

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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 some time 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

see the President embracing a study that reflects none of that creativity and none of that capacity on the part of the private sector.

Let me be very specific about that. A number of companies have stepped forward to embrace the four pollutant approach I am talking about. They include Consolidated Edison, PG&E, Northeast Utilities, PECO, and others. These companies have found a way to embrace a four pollutant reduction strategy and do so in a way that benefits their company's bottom line and also benefit the consumers at the same time.

I want to put this in a context, if I may. Why is this so important to our country and to the concerns we have about global warming and about pollutants in the air and the quality of life? I don't know a thoughtful Republican or Democrat who doesn't understand the linkage of some of the things we emit into the air and water in various forms of pollution, which have a terrible impact on the lives of our fellow citizens.

The country has been treated to a couple of movies recently that showed what happens when you have that kind of pollution taking place—the impact of it on the lives of our fellow citizens. I had the privilege of attending, as an official observer for the Senate, the discussions in Rio when President Bush's father was President in 1992—the Earth Summit, when the United States said we would try to hold ourselves to the emissions baseline of 1990 levels. We never took the steps necessary to live up to that voluntarily agreed-upon goal. Since then, I have been to Kyoto, to The Hague, and Buenos Aires, in each place where global negotiations were taking place, where Presidents and prime ministers and environmental ministers and financial ministers were all struggling together to find a way to reduce emissions. In every one of those discussions, all of the less developed countries, and our European partners, looked at the United States of America as a culprit, as the problem, because we weren't willing to embrace some of the steps they were taking, or were prepared to take, in order to enter a global solution that has an impact on all of us.

I say to my colleagues, I am not talking about politics, I am talking about facts—scientific facts. Just recently, 2,500-plus scientists at the United Nations, through the IPCC, released increased data regarding our status with respect to global warming.

The decade of the 1990s was the hottest decade in all of human history. The glaciers on five continents are receding at record rates. One thousand square miles of the Larsen ice shelf in Antarctica has collapsed into the ocean. Arctic sea ice has thinned by 40 percent in only 20 years.

For the first time, boats are traversing the Canadian Arctic without hitting ice pack. What used to take 2 years as a journey has now taken only

2 months. Permafrost in Alaska and Siberia is defying its name by thawing. Ocean temperatures throughout the world are rising, and a quarter of the world's reefs have been bleached.

The scientific evidence that pollution is dangerously altering the atmosphere is becoming more compelling as each year passes. This is peer-reviewed, hard science—reviewed science from the best researchers in the world. I believe it is compelling and it demands action.

In January of 2000, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change released its third assessment report. The IPCC involves thousands of scientists from around the world and many of the very best American scientists. It was organized in the early nineties by President Bush to assist governments in assessing the state of the global climate and what threat pollution may or may not pose to it.

This January, the IPCC released its strongest, most conclusive and most alarming assessment of the global climate. It warned that rising temperatures are attributable to human activities; that temperatures may rise at a far faster rate than previously expected—as high as 10.4 degrees over the next 100 years—and that the consequences will be adverse and far reaching. The potential consequences include droughts, floods, rising seas, the displacement of tens of millions of people living in coastal areas, and the massive die of plant and animal species.

The chair of IPCC, Dr. Robert Watson, put it his way:

We see changes in climate, we believe we humans are involved, and we're projecting future climate changes more significant over the next 100 years than the last 100 years.

And the IPCC report is only the latest in a body of science that demands action.

October 2000, "Coral Reefs Dying; Most May Be Dead In 20 Years."

Addressing the International the Coral Reef Symposium on the island of Bali, researchers warn that more than a quarter of the world's coral reefs have been destroyed and remaining reefs could be dead in 20 years. The most serious threat to the reefs is global warming. Coral reefs are crucial anchors for marine ecosystems, and more than a half billion people depend on reefs for their livelihood, researchers at the conference say.

March 2000, "NOAA Finds Oceans Warming."

Scientists at the National Oceanographic Data Center find that the world's oceans have soaked up much of the warming of the last four decades, delaying its full effect on air temperatures. Scientists speculate that perhaps half of human-caused climate change is not yet in evidence in the form of higher air temperatures, because of the delay caused by oceans.

January 2000, "NAS Concludes Warming Is 'Undoubtedly Real.'"

A study by the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences concludes that the warming of the Earth's surface is "undoubtedly real" and that surface temperatures in the last two decades have risen at a rate substantially greater than the average for the past 100 years. This study put

to rest charges that satellite data contradicted land-based data.

