

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

Mrs. DOLE. Mr. President, during my years in public service I have learned a great deal about the severe effects of hunger in our Nation and around the world. My passion for this issue has significantly grown over time, so much so that I chose the topic as the focus of my maiden speech in the Senate. My hope is to shine a light on the devastating plague of malnourishment and severe hunger in our country and around the world.

October 16 is World Food Day, which was established 25 years ago by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Since its inception, the day has been recognized annually in more than 150 countries and I am proud to share my support today.

In truth, hunger affects millions of individuals across the globe. I know this to be true from my previous years of public service and my time at the Red Cross where I saw first hand the devastation of hunger. That is why I have made it a mission to fight this battle not only in our country, where I believe we can have a hunger free America, but around the world, where the issues of hunger so often become a useful strategy in developing relations with other governments and their people.

As a leader in agricultural production, the United States has long recognized its responsibility to assist in alleviating world hunger through food donations, financial aid, and technical assistance. As many of you know, the United States, the world's leading provider of food assistance, began providing food aid in the 1920s. That is why I am involved in the McGovern-Dole program which builds off of this important and proud tradition.

The McGovern-Dole program was named in honor of two former U.S. Senators, Senators George McGovern and Bob Dole, who worked tirelessly on behalf of U.S. school feeding, and more recently, for a global food for education program. The major objectives of the program are to reduce hunger and improve literacy and access to primary education, especially for girls.

The focus is on low-income countries striving to ensure an education for all children. The World Food Program estimates that there are more than 300

million chronically hungry school-age children in poor countries. Of these, perhaps 170 million go off to school hungry. Another 130 million children—60 percent of them girls—do not attend school.

An estimated 2.2 million beneficiaries received meals and take home rations under the fiscal year 2003 program, which is still ongoing in some countries. These resources, together with the \$50 million Congress appropriated for the fiscal year 2004 program are reaching an additional 1.5 million beneficiaries. Given the program's success and high demand, the Bush administration requested an increase above the 2004 funding levels for fiscal year 2005, which I supported. After working with the Senate Appropriations Committee, I am proud to report that the bill voted out of committee includes a 50-percent increase above the fiscal year 2004 levels, bringing the fiscal year 2005 funding levels for McGovern-Dole to \$100 million.

Reducing hunger and improving literacy are global challenges, and meeting those challenges will require a global effort. We have experienced some marked successes in our efforts to involve other donors in helping achieve our goal of global school feeding and the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program has made a positive contribution to those efforts to combat hunger and illiteracy.

It is my belief that this program will do more than just feed those in desperate need of food and improve the nutrition of children. It will bring hope and opportunity through education to some of the world's poorest children, improving their future and making the world a safer place for all of us.

Mr. President, on World Food Day, I congratulate those who are fighting the battle to end hunger, and ask my fellow Americans to stand with me in this vital and important effort.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, like all of my colleagues I have been watching the presidential campaign with great interest, and I have noticed that the Democratic nominee has been making comments, particularly in the Midwest, which can not be reconciled with his record here in the Senate.

The Democratic nominee says coal should play an important role in America's energy future. He wants to "forge new ways to draw cleaner power from coal." But his record tells a different story—his votes and policies are aggressively anti-coal. On every issue of importance to coal and coal miners, he has sided with environmental extremists, who, like the Democratic nominee, view coal as a "dirty energy source" that must be eradicated.

Last year, the Democratic nominee voted for the Climate Stewardship Act, S. 139, a bill very similar to the Kyoto Protocol, which would destroy the coal industry. Unions for Jobs and the Environment, a group that includes the United Mine Workers, called S. 139 "a

bad idea," and believe that passage of S. 139 "would be tantamount to adoption of the Kyoto Protocol."

According to the Energy Information Administration, the bill causes steep declines in coal use and production and eliminates thousands of coal jobs. S. 139 would: cut coal-fired electricity by 80 percent; cut bituminous coal production by 69 percent; destroy 56,000 coal industry jobs; and cause existing coal plants in West Virginia, Ohio, Michigan, and Pennsylvania to shut down. "In the S.139 case, a large proportion of existing coal capacity is projected to be retired. It is simply not economical to continue operating these plants."

Along with running mate JOHN EDWARDS, the Democratic nominee is a cosponsor of the Clean Power Act. This legislation would impose heavy burdens on coal, forcing many plants to switch to natural gas or shut down.

