

However, it was also clear to me from my discussions with those scientists that many other important scientific issues concerning the extent of the human contribution to warming trends, the extent to which the earth will continue to warm, and perhaps, most important, the extent to which mankind can take actions that will effectively stop or slow climate change are far from settled and will likely take years to determine.

Indeed, the consensus that is forming among scientists working on this issue for the National Research Council is that we need a plan to focus more on climate change "adaptation" rather than climate change "mitigation." This thinking would have been considered radical a little over a year ago and today still may be anathema to many in the environmental community. Yet, a July, 2000, Atlantic Monthly article entitled "Breaking the Global Warming Gridlock" by Daniel Sarewitz and Roger Pielke, Jr. boldly and intelligently addresses this issue and persuasively makes the case for new thinking on what many of us would agree is one of the most important issues for this new century.

Instead of discussions at The Hague centering on ways to reach consensus on actions that would reduce vulnerability to climate change such as encouraging democracy, raising standards of living, and improving environmental quality in the developing world through the use of innovative American and other industrialized countries technology, many discussions were consumed by scathing anti-American rhetoric.

Some non-governmental environmental organizations and some European Environmental Ministers were criticizing the United States for not wanting to surrender some of its sovereignty by allowing other nations to police American fuel use and economic expansion strategies.

Many in the developing world were brazenly demanding billions of dollars in "pay-offs" for the perceived harm that climate change—in their opinion, brought about by American greed—was causing developing countries. Astonishingly, all of this pay-off money would be in addition to the large sums currently being sent to developing countries through AID and many other American taxpayer programs designed to help developing nations reach better standards of living.

The motives of America's strongest critics at The Hague Climate Conference appeared to be nothing more than transparent efforts to have wholesale redistribution of wealth to the developing world and to maneuver our competitors in the global market place into stronger competitive positions.

Many in the non-governmental environmental community appeared to be more interested in promoting non-growth and anti-population agendas than taking actions that would offer the best prospects to reduce green-

house gas emissions or helping vulnerable nations adapt to capricious climate variations.

I believe America will responsibly move forward in addressing the climate change issue whether or not Kyoto is ever ratified by the Senate. We should not, and the Senate will not allow the international community or powerful non-governmental environmental organizations to force our nation to accept a deal that will be economically threatening or scientifically ineffective.

Secretary Loy and his negotiating team at COP-6 should be commended for their hard work and steadfastness in demanding from the international community solid proposals that fully recognize both America's determination to defend its sovereignty and its unmatched ability through its technological prowess to help the world deal with any potential calamities as a consequence of climate change.

Moreover, the United States won key concessions from international negotiators at Kyoto that now appear to be at serious risk. Indeed, European negotiators at The Hague, with strong pressure from some non-governmental environmental organizations, made aggressive attempts to rescind those concessions.

The flexible mechanisms provision and the sinks provision were elements of the Protocol that were prominently displayed to Congress by the Clinton/Gore Administration when Congressional Oversight Committees questioned the costs associated with the Protocol. Each time the Administration responded to such queries, the Administration would point to the carbon sink and flexible mechanism provisions to rationalize its assessment that compliance with the Protocol would be in-expensive.

Clearly, without those provisions, the Protocol's cost will be prohibitive and violate one of the critical tenets of Senate Resolution 98—the Byrd/Hagel Resolution—which passed the Senate 95-0 in 1997.

I can only hope that the current Administration will do nothing to compromise these principles in the coming weeks. To do so would be irresponsible and unproductive. Clearly, it would be politically ineffective inasmuch as the Senate would not ratify such agreement.

Meanwhile, as scientists continue to research, discover, and even disagree on the causes and effects of global warming, I will continue to work with my colleagues in Congress to aggressively establish a system of incentives that reduce the environmental impacts of human activity, while preserving the freedoms and quality of life that make the United States the greatest Nation on Earth.