December 1999, "Arctic Melting Almost Certainly The Result of Pollution."

A computer-based study by the University of Maryland and NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center finds less than a 2 percent chance that observed melting of Arctic sea ice is the result of normal climatic variations—and less than a 0.1 percent chance that melting over the last 46 years is the result of normal variations. Arctic sea ice is melting at a rate of 14,000 square miles per year, an area larger than Maryland and Delaware combined. Melting of arctic ice accelerates global warming, since ice reflects 80 percent of solar energy back into space and water absorbs solar energy. Meanwhile, the melting of arctic ice could disrupt ocean currents and salinity levels.

June 1999, "Greenhouse Gases Higher Now Than Any Time In 420,000 Years."

A two-mile-long ice core drilled out of an Antarctic ice sheet shows that levels of heat-trapping greenhouse gases are higher now than at any time in the past 420,000 years. Scientists with the National Center for Scientific Research in Grenoble, France, find that carbon dioxide levels rose from about 180 parts per million during ice ages to 280–300 parts per million in warm periods—far below the current CO₂ concentration of 360 parts per million. Methane levels, meanwhile, rose from 320–350 parts per billion during ice ages to 650–770 parts per billion during the warm spells. The current methane concentration is about 1,700 parts per billion.

April 1998, "20th Century Was The Warmest In 600 Years."

Based on annual growth rings in trees and chemical evidence contained in marine fossils, corals and ancient ice, scientists at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst find that the 20th century was the warmest in 600 years, and that 1990, 1995 and 1997 were the warmest years in all of the 600-year period. Scientist conclude that the warming "appears to be closely tied to emission of greenhouse gases by humans and not any of the natural factors," such as solar radiation and volcanic haze.

January 1998, "Changes May Happen Quickly With A Climate Shock."

A University of Rhode Island study of ice cores from Greenland shows that when the last ice age ended, the change was sudden. In Greenland, a 9 to 18 degree F increase in temperatures probably took place in less than a decade. The finding challenges the widespread assumption that climate changes are in all cases gradual, and suggests that human-induced climate change could occur rapidly rather than slowly.

I could go on; the science is compelling.

I committed to finding a solution to the problem of global warming. Some of my colleagues—and now the President—have charged that dealing with this problem will bankrupt the American economy. I disagree. I believe that America can have a strong economy and a healthy environment. Fortunately, more and more companies are stepping forward to solve this problem and lead the way where government won't. BP will reduce its emission to 10 percent below its 1990 levels by 2010. Polaroid will cut its emissions to 20 percent below 1994 levels by 2005. Johnson & Johnson will reduce its emissions to 7 percent below 1990 levels by

2010. IBM will cut emissions by 4 percent each year till 2004 based on 1994 emissions. And, Shell International, DuPont, Suncor Energy Inc., Ontario Power Generation have all made similar commitments.

All the dire predictions of economic calamity from entrenched polluters just is not credible when leading companies are doing exactly what they say cannot be done. We know the power of technology to transform an industry—just look at the impact of technology on information and medicine—and technology and innovation can transform how we produce and use energy.

President Bush's reversal will also weigh heavily on the international talks to fight global warming. As a Senate observer to the talks, I have seen firsthand how America's inaction has prevented progress. In 1992 the U.S. pledged to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2000 through the strictly voluntary Framework Convention on Climate Change. We will miss that goal and end the year with emissions 13 percent above 1990 levels.

Our failure goes beyond numbers alone. In the past eight years, we have not taken a single meaningful step toward our commitment. We have not seized opportunities to increase efficiency and reduce pollution from automobiles, appliances, electric utilities, housing, commercial buildings, industry or transportation. Nor have we provided sufficient economic incentives for the development and proliferation of solar, wind, hydrogen and other clean energy technologies. A range of sound proposals have been floated in Congress, but almost all have been relegated to the legislative scrap heap.

Instead, Congress has enacted budget riders to keep us mired in the unsustainable status quo. An unwise mix of politics and special interests has produced laws prohibiting the government from even studying the efficacy of strengthening efficiency standards for cars and light trucks, laws blocking stronger efficiency standards for appliances, and laws hampering energy and environmental programs because, their sponsors mistakenly argue, these programs represent an unconstitutional implementation of the unratified Kyoto Protocol.