This bill is so hostile to coal that the Ohio legislature, by an overwhelming bipartisan margin, passed a resolution condemning it. The resolution states:

The carbon dioxide emissions cap in the bill needlessly eliminates a significant component of electric generation in the United States by effectively removing coal as a fuel source. The bill will cause electric utilities to switch from coal to natural gas because the electric utilities would no longer have the option to economically generate electricity from coal. . . .

The United Mine Workers, the Utility Workers, the Boilermakers, and other labor unions oppose the bill. In testimony before the committee I chair, the Environment and Public Works Committee, Eugene Trisko of the United Mine Workers stated:

The union is strongly opposed to efforts to use the Clean Air Act as a vehicle for regulating greenhouse gas emissions . . . Limits on carbon emissions would require switching from coal to natural gas or other higher-cost energy sources, with potentially devastating impacts on the economies of coal-producing states.

Further, according to independent analysis, the bill: cuts coal-fired electric generation by 55 percent and coal production by 50 percent, EIA analysis of the Clean Power Act; destroys 32,000 coal jobs; and forces many coal-fired power plants to shut down, "resulting in substantial economic impacts."

The Democratic nominee has routinely criticized President Bush for rejecting Kyoto. As he said last year, "Instead of renegotiating the Kyoto Treaty to improve it, he simply repudiated it." And the Vice Presidential nominee, when asked in February by the San Francisco Chronicle whether he would support Kyoto, responded with a direct, "Yes," and said his running mate agreed with him.

The Democratic nominee says the U.S. should "reengage with the international community" to forge a new global warming agreement, but the question remains: What would the agreement look like? And how could any agreement calling for strict reductions in CO₂ emissions not harm coal?

Now they say they oppose Kyoto, describing its timetables and mandates

as “infeasible.” “The Democratic nominees believe that the Kyoto Protocol is not the answer. The near-term emission reductions it would require of the United States are infeasible, while the long-term obligations imposed on all nations are too little to solve the problem.”

But the Democratic nominee’s environmental group supporters know where he stands on Kyoto. “We don’t have doubts that this issue is at the top of his to-do list when elected, or his re-do list,” said Betsy Loyless of the League of Conservation Voters, which endorsed him for president. Saying, “there is no doubt in our mind that he will re-engage in Kyoto.”

Further, the Democratic nominee tried to save Kyoto in 2000 during negotiations with the EU. Quoting from a UPI article at the time:

Instead, one senator who accompanied him to Vietnam, John Kerry (D-MA), entered the fray. Senator Kerry, an aggressive promoter of the United States, was ubiquitously huddled over notepads and scribbling aides, attempting to develop U.S. offers on certain mechanisms that its counterparts would accept.

Not only did he try to save Kyoto, but he opposed efforts by the Clinton administration to ease U.S. compliance with the treaty. According to an AP article:

U.S. Sen. John Kerry, a Massachusetts Democrat who has been involved in environmental legislation, said he also had problems with the U.S. position. Instead of cutting its emissions by 7 percent as agreed at Kyoto, he said, the sinks proposal would allow the United States to pump at least 1 percent more greenhouse gases than it did in 1990. “Some sinks clearly must be counted, but they should be in line with the spirit of the Kyoto agreement,” he said. “Any retrenchment diminishes our credibility on other proposals” and raises “understandable suspicion that they are mere loopholes.”

According to a Grist Magazine article this year:

The Democratic nominee is no casual Kyoto detractor—he has attended a number of Kyoto conferences over the years and tried to push negotiations forward, and he has a long record of consistently voting in favor of policy measures to curb global warming, from stricter CAFE standards to mandatory greenhouse-gas regulations.

I want everyone to understand, Kyoto would eliminate coal use. “Under the Kyoto Protocol, coal consumption would be phased out over the period 2010 to 2020. The result would be massive dislocations in coal producing areas. . . .”

Kyoto would eliminate nearly 50,000 jobs in Ohio; 40,000 jobs in Pennsylvania; and 22,000 jobs in Michigan.

Kyoto would be disastrous for West Virginia coal. According to a study by West Virginia University, Kyoto would cause a 25.5 percent decline in coal mining; destroy 42,800 jobs; reduce state GDP by over \$3 billion; and reduce per capita income by \$393.