BIPARTISANSHIP

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I was of course very disappointed in the deci-

sion of the U.S. Supreme Court. I sat and listened to that argument. I think both lawyers Olson and Boies did an outstanding job. I was disappointed in the 5-4 decision. I think it was as a result of the Supreme Court's decision that the vote did not go forward in the first place.

Having said that, I am an attorney. I have always believed we are a nation of laws and not of men. I said prior to the decision being rendered by the Supreme Court I would follow that decision; that I may not like it, but I would do whatever I could to make sure it was accepted.

I think during this entire process we as a nation should be very proud. I repeat, I didn't like the way the election turned out. We have a man, Vice President GORE, who won the national vote, a vote of the public, by 250,000 votes over his opponent. If there had ever been a count in Florida, he would have won that. But this country is a great country. Even though AL GORE won the election, he will not take office. This country is amazing. In spite of that, there was not a single arrest during any of these very bitter discussions regarding the vote. There was not a single injury that I know of. It is something that is part of history. I am going to do everything I can to make sure that George W. Bush's Presidency is as good as it can be.

I know he comes from a good family. I served in the Congress during the tenure of his father. I liked his dad very much. He wrote me a number of personal letters on things that I did that he thought were good. I have those letters and I treasure those letters. I was the first Democrat to speak openly for our incursions into Iraq. I think President Bush did the right thing. In short, I think George W. Bush has the ability to be a good President. I am going to do everything I can, as I said, to support President-elect Bush.

I think we have to recognize that what took place last night was magnificent. Vice President GORE's speech was magnanimous, gracious. As we indicated, he got more popular votes than even Ronald Reagan. Then that was followed by a speech by President-elect Bush which was outstanding. I think the tone of his speech was good. I think the issues he talked about were issues we have talked about for some time here on the Senate floor.

President-elect Bush is going to get all the advice and counsel he needs, I am sure, and he does not need mine. I am confident that today he is being briefed and briefed and briefed and told opinions of what people think he should do. But, in spite of that, my advice to the President-elect is, if he wants to be bipartisan in action rather than just words, the first thing he should do is recognize we have a House of Representatives which is almost evenly divided. He has to recognize that we have a Senate that is evenly divided. We have 50 Democrats; we have 50 Republicans. Either by math

that is taught at MIT or the so-called fuzzy math talked about during the campaign, 50 and 50 are equal.

As a result of that, I recommend the President-elect interject himself into what is going on here in the legislative branch of the Government. I think what he should do is say 50-50 is equal. I think the Republicans should go along with the Democrats to have committees that are even—that is, the same number of Democrats on the committee as Republicans. There should be equal funding. There should be equal staffing. I think he should take a look at the committee chairmanship structure. I think it would be a significant step if President-elect Bush stepped forward and looked at what the future holds.

The future holds that, for example, if the Budget Committee is 10-10—one of the first things we are required by law to do is come forward with the budget—if the committee is 10-10, anything that comes before this Senate will be bipartisan in nature and I think will be approved quickly. It would be the same on other committees. I think one thing the American people have said is that we should work in a bipartisan basis, 50-50 in the Senate, 50-50, approximately, in the House.

We have a President who was elected with fewer votes than the his opponent. I just think this is a time that calls for bipartisanship. I think we can do that. But I think it would set a very bad tone if the Republicans, some of whom are in denial that the Senate is 50-50, would prevent the Senate from going forward by saying we are not going to give you equality on the committees. If that happens, it is not the Democrats who are holding up action in the Senate, it is the Republicans—the Republicans who we no longer refer to as the majority because they are not the majority. It is the Republicans who will be holding up this Congress and this country from moving forward.

I also think it appropriate that President Bush follow the example we have in the Cabinet today with Secretary Cohen. Secretary Cohen is a bona fide, card-carrying Republican from the State of Maine who did an outstanding job and is doing an outstanding job during his tenure as Secretary of Defense. I hope President-elect Bush will also look to people of the other party, the Democratic Party, to fill spots in his Cabinet. I am confident he will do that.

