and died 2 days later—John Quincy Adams. He was elected to nine terms in the House, after having served as President.

Senator KENNEDY, we are not supposed to address each other in the first person in this body, but I want to tell you, I really enjoyed what you had to say. I am glad that you have such an appreciation of American history and the great patriots who gave us the Constitution. Senator KENNEDY is a student of history *sui generis*.

Mr. JEFFORDS. And an important part of history.

Mr. BYRD. I thank my friend, Mr. JEFFORDS, for his recollections of teachers. I remember a Miss McCone who taught history. And she asked me a question one day. I said: Huh? And I kept on studying. I was paying attention to my reading, and Miss McCone had not said another word. Next thing I knew, she had walked around the room and she came up behind me and gave me a resounding slap on the cheek and said: ROBERT, don't you ever say "huh" to me again.

I never said "huh" to Miss McCone again.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there is no further discussion of this particular amendment, we are prepared to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 402.

The amendment (No. 402) was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. I again thank both of the Senators.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, we have had a wonderful moment here, and I now would like to give the opportunity for others to come and give their moments if they so desire.

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday, during rollcall vote No. 96, the Mikul-

ski amendment, and No. 97, the McConnell amendment, as modified, I was necessarily absent to attend the funeral of a dear friend, Larry Cacciola, of Middletown, Connecticut.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" for each amendment.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

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

#### ENERGY AND CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, in the midst of the energy challenges facing our Nation lies a very unique opportunity. We have a chance to develop energy and environmental policies that work together. A clean environment and a strong energy policy need not be mutually exclusive. The forces of reality have brought us to this point. We have an energy problem that we cannot ignore. We also have a new administration which is re-evaluating our environmental policies, as any new administration would do, to ensure that what we are pursuing, and how we are pursuing it, is relevant, realistic, and achievable.

In the past, there has been a division of these issues. Energy and environmental policies have been considered separately—and mostly at odds with one another. This has led to an unnecessary gap of confidence in both efforts. We have an opportunity to reverse this division and create integrated policies to pursue both critically important objectives of a steady energy supply and a clean environment.

In the next few days, President Bush will release the administration's new energy policy. This policy will provide a balanced approach to meet the supply and demand imbalance we are now facing in this country. It will reflect our absolute need for a wide and deep energy supply portfolio, including the use of renewable energy and alternative energy sources. It would have been easy to defer this challenge, to delay the tough choices. But that's what got us into this mess. For the last 8 years, this country drifted without an energy policy, and today we are literally paying the price.

Gas prices have hit record levels and are predicted to continue rising. The energy shortages in California will

spread to other areas of this country during the hot summer months when the demand for energy will continue to outstrip supply.

Finding solutions to problems requires bold ideas, common sense, imagination and sometimes unpopular choices. President Bush has shown courage and leadership for his willingness to address the problem and develop solutions. As we create a comprehensive and balanced policy to address our energy needs, we need to take into account our environmental priorities, particularly in the area of climate change.

Just one example of where we can do this is nuclear energy production. Like solar and wind power, nuclear power produces no greenhouse gases—zero emissions. It is one of the most cost effective, reliable, available, and efficient forms of energy we have. Vast improvements in technology have made it one of the safest forms of energy production. Having nuclear energy play a vital role in our energy policy will enhance not only our energy supply but our environmental health as well.

President Bush has assembled a cabinet level environmental task force to review climate change. They have been listening to and learning from some of the world's foremost meteorologists, climatologists, physicists, scientists, and environmental experts. The President has said that his administration will offer a science based, realistic, and achievable alternative to the Kyoto protocol.

That is the responsible thing to do. President Bush merely stated the obvious when he declared the Kyoto protocol dead. Although his actions have been criticized, the forthrightness and clarity are refreshing on this issue. The Kyoto protocol would never have been in a position to be ratified by the U.S. Senate. The Clinton-Gore administration knew this as well. That is why they never submitted the treaty to the Senate even for debate and consideration.

Despite the heated rhetoric on this issue from the other side of the Atlantic, no major industrialized nation has ratified the Kyoto protocol. In fact, Australia has said it will follow in rejecting the treaty. There is a reason for that. The Kyoto protocol would not work. It left out 134 nations, some of whom are among the world's largest emitters of greenhouse gases. A treaty claiming to attempt to reduce global emissions of greenhouse gases has no chance of being effective when it exempts some of the largest greenhouse gas emitters in the world—nations like China, India, South Korea, Brazil, and 130 other nations.

My colleague from West Virginia, Senator BYRD, whom I worked with in 1997 on S. Res. 98, addressed this point last week. S. Res. 98, or the Byrd-Hagel