

be educated on the issue all over the world. Only while working together, we can have the power to take action and to end child labour. This network will be made up of children from all over the world, and it will spread the stories of child labour and opinions. The network will help us plan more effective actions in our struggle against child labour. The network will also be a medium to report on the governments' failing or not failing their promises among the children of the world.

We believe that the use of art, dance, music and drama as a form of expression and means to spread awareness about child labour is very important. These are ways in which children from any background can connect with, understand and enjoy. There are many ways to spread the message against child labour, beyond borders, through performing art.

We must also use media to spread our voices. We would create our own form of media, such as newspaper developed by the children for the children, for us to freely express our opinion. Media also must be more friendly and tell the truth about child labour and help us combat child labour.

We have to bring the efforts to end child labour out to the villages, where the fight is not as strong. Information about child labour sometimes only reaches cities and people in the villages do not have information about the dangers of child labour. We must get them involved.

We promise to continue to take action to eliminate child labour and make a better world for children. Now, we ask all of you to join us, because only together can we truly achieve freedom for all. In this friendship, we will create a healthy and peaceful world for all.

Today, the power is in our hands. We define the future.

We are the present and our voice is the future.

ENERGY BILLS UNDER CONSIDERATION BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, as the ranking member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, I express my serious concern with several pieces of so-called energy legislation that the House of Representatives is considering this week. This package of bills includes a comprehensive energy bill that differs both from the failed conference report on H.R. 6 and from the Senate energy bill that was introduced on February 12, 2004, and placed directly on the calendar.

These bills are not the product of hearings or of bipartisan consensus between the House and the Senate. The comprehensive energy bill the House is considering is nearly identical to the energy bill conference report we have already defeated. The other bills are equally troubling. They trample States rights and they enact significant new taxpayer subsidies. Most importantly, they are not the right energy policy for America.

I have for many months now said that we should try to reach consensus on targeted pieces of energy legislation. We could pass legislation on issues such as the increased production of renewable motor fuels. We could

enact fiscally responsible extensions of needed energy tax provisions, such as the wind energy tax credit. National electricity reliability standards are another area in which Senator CANTWELL, Senator FEINGOLD and I believe there could be agreement and we could pass a bill. I also believe there are a number of energy efficiency measures that could garner broad support.

But, there should be no agreement on the poor environmental policy that is contained in these bills. The Senate should reject them if they are passed and sent over for consideration.

The omnibus bill the House passed yesterday, H.R. 4503, is identical to the failed conference report on H.R. 6, except for the inclusion of two coal-related provisions that are in the pending Senate bill, S. 2095.

As with the energy bill conference report, nearly a hundred sections of the bill are in the jurisdiction of the Environment and Public Works Committee. We were not consulted on any of these sections, the House has made no effort to fix these provisions, and I have repeatedly raised concerns about them on the Senate floor.

The waiver of liability for MTBE producers is included in the House's bill. The Senate has repeatedly rejected this provision.

The House bill unravels the ozone designation process in the Clean Air Act by delaying compliance with the national health-based air quality ozone standards until the air in the dirtiest city is cleaned up. The House insists on this leftover from the failed energy bill conference report, though changing cities' ozone compliance deadlines under the Clean Air Act doesn't increase our Nation's energy supplies.

This bill also provides unprecedented relief for a single region of the country from application of the entire Clean Air Act, without a hearing.

The House continues to insist that oil and gas exploration and production activities be exempted from the Clean Water Act stormwater program.

The Clean Water Act requires permits for stormwater discharges associated with construction activity. The amendment changes the act to provide a special exemption for oil and gas construction activities from stormwater pollution control requirements.

The scope of the provision is extremely broad. Stormwater runoff typically contains pollutants such as oil and grease, chemicals, nutrients, metals, bacteria, and particulates.

I have told colleagues this before, but EPA estimates that this change would exempt at least 30,000 small oil and gas sites from clean water requirements. In addition, every construction site in the oil and gas industry larger than 5 acres would be exempt as well.

The large sites have held permits for 10 years or more. That is a terrible rollback of current law. I want Senators to imagine trying to explain to constituents why an oil drilling site that had to comply with the Clean

Water Act for 10 years suddenly no longer needs to do so.