This regressive record is fatal to the international effort. It heightens distrust, undermines the credibility essential to success, and gives opening to our sharpest critics to seek advantage. For example, the U.S. has insisted that unrestricted, international emissions trading be part of the global warming pact. Trading is a proven method to achieve greater environmental benefits at lower costs; it has halved the cost and accelerated the environmental gains of Clean Air Act. But European nations—led by Germany and France—charge the trading program must be severely restricted or it will become a loophole by which the U.S. will avoid domestic action. They make that charge as much for reasons of economic

and political self-interest as they do for environmental concerns, but, nonetheless, our paltry environmental record at home lends dangerous credibility to their charge, and that makes the work of our negotiators all more difficult. Moreover our inaction has an equally dangerous practical effect. Every year we fail to act, our environmental goals become more difficult to achieve.

Mr. President, it is early in this Congress and even earlier in President Bush's new administration. I remain hopeful, but being hopeful is becoming increasingly difficult, particularly today. President Bush has rejected a policy that can work, that can benefit the environment and the nation. He did it really before the debate even started. And he broke the most important campaign pledge he made regarding the environment. And it took him less than two months to do it.

Let me just say that I wanted to review for my colleagues—and I hope some will perhaps take an interest in reviewing these other assessments—a number of major assessments of the negative impact on crops, on quality of health, on sea life, on major areas that should be of enormous concern to all of us, not as Republicans and Democrats, but as thinking U.S. Senators. I don't want to approach this in a doctrinaire way, but I know that we have a responsibility to contribute our part to a major solution and reduction in global greenhouse gases, as well as to contribute to the better quality and health of our citizens.

This decision by the President which, once again, gives increased power to the large energy interests of the country is the wrong decision for our Nation and the wrong decision in the long run for creating the sustainable environmental approach. My hope is that my colleagues and the administration itself will review and come up with an approach that will better serve the interests of our Nation.

ERWIN MITCHELL AND THE GEORGIA PROJECT

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, on March 7, 2001, the Washington Post reported that the recent census indicates a 60-percent growth in our Nation's Hispanic population, which now totals 35.3 million. Georgia has also been witness to this growth. In 1991 the Hispanic student population in Dalton, GA, was only 4 percent and now 10 years later, Hispanic enrollment in Dalton public schools has skyrocketed to 51 percent. The data from the 1999–2000 school year show that 45 percent of students in Dalton and 13 percent in Whitfield County are Spanish speaking. There are children of hard-working families who are an important part of the Dalton community. Accordingly, business and community leaders in that north Georgia community recognize the need for innovative and comprehensive solutions to address the re-

cent influx of immigrants. Recent studies show that where quality education programs are joined with community-based services, immigrants have an increased opportunity to become an integral part of their community and their children are better prepared to achieve success in school.

The Georgia Project has provided an innovative solution to the needs of northwest Georgia. This is a teacher exchange program which brings bilingual teachers from Mexico to provide language instruction to all Dalton/Whitfield students. In addition, the program also sponsors a Summer Institute which provides Dalton/Whitfield teachers with the opportunity to study Mexican culture and history and the Spanish language in Monterrey, Mexico.

The driving force behind this endeavor has been the creative efforts of Erwin Mitchell. His dedication to public service and fairness was evident during his days as a Member of the House of Representatives. This same dedication and spirit of duty were the guiding forces behind the award-winning Georgia Project. As the mastermind behind the Georgia Project, Erwin Mitchell's efforts have been confirmed by the rising test scores of Dalton/Whitfield students on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. His work has recently been recognized by both the National Education Association, NEA, and the National Association for Bilingual Education, NABE. The NEA has selected him to receive the NEA's 2001 George I. Sanchez Memorial Award for his "exemplary contributions in the area of human and civil rights." NABE has named him the 2001 Citizen of the Year for his "efforts in shaping a successful future for America's students."

This wave of immigration is not limited to Georgia alone. For example, the Waterloo, IA, school system is being challenged to teach 400 Bosnian refugee children who came here without knowing our language, culture or customs. Schools in Wausau, WI, are filled with Asian children wanting to achieve success in the United States. In Wayne County, MI, 34 percent of the student population are Arabic-speaking and receive special help. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the recently arrived immigrant and refugee population living here today will account for 75 percent of the total U.S. population growth over the next 50 years. This growth is occurring in places like New York, Los Angeles, and Miami, but also in nontraditional immigrant communities like Gainesville, GA, and Fremont County, ID. Innovative programs are being offered across the country to help accommodate these populations, which is why I have once again introduced the Immigrants to New Americans Act. This legislation will create a competitive grant program within the Department of Education that funds model programs, which, one, help immigrant children to succeed in America's classrooms and,