

3. *The President's proposal to spur development of bioenergy and bioproducts that can benefit farmers and rural areas, reduce reliance on foreign oil, cut air pollution, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions—*

This program first surfaced, of course, in an article by Senator Dick Lugar in *Foreign Affairs* magazine over a year ago. It is embodied in his bill which recently passed the Senate without dissent. Actually, in the early drafting stages I contemplated adding the text of the Lugar legislation to my bill, but did not do so out of deference to Senator Lugar whose strategy was to move his bill separately. Instead, in public speeches leading up to its approval by the full Senate I helped promote his legislation as a stand-alone proposition. Let's both hope that the House takes it up quickly and sends it to the President for enactment!

4. *An initiative to encourage open competitive markets and promote the export of American clean energy technologies into the multi-billion dollar market of developing transition countries around the world—*

Again, we are in harmony. My bill takes the Administration's proposal a few steps further with an entire title on technology transfer. Projects that replace older machinery in other countries with more advanced energy-efficient technologies will qualify for a suite of export incentives. These will undoubtedly be deployed in developing countries because the bill is crafted in a way to target these projects where local hosts do not have the economic clout to finance them on their own.

5. *The ongoing Vision 21 Power Plant program to develop coal-fired power plants that would be about twice as efficient as current plants—*

My approach to achieve this objective is by way of tax incentive. S. 1777 spurs continuing efficiency breakthroughs by offering incentives to reach increasingly challenging efficiency benchmarks—achievable in the short-term, improving in the long-term.

6. *Nuclear energy plant optimization—advanced technologies that can help ensure the longer term reliability and efficiency of existing nuclear power plants—*

While my bills do not specify nuclear power projects for short- or long-term promotion, I am confident that nuclear power will benefit from my legislation. First, the current and future Presidents are called upon to recommend to Congress legislation to respond to climate change. Any comprehensive execution of this provision would have to address the role of nuclear power. However, if a President should overlook nuclear in the mandated report and recommendation to Congress, I offer a back-up. My bill also includes a statutory requirement for the General Accounting Office to identify statutory or administrative