Again, I feel so good today about our country. We should all feel good about our country. In spite of the closeness of the election, in spite of the more than 1 month since the election took place, we have two men who stepped forward last night; they stepped forward with compassion, stepped forward with confidence—confidence at the greatness of this country.

I have been through statewide recounts, two of them, one of which I lost by 524 votes; one of which I won by 428 votes. I know what close elections are

all about. I know how difficult recounts are. I was very proud of both men and their families for what they put up with and how they ended the election process last night. It speaks well of them and of our country.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR SLADE GORTON

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, everyone has been focused on the Presidential election. It has been one of the most drawn out Presidential elections in U.S. history. Another election came to conclusion recently, and that was the Senate race in the State of Washington, one of the closest Senate races in many years. It took weeks to discern.

Our friend and colleague, Senator SLADE GORTON, was defeated. I want to make a couple comments concerning our colleague, Senator GORTON.

I had hoped he would not lose this race because he is a friend of mine and, in my opinion, he is one of the most outstanding Senators we have had.

By way of a little history, I was elected with Senator GORTON in 1980. Both of us were freshman Senators. He was formerly an attorney general. He gained some attention nationwide in that he and his family bicycled all the way across our country. It shows they are a close family and individuals with endurance and athletic talent.

He is an outstanding Senator. He lost reelection in 1986, unfortunately. A lot of people lost. It was a tough year. That was certainly one of the toughest losses we had. I remember stating at that time when Senator GORTON lost that he was a Senator's Senator. I hated to see him lose that race. He showed great endurance and came back in 1988 and won and also won reelection in 1994. As I mentioned, he was just defeated in a very close race in 2000.

Senator GORTON has served 18 years in the Senate. In his last two consecutive terms, he was chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee and worked on a couple of different Appropriations subcommittees. He did an outstanding job with the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee which has enormous responsibility. He handled that with great skill and in a bipartisan way.

People ask: Can the Senate function? Can we work in a bipartisan manner? I look at Senator GORTON and his leadership on the Interior Subcommittee, working with Senator BYRD and Senator REID. He has proven it can happen and has shown how it can happen and should happen.

He is an outstanding Senator. He has handled his defeat with great class. There was a recount, and he congratulated MARIA CANTWELL as the victor. We are proud to call him our colleague and our friend. Certainly he will be missed in this body; certainly his leadership will be missed in the State of Washington.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BOB KERREY

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, Senator BOB KERREY from Nebraska, as most people know, was a former Governor of Nebraska. He has completed two terms in the Senate. I, for one, hate to see him leave the Senate. I have had the pleasure of working with Senator KERREY on the Finance Committee. He has shown great courage.

He is a person who has been willing to talk about difficult issues: Curbing the growth of entitlements, Medicare, and Medicaid. He worked on the commission that was also chaired, I think, by Senators BREAU, FRIST, and THOMAS, and was an outstanding member in saying: Let's make some of the tough choices; let's make some of those tough choices now.

He is a person who has been willing to reach out and work in a bipartisan fashion, such as on personal savings accounts for Social Security, reforming Social Security.

He has courage. He has conviction. He has shown it time and time again with his service in the Senate, with his activities in the Senate and outside the Senate.

Everyone knows he is a Medal of Honor winner. I think of him as a competitor, as a friend, as a colleague. Some of us jog on occasion. Senator KERREY jogs and jogs quite well. That is very inspirational because he also has an artificial leg.

He has a great personality. I think he has made a great contribution to the Senate. He has helped improve the quality of the Senate, and certainly he will be missed. I think he has announced he is going to be a university president. That will be very much to the gain of that university. He will be sorely missed in the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and 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. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROD GRAMS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to take just a few minutes to comment on one of our friends who is leaving the Senate.

We all, of course, feel strongly about the changes that take place in this