The West Virginia and Ohio legislatures passed resolutions rejecting Kyoto and preventing State agencies from implementing any part of the treaty.

According to his website, the Democratic nominee says he will spend \$10 billion over the next decade on clean coal technologies. But as the above demonstrates, you can’t have clean coal without coal. Moreover, his policies would obstruct installation of clean coal technologies, placing further burdens on the industry in meeting new Clean Air Act requirements.

The Democratic nominee opposes President Bush’s New Source Review reforms that allow utilities to upgrade their facilities with clean, energy efficient technologies, avoiding the complex, burdensome, and environmentally counterproductive permitting process unleashed by the Clinton EPA.

He supports lawsuits filed by environmental groups now blocking President Bush’s NSR reforms.

He even joined in the junior Senator from New York’s anti-NSR reform legal brief.

He voted last year for his running mate’s amendment to delay President Bush’s reforms and vows to “immediately reverse the Bush-Cheney rollbacks of the Nation’s Clean Air Program.”

Most critically, returning to the Clinton NSR program would thwart installation of clean coal technologies. According to the National Coal Council, uncertainty over the Clinton NSR policy “has had a direct and chilling effect on all maintenance and efficiency improvements and clean coal technology installations at existing power plants.”

The Democratic nominee also missed the vote on last year’s energy bill, and later said that had he been present, he would have voted against it. Yet the bill included several provisions and substantial funding for clean coal technologies: Authorizes \$200 million annually for fiscal years 2004 through 2012 for clean coal research and coal-based gasification technologies; authorizes funding to the Secretary of Energy for loans, and authorizes the Secretary to make loan guarantees for a variety of clean coal projects around the country; directs the Secretary of Energy to carry out a program to facilitate production and generation of coal-based power and the installation of pollution-control equipment; and creates an investment tax credit for facilities retrofitted, repowered or replaced with clean coal technology.

“Where we see a beautiful mountaintop, George Bush sees a strip mine.” This is the Democratic nominee’s view of mountaintop mining, which employs 15,000 people and provides \$21.8 million in revenue for education in West Virginia, according to a study by Marshall University.

In 1999, he voted against the senior Senator from West Virginia’s amendment to overturn a Federal court decision that threatened to end mountaintop mining in West Virginia.

According to the senior Senator from West Virginia said the goal of his amendment was “to allow for the con-

tinuation of our coal industry and the jobs it provides while better protecting the mountains and hollows of the state we love.”

I would point out that the United Mine Workers of America strongly supported the amendment.

He even joined forces with then Vice President Al Gore, who, after initially supporting the amendment, threatened to veto any appropriations bill that included it.

A recent Federal court decision, issued by U.S. District Judge Joseph Goodwin a Clinton appointee, halted 11 mountaintop mining projects in southern West Virginia. The economic impacts, according to West Virginia economists, could be devastating. The question is: where does the Democratic nominee stand on this decision?

Economist Michael Hicks and Cal Kent, former dean of Marshall University’s business college, said the ruling could slow the permitting process for mountaintop mining by 2 years, resulting in a 40 percent decline in coal production.

“That decline the economists predicted, could lead to layoffs, stunted investment in West Virginia—particularly in the southern Coalfields region—and less revenue for the state. And the impact could be felt as soon as this fiscal year,” they said.

The Democratic nominee has a unique view of the Clean Air Act. According to him, when the act was passed in 1970, there was a consensus that existing coal-fired power plants had a remaining life-span of 10 to 15 years. Beyond that time, according to this view, they would be forced to install costly new pollution controls or simply shut down.

Nearly 46 percent of coal-fired capacity in Ohio was built before 1970. In West Virginia, nearly one-third of capacity was built prior to 1970. Additionally, over 75 percent of coal-fired capacity in Ohio and West Virginia was built between 1970 and 1974.

According to the Democratic nominee, these plants must install exorbitantly expensive pollution controls, which would force many plants to close, or simply shut down altogether, causing massive economic dislocations, job losses, and higher energy costs in Ohio and West Virginia.

According to the NSR legal brief, which the Democratic nominee joined, the Clean Air Act “created a limited and qualified grace period within which existing plants could continue to operate. Accordingly, the 1970 CAA set up a simple choice for existing sources: either upgrade to new source standards or shut down.”

In conclusion, Kerry-Edwards is the most anti-coal presidential ticket in American history. Yes, even worse than Clinton-Gore.

(At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)