

the efficiency of production; consumer protections to guard against fraud, market manipulation, and abuse; and environmental sensitivity to minimize the impacts from wastes and emissions.

These are essential elements for any comprehensive energy policy. These elements must be fully integrated through a policy that is designed to maximize fuel diversity and efficiency of production while minimizing consumer abuse and environmental degradation. These elements could provide a complementary path forward, but this Energy bill is a significant detour.

With these guiding principles in mind, we must then begin to make the hard choices. We must develop a truly strategic plan. Planning requires that we decide how much, to what extent, and when actions must be taken. It requires the development of criteria so the progress can be measured.

For the past three decades, the United States has struggled to find and secure its energy future. Administrations since Richard Nixon have been trying to craft a sensible energy policy, with some small successes, but mostly with little significant progress to show. All too often, America's energy agenda has shifted—lurching first in one direction, then in another. The net effect has been that the Nation has grown more and more dependent on foreign oil, making America's energy security increasingly vulnerable to manipulation and terrorist attack.

This Nation has not had a serious, thoughtful energy strategy or a comprehensive set of energy policies for a long while. Too often, the Government has, instead, reacted to shortages, dislocations, and various energy crises. For example, the Government has tried to control oil and natural gas prices, which only served to exacerbate supply shortages. For a period of time, one administration tried to prohibit the use of natural gas and forced the use of coal for power generation. Two decades later, another administration discouraged the use of coal and Federal priorities shifted to the increased use of natural gas. Today, the Nation finds itself caught in what Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan calls "the gas trap."

The energy bill soon to be before this Congress is primarily another reactionary effort. While there may be some strong trees planted, it is by no means a healthy forest. From past energy efforts, only a few actions, such as creating the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and the Clean Coal Technology Program, have proven to be truly far-sighted. I fear that most of this energy bill will continue a business-as-usual approach.

Furthermore, we must, once and for all, realize that our energy and climate change policies are two sides of the same coin. Yet we are doing little, if anything, to address seriously these critical links. This energy bill includes nothing substantial to address either global climate change or advanced

clean energy technology exports. If these and other key provisions are not included, why should I support such a flawed, misguided energy conference bill?

Furthermore, the administration has been seeking my support for its so-called FutureGen project, claiming this purported \$1 billion, 10-year proposal would build one large powerplant as an experiment to address climate change. My support for this project is largely contingent on identifying the long-term resources for FutureGen and knowing that it will not erode other critical energy programs. So I have to say that, if the administration is expecting my support for FutureGen, then, in coming years I expect that the administration will support my climate change and international technology transfer provisions as well. If the administration is still around.

Global warming is an Achilles' heel for this White House—one among other Achilles' heels. The President has shown no desire to address this problem in an energy bill or anywhere else.

In the end, the President would dearly love a showy Rose Garden ceremony in which to sign an energy bill and thus have a 2004 campaign press release to tout its so-called success. But, given this administration's track record, an energy bill would simply be another empty soapbox for the President to stand on to announce a bankrupt deal.

I say, where have we seen that before? While the Congress has passed bills and supported the Bush administration's rhetoric, the necessary resources to carry all this out never materialize.

The American people deserve much better than this. As the blackout of August 14 vividly demonstrated, this Nation's energy system—which is the lifeline of our economy and national security—is on life support. As we struggle to define and implement a national energy policy needed to address these issues, we again find ourselves on a collision course.

We need a new framework based on a consistent and cohesive set of policies. But we must recognize that we must get to that critical juncture. This new framework must be designed to strengthen the law, not gut it. Most importantly, as we approach this crossroads, we must seek to fully integrate our energy and environmental policy goals and objectives in a complementary way.

We were told we had to rush into Iraq to contain Saddam's WMD programs. Now we are being told this energy bill will reduce our dependence on foreign oil, counteract increasing fuel prices, and do so many other things.

Americans should not be fooled. They will not. There are few, if any, benchmarks or yardsticks from which we can truly chart our progress. Sadly, such milestones are anathema to this administration. At the same time, we have squandered a huge opportunity. The bipartisan cooperation in the de-

velopment of this energy bill was purely superficial. Soon this Senate could be asked to vote on this legislation. There is pressure to cajole Members to swallow hard and pass it. Despite some solid provisions, why should I be a party to this boondoggle?

A cherry-picked energy plan based on soliciting big industry campaign contributions is a bankrupt policy. It takes this Nation nowhere, and it puts our Nation's future at risk. It is time that the dots were connected. The same pattern by this White House continues to repeat itself. That pattern is statements of policy that build on infinite mirages and boundless facades.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today, in the few days before Veterans Day, to pay tribute to one of America's and one of Ohio's fallen sons. Twenty-seven year-old Army Specialist James Christopher Wright, who served in the 4th Battalion, 42nd Field Artillery Regiment, of the 4th Infantry Division, passed away on September 18, 2003, while trying to secure a hostile area near Tikrit, Iraq.

James Wright—known as Jimmy by his family and friends—was from Delhi Township, OH. In the early 1990s, he graduated from Oak Hills High School and Diamond Oaks Vocational School.

Growing up, Jimmy was a fun-loving kid. Friends say he was always ready with a smile or a joke. He could make any situation seem comfortable.

He could put people at ease.

Christina Schwaller, who attended Oak Hills High School with Jimmy said that he was "very outgoing and lovable, very much the clown. He was always laughing—you never had a bad moment when he was around."

Jimmy also loved cars. It's a love he shared with his older brother, Eddie. When Jimmy was still in high school, and Eddie had just graduated, they bought low-riding pick-up trucks and spent hours upon hours outfitting them. In Iraq, Jimmy was the proud driver of a Humvee. Today, Eddie drives a Porsche with a memorial to his brother painted on the front hood.