

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<sub>x</sub> and 4.1 million tons of nitrogen oxides, NO<sub>x</sub>. 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<sub>x</sub> and a 70 percent reduction in NO<sub>x</sub> 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<sub>x</sub>, and 2012 for SO<sub>x</sub>. 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

of carbon dioxide. That's the amount that should be reduced by the electric utility sector under our treaty commitment to try to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels. Clearly, we have failed.

Perhaps these shortfalls are why no Senators cosponsored the President's Clear Skies proposal when it was finally introduced last year. Perhaps the elimination of important State and local air protection authorities kept senators from supporting it.

Whatever the reason, the President's proposal had little or no public support. Yet, since January 20, 2001, the administration has had every opportunity to constructively engage with us and promote his Clear Skies proposal.

But, they did little or nothing. They certainly did not respond in a timely, helpful way to legitimate inquiries on its effects.

Instead, they spent their time figuring out ways to deregulate and to rollback air quality protections under the cloak and shadow of their three-pollutant initiative.

Perhaps now, as the 2004 elections get nearer and the administration as yet has no tangible and positive environmental achievements of its own, we can work together, I urge us to work together to make progress.

But, unless the Administration agrees to cooperate on information sharing and problem solving, we are going to get nowhere even faster. We cannot afford to change and we should not change the Clean Air Act without knowing the likely outcome of our actions.

Let's assume for a moment that we all want the same things. We want to stop acid rain. We want to reduce mercury-related fish contamination and birth defects. We want to start dealing with manmade global warming. Most importantly, we want cleaner, clearer air as soon as we can get it.

We can achieve all those goals in a four-pollutant bill. We can do even better than the Clean Air Act at full implementation if we have the will and the courage. But doing less than the Clean Air Act would provide is simply backsliding.

I will soon be introducing an alternative to the President's proposal with Senators COLLINS, LIEBERMAN and others. This legislation is a better and much more accurate response to the environmental and public health problems that our Nation faces.

In the coming days and weeks, I will take to the floor to discuss the need for strong legislation.

I will continue my efforts to obtain information that the administration continues to withhold. This regards the legal, public health and environmental effects of their deregulation efforts as well as their three-pollutant approach.

A detailed chronology of correspondence on our New Source Review requests appears in the RECORD of January 21st.

On Tuesday evening, the EPA Administrator called to tell me the President would speak on the Clear Skies proposal in the State of the Union. She said she hopes we can work together. I don't doubt Governor Whitman's sincerity. But, so far, "working together" on environmental policy has been an alien concept for this White House. Instead, they have left Congress, the States, the environmentalists, and the people, in a public relations haze.

Progress will be much easier and swifter if we can really work together honestly and without all the smoke and mirrors. That is the only way to approach these severe public health and environmental problems. That is why a four-pollutant bill is necessary.

I point to the chart and urge people to look at this chart which demonstrates very clearly what would happen if we leave things the way we are or if we put the "Clear Skies" in. We are much better off to leave the Clean Air Act where it is than we are to do anything. But we will be producing and bringing forward at a future time our four-pollutant bill, again, which will do even more than the present Clean Air Act and does not degrade or lessen the Clean Air Act.

I urge everyone to be very alert about what is going on in the environmental legislation because it could get better and save lives or it could knock it out.

I yield the floor.

#### DAVID HOPPE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to join many of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to thank Dave Hoppe for his service to the Senate and to wish him well as he continues to pursue new opportunities.

One of the reasons we will miss Dave is because he exemplifies the best of the Senate—a place where we can find compromise, a place where we can disagree passionately, but one where we can do so honestly, and amicably.

From personal experience, I can tell you that Dave is a gifted negotiator, and, when necessary, a tough adversary.

But I can also tell you that much of what I admire about him—much of what we all admire about him—transcends his political skill, and his legislative prowess. It is his decency.

In 1997, Dave drew on his personal experience, and became integral in bringing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act into being. In talking about the issue of disability in our society, Bob Dole once said, "some issues transcend politics, foster a bipartisan spirit, and result in legislation that makes a real and lasting difference."

Because of Dave, disability education is one of those issues.

And, as Dave leaves, I think we could modify Bob Dole's words. There are some people who transcend politics, foster a bipartisan spirit, and make a

real and lasting difference. Dave is one of those people.

So, Dave, I want to thank you, congratulate you, and wish you and Karen—and Katie and Geoffrey and Gregory—all the best in the years ahead.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. DOLE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. ALLARD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:26 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 6:59 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CHAMBLISS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statements of Senators HARKIN and DURBIN be printed as in executive session.

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

#### NOMINATION OF JOHN W. SNOW

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, pursuant to that unanimous consent request, I would like to take the floor for a few moments and then yield to my friend Senator HARKIN.

This evening, we are considering the nomination of John Snow to be the Secretary of the Treasury. It is a very important position, one of the most important in the President's Cabinet. I have had the opportunity on two occasions now to sit down with Mr. Snow and discuss with him a number of issues, but in particular one that I would address this evening. After these conversations, I am happy to report I will be supporting his nomination as Secretary of the Treasury. He will have an awesome responsibility in this post. I hope he can rise to that challenge. His resume shows that he can and that he will serve our Nation with pride.

The particular issue which drew us together last night and again this evening is one that Senator HARKIN has been the leader on for many years. Literally millions of Americans have pension plans which they have worked long and hard to maintain in their place of employment. The traditional defined-benefit plan is one where someone works for a company for a certain number of years and the company promised that at retirement they would pay them a certain amount of money. That is the retirement plan with which most people are familiar. That is the basic and traditional approach. But over the years retirement plans have changed. They have become more like 401(k)s or savings plans or investment plans, and those are known