The House is scheduled to act today on another bill, H.R. 4517, called the United States Refinery Revitalization Act of 2004. It gives the Department of Energy a lead role in environmental permitting decisions for refineries in a newly designated "refinery revitalization" zone. The Energy Department would get the ability to issue permits and make "federal authorization decisions" under our major environmental laws including: the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, and our national solid and hazardous waste laws, among others.

The Energy Department would get to make environmental regulatory decisions and set compliance deadlines. This is a classic case of the fox guarding the hen house. Moreover, if a permit is denied, there would only be an appeal to the DOE Secretary and then judicial review in the D.C. Circuit Court. The EPA, which normally makes these decisions, has no role at all.

In an effort to assure Members, there is a savings clause in the bill that is supposed to protect environmental laws. The bill includes language that contradicts the savings clause provisions. It states that if the best available pollution control technology is used at a facility then that facility is in compliance with all environmental permitting requirements. In addition, the role of states is not clear, particularly those with more stringent standards.

While this bill proposes to increase our domestic refining capacity, it will not do so. In fact, it is drafted in a way that will likely reduce our supplies of gasoline and heating oil.

The bill is supposed to restart idled refineries. It defines "idle refineries" as those that have shut down after June 1, 2004. Let me say that again for my colleagues, idle refineries are refineries that shut down after June 1, 2004. These are not refineries that have been mothballed and shut down for many years. These so-called idle refineries could be operating now and then shut down after enactment of the bill in order to game the system. The refineries would seek regulatory relief under a newer, inexperienced regulatory agency, and drive prices even higher by further constraining production. This is a tragic outcome, and certainly not one that expands our Nation's refining capacity.

The House passed another bill yesterday, H.R. 4513, that exempts Federal agencies planning renewable energy projects from the National Environmental Policy Act. Federal agencies would no longer have to identify alternative project locations when they site a renewable energy project. They also would no longer have to examine alternatives to the project other than the actions they propose to take, or the option of doing nothing at all. Like the

refinery bill, this bill has bad consequences. While the bill seeks to speed up renewable energy projects, it is really a way to trample over Federal environmental laws or State and local requirements. For example, a city's objections to a windmill or solar panels proposed for the top of a downtown federal building may not have to be resolved or alternatives considered, even if there are local scenic concerns or conflicts with zoning ordinances. In a regular NEPA process, discussion could resolve those concerns and produce a project that meets both Federal and local needs. We should be reaching agreement over the development of renewable energy, not creating conflicts.

Also today, the House will take up H.R. 4545, the Gasoline Price Reduction Act of 2004, a bill that proposes to increase gasoline supplies by capping the number of so-called boutique fuel blends. This bill is not likely to have a beneficial effect in terms of reducing gasoline prices or increasing supplies, and appears designed to significantly worsen air quality. It allows EPA open-ended authority to waive cleaner-burning gasoline or diesel requirements indefinitely based on an undefined "significant fuel supply disruption." In addition, EPA's determination appears not to be judicially reviewable, since the EPA Administrator need only deem a waiver "necessary." Further there is no obligation to mitigate or make up for the excess air pollution that may occur over the waiver period.

This bill also would bar any increase in the number of existing fuels and fuel additives. This would apply to any State-adopted ultra-low sulfur diesel, biodiesel or cleaner-burning gasoline programs, even though these programs do not affect gasoline prices or supply, and regardless of the fact that they may be needed to meet new, health-based air quality standards for ozone or fine particulate pollution.

There are too many serious problems with these bills. The American people do not want us to act at the expense of environmental quality. We should be passing the pieces of the energy bill where we can reach agreement to do so, like those issues I outlined.

We should not be rushing to pass legislation with such serious consequences. These are aggressive, overreaching bills, and are deeply flawed. I will oppose them, and other Senators should as well.

ENERGY TRADING OVERSIGHT

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the recent release of audiotapes of Enron traders gloating about their ability to manipulate energy markets should jolt the Senate into passing S. 2015, the Energy Needs Regulatory Oversight Now or ENRON Act.

A public utility near Seattle, which is trying to get back the money it lost to Enron's unscrupulous energy trading practices, received the tapes from the Justice Department. These tapes

confirm what we all suspected: Enron manipulated energy markets and gouged consumers. According to these tapes, Enron traders celebrated when a forest fire shut down a major transmission line into California in 2000. This shut down cut power supplies and raised energy prices. An energy trader sang: "Burn, baby, burn. That's a beautiful thing." These taped conversations also provide evidence that Enron made secret pacts with power producers and Enron traders deliberately drove up prices by ordering power plants to shut down. The traders also brag about their ability to manipulate markets and steal money from the "grandmothers of California," who one trader called "Grandma Millie." The arrogance of these traders shocks the conscience. It also demonstrates the need for Congress to protect consumers from energy market manipulation. We cannot let the market abuses that took place during the Western energy crisis of 2000 happen again.

S. 2105 requires the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to prohibit the use of manipulative practices like these that put at risk consumers and the reliability of the transmission grid. We learned from this crisis that electricity markets need close government oversight to ensure that companies do not engage in risky and deceptive trading schemes leading to soaring energy prices and their own possible financial failure. In both cases, consumers—the people who depend upon the electricity these companies generate or trade—are the losers.

The Senate recently went on record in support of barring abusive energy market practices when it approved an amendment to the fiscal year 2004 agricultural appropriations bill offered by Senator CANTWELL. I am disappointed this language was stripped from the omnibus spending bill. These necessary protections were also omitted from the final energy conference report and the revised energy bill we voted on in April.

We need to send a clear message to the energy industry that this behavior will not be tolerated, and we must show consumers that we will protect them from energy market manipulation. I am proud to cosponsor S. 2015 and encourage my fellow colleagues to pass this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JUDITH RODIN

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to pay tribute to Dr. Judith Rodin, who on June 30, 2004, will complete a remarkable 10-year presidency of the University of Pennsylvania, my alma mater.

When she came to the University of Pennsylvania in 1994, Dr. Rodin became the first woman president of an Ivy League school. During her tenure, she has led the University of Pennsylvania through a period of growth and development that has transformed the University academically and greatly im-

proved the quality of life on campus and in surrounding West Philadelphia.

Since 1994, the University of Pennsylvania has doubled its research funding, tripled both its annual fundraising and endowment and attracted record numbers of undergraduate applicants. However, Dr. Rodin's greatest legacy will be her response to the challenge the University of Pennsylvania faces as a citizen of West Philadelphia.

From her first days as President of the University of Pennsylvania, Dr. Rodin made clear that one of her core beliefs was that a great research university must also be a great neighbor.

Dr. Rodin established the West Philadelphia Initiatives—a multi-faceted urban-planning and community-development program which has reduced crime and blight, increased job opportunities and improved the quality of life in West Philadelphia. This program in turn has reinforced the University's ability to attract the best students, faculty, staff and research opportunities.

The success of the West Philadelphia Initiatives in bringing employment, investment and quality-of-life improvements to West Philadelphia has become a model for collaboration between universities and urban communities throughout the United States. Key to the success of the program has been Dr. Rodin's acute understanding of the problems facing the West Philadelphia community, as a native Philadelphian.

Dr. Rodin was born in Philadelphia and attended Girls' High School, where she was a Mayor's Scholar. As an undergraduate at the University of Pennsylvania, she showed great talent both in the classroom and in politics, where, as president of the women's student government, she helped to lay the groundwork for a merger with the men's student government.

Dr. Rodin later earned a doctorate in psychology at Columbia University, and spent two decades on the faculty at Yale University, where she worked tirelessly to research and explain the biological and psychological factors that lead to obesity—a critical health issue facing our country today.

She also helped launch the women's health movement, and expanded our understanding of aging by demonstrating that elderly people who are empowered lead more active, healthier, and longer lives than those who are consigned to helplessness. It is a true testament to Dr. Rodin that she brought with her to the University this same resolve and tremendous passion to serve the students of the University of Pennsylvania and the less fortunate of the West Philadelphia community.

As a graduate of Penn, I am pleased to be able to honor Dr. Judith Rodin today, as a great Philadelphian, Pennsylvanian, and American, and perhaps most important, a great University of Pennsylvania Quaker.

I thank her for her service and wish her the best in the future.