

We even see the Sierra Club come out against wind power claiming that the windmills are some kind of Cuisinart that decimates the bird population.

What does our President propose?

It is rather interesting to reflect on where we are now because he has come almost full circle. The President hints at some vague notion of meeting our emissions targets through electricity restructuring, but he is very short on specifics. Perhaps the President is playing to the headlines today, but leaving the details to tomorrow or to the next administration.

His proposal is that we, by the year 2008 to 2011, reduce our emissions to the level of 1990. Well, where is his administration going to be by that time? So they are just putting these things off as opposed to coming up with the mechanics that will work.

There are, in fact, things that we can do in the context of energy restructuring that can help restabilize our carbon emissions. We have had some 13 hearings on this subject in my committee, the Energy Committee, and we have heard from 120 witnesses. Thus, I am prepared to suggest some of the specifics that the President has not suggested.

For example, we can provide for stranded cost recovery of the more than 100 nuclear power reactors that together provide some 22 percent of our total electric power generation.

We can provide incentives to encourage or require regions to employ a mix of carbon-free wind, solar, nuclear, or hydropower adequate to achieve a specified carbon-free emissions standard.

We can offer a means to certify the claims of power producers who wish to market their power to consumers as low-carbon or carbon-free.

And we can offer assistance for market-led investments in new research towards carbon-free or low-carbon energy.

There is no shortage of policies we can pursue if we really want to address the issue of carbon emissions. We can be encouraged about recent technology breakthroughs in fuel cell technology, wind energy, solar technologies, and advanced nuclear plant designs.

In the end, I think, Mr. President, American ingenuity, technological innovation, and common sense will produce the solutions that the U.N. negotiations thus far have been unable to provide.

Finally, Mr. President, we need to employ these new technologies to increase energy efficiency, promote conservation, and stabilize our carbon emissions—but we do not need a flawed treaty that cannot get the job done. The climate issue is serious, but so are issues of equity, economic prosperity, and pragmatism.

During the last round of negotiations at Bonn, the draft treaty got worse. It got worse, not better. As a consequence, we need to prepare ourselves and the American people for the prospect that the new treaty will be unwor-

thy of support, even if you are deeply concerned about the increase of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, as I am. In other words, it doesn't do us any good to board a fast train, a fast train that is going in the wrong direction, particularly if all nations of the world aren't aboard.

I yield the floor.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent the period for morning business now be extended until the hour of 1:30.

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

FAST TRACK

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the fast-track bill that is before us. I have followed the debate on this legislation very closely. I have listened to my colleagues discuss at length the issues of trade flows, foreign direct investment, the delegation of authority, and unfair trade agreements. It has been an interesting debate for this freshman Senator.

I want to share with my colleagues the feelings that my constituents have expressed to me. Many of them have deep concerns about our progress on trade. Intense import competition makes them feel as if they have been left behind in the pursuit of fair trade.

There is an issue here that is far more important to my constituents than trade, however, but it is inextricably linked to their ability to compete. While the administration vows to fight for fair trade with foreign countries, people in Wyoming want this administration to fight for fair regulation in this country. For them, fair trade will not stimulate economic growth when their growth is halted by unreasonable regulations.

It seems that there is a real disconnect in our administration's policies on economic health. While one side of the administration is promoting job growth in exports, the other side is shutting down our enterprises with overly restrictive environmental regulations.

There is an inconsistency here that is difficult to explain to people in Wyoming. They do not understand why the administration supports export growth, but allows the Environmental Protection Agency to issue and adopt regulations such as the new particulate matter and ozone standards for air quality.

How does this relate to the fast-track bill we are debating? It connects in two ways. The first issue is jobs. The purpose of the bill before us is to promote job growth—which is a good purpose and I support it. Unreasonable regulatory mandates, however, do not create jobs. Second, like fast track, environmental regulation is a delegated authority. And in my opinion, it is one

delegated authority that is out of control.

Let me first discuss what is wrong with the standards and how they will destroy jobs. They were formulated and adopted with a disturbing lack of scientific consensus; with no accountability; and with a genuine disregard for the real effects they will have on working people.

The accuracy of scientific information in the formulation of scientific rules is critical for a democracy. Democracies cannot survive without being able to rely on the precision of their scientific information. Furthermore, democracies cannot survive when bureaucracies are able to impose expensive mandates without any accountability. Democracy depends on representation along with taxation. Bureaucrats must consult with elected representatives before imposing massive costs on our citizens.

With the adoption of these unreasonable standards, the EPA and the administration have failed on both of these counts.

There are numerous examples that show a lack of scientific consensus in the promulgation of these new air quality standards. The EPA's own Clean Air Science Advisory Committee, stated that at this point, "there is no adequately articulated scientific basis for making regulatory decisions concerning a particulate matter National Ambient Air Quality Standard."

The administration's National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences dismissed the EPA's claims about the relationship between childhood asthma and air quality. They observed that the asthma rate in Philadelphia has soared even as that city's air pollution levels have plummeted. They also noted that some of the highest asthma rates in the world occur in Australia and New Zealand—two countries with excellent air quality.

Strangely enough, while the EPA is promulgating expensive rules, other agencies have been pushing for economic growth. The U.S. Trade Representative, the Department of Commerce, the Small Business Administration, and the Department of Agriculture—have all advocated the importance of fast track for growth.

Even the President has emphasized the need for fast track in terms of job creation. He stressed that,

"In order for us to continue to create jobs and opportunities for our own people, and to maintain our world leadership, we have to continue to expand exports . . . We have to act now to continue [our] progress to make sure our economy will work for all the American people."

Well, I stand here to tell you that unreasonably expensive regulations will not make our economy work for all American people. Achievements in trade expansion will not overcome the excessive costs imposed by regulatory mandates.

And the costs are excessive. At first, the EPA estimated the cost would be