

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 Mikulski 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 criti-

cally 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 Atlan-

tic, 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 resolution, which the Senate agreed to by a vote of 95 to 0, stated that the United States should not agree to any treaty in Kyoto, or thereafter, which would place binding limits on the United States and other industrialized nations unless “the protocol or other agreement also mandates new specifically scheduled commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions for Developing County Parties within the same compliance period.” As Senator BYRD reiterated last week, developing countries must be included in any international agreement to limit greenhouse gas emissions.

From the moment it was signed, the Kyoto protocol was never a realistic or achievable way to move forward on climate change. In the meantime, we’ve lost precious time when we could have been exploring achievable and realistic ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We have an opportunity now to discard an unworkable protocol and build a new consensus that will address climate change, and initiate efforts that are realistic and achievable.

The United States is still a party to the Framework Convention on Climate Change (Rio Treaty), which was signed by the United States and ratified by the U.S. Senate in 1992. We should go back to the framework of that treaty, before the Berlin Mandate that excluded developing countries from participation, and lay the groundwork for future international efforts. This gives us a strong base to work from. Many of the discussions during the negotiations for the Kyoto protocol have worked to build consensus on areas that will need to be part of any international initiative—flexible measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, the role of carbon sinks, and other areas. We can build on this progress in developing an alternative to Kyoto.

If we are creative and if our partners will work with us in good faith, we can negotiate arrangements that are responsible and proactive. By addressing this issue domestically, the United States can demonstrate our commitment to climate change and show that meeting this challenge can be done in an integrated way that ensures a sound energy supply and economic stability. The world will not be better off if the

United States slips into an energy crisis or if our economy falters. Both would set off shock waves that would reverberate around the world. By creating our own integrated policy, we can provide direction for how the world can address the dual challenges of energy and climate change.

Senators MURKOWSKI and BREAUX have introduced a comprehensive energy bill, of which I am an original co-sponsor, that will increase our domestic resources, and increase the use of renewable and alternative fuels. In the last Congress, Senators MURKOWSKI, BYRD, CRAIG, and I had legislation that would dramatically increase funding for the research and development of technologies to provide cleaner energy sources, and to incentivize efforts to reduce or sequester greenhouse gases. We are building upon that legislation and will be reintroducing it soon. It will improve our scientific knowledge and lay out positive steps that we can take now to address climate change.

A forward-looking domestic policy will demonstrate our commitment to this important issue, enhance what we genuinely know about climate change, create more efficient energy sources, include the efforts of our agricultural sector, and have the additional effect of reducing air pollutants.

Mr. President, as I stated earlier, we have an historic opportunity to create policies that will address both our energy and environmental priorities in a way that is not mutually exclusive. Policies that compliment each other and work together. As we enter the 21st century, we face a world that is integrated like never before in history. Just as foreign policy cannot be considered separate from national security or trade policy—energy policy cannot and should not be considered separate from environmental and economic policy. What we do in one policy area has dramatic implications for another—both in our nation and across the globe. Building sound policies for our future requires that we create integrated policies to address the challenges facing America and the world.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

MOTHER'S DAY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this Sunday is Mother's Day. In an annual tribute as old as the holiday itself, all across America, families will demonstrate just how essential mothers are to the smooth functioning of our families. How will they do this? They

will serve mother breakfast in bed. Youngsters will rise early and attempt to sneak past their sleeping mother to reach the kitchen undetected. And despite the keenness of a mother's hearing—just ask any teenager who has been caught coming in too late how keen it is—a mother's soft heart will keep her breathing even and her eyes gently shut as this stealth attack on her kitchen is made. Toast will be burnt, eggs—well, they will be runny, coffee may be the consistency of tar, and the flowers freshly plucked from the prized beds outside the window may be presented in a juice glass because no one knows in what dark cupboard mother hides her nice vases.

Why are these mealtime disasters met by smiles and nods of recognition? Simply because mothers do their many jobs so well. Day after day, week after week, month after month, the meals get cooked, the dishes done, the laundry folded, the house cleaned up, in a never-ending routine performed by loving, busy, efficient hands—mother's hands. Despite all the changes in American families, it is still the mother, whether or not she also works outside the home, who does most of the household chores. So, when other family members, particularly the younger ones, attempt to take over mom's role for even one meal, their inexperience shows, highlighting in its comedy mom's effortless mastery of her crowded schedule.

Children who do not attempt to serve mother breakfast in bed may instead make reservations for brunch. That's another Mother's Day tradition. And on this day, long distance telephone circuits will be busier than usual. Florists, too, will be working overtime to deliver flowers, just as the postman will have carried more flowery cards and calorie-laden packages of sweets than bills in the leather bag slung over his shoulder.

Mothers deserve far more recognition and far more applause than can be delivered on just one day. Even women who are not mothers in the traditional sense exercise their inborn mothering skills all around us—the co-worker whose desk serves as the office pharmacy for headaches, colds, and just plain sympathy—these coworkers are mothers. The neighbor who picks up the mail and newspapers when we are out of town, and who we know is watching over our house while we are away, these are mothers, really. The woman who feeds stray animals and birds—those women are mothers. Without them, we could not function and society would fray and tear just a bit more.

Even in a world of automated teller machines and on-line banking, one still needs to know how to multiply and divide in one's head to be sure that the bank has not made a mistake in one's account. One still needs to be able to think, to analyze, to cogitate, to compute. It does not all need to be done in some glitzy new way in order to be ef-

fective. There is still a place for the tried and true, even for rote memorization. After all, what child does not learn the alphabet by memorizing the alphabet song? Of course, that simple tune was likely not taught by a teacher in a school but by a mother, perhaps in a nursery, using the same melody line as "Twinkle, Twinkle, Little Star."

All parents are teachers, by deed as well as by example. When a mother and child bake cookies together, that mother effortlessly includes lessons in mathematics, chemistry, and reading, in addition to teaching order and discipline. And what sweeter way to take those lessons than by reading and following a spotted and time-worn family recipe, measuring out a half of a teaspoon of salt or a tablespoon and a half of vanilla, adding ingredients in the proper order and mixing long enough but not too long, then dropping even rows of dough on a baking sheet and waiting for the edges to crisp and turn brown. Taken separately, flour and egg, spices and chocolate, do not look especially mouth-watering, perhaps. But is there anything more sublime than warm chocolate chip cookies still tender from the oven, washed down with a glass of icy cold milk? "Ah, how sweet it is," and Jackie Gleason used to say. Not when you are 10 years old, I suspect. Perhaps not ever. Those are the lessons, and the memories, that mothers give us every day.

We learn life's essential lessons at our mother's side. They may not be life's greatest lessons, yet they may be. They may not be earth shattering new inventions may result, no cosmos-clarifying theorem be inspired—but they are essential nonetheless. When mothers read stories at night, and when they wash grimy hands and smeared faces, when they nag children to pick up their toys and put away the clean laundry, when they scold children for not sharing with a playmate or for perhaps hitting a playmate, they teach more than reading, more than cleanliness, more than tidiness, more than manners: they teach love. They teach respect for themselves, for oneself, and for others. These are lessons that last a lifetime. They are ingrained. They are what we teach our children. They are how we live our lives. Mothers—they are what make society work. Even as adults, in times of trouble, we may seek solace in a prayer learned in the dim bedrooms of an earlier time, when our mother's voice led us in "Now I lay me down to sleep, I pray the Lord my soul to keep."

For all that mothers have to do each day, for all the lessons they teach, setting aside one day each year to honor them is but a small down payment on the debt of love and gratitude that we owe. My own angel mother, having died when I was just a year old, left no memories for me.

But to her, that angel mother whose prayers have followed me in all the days of my years, and to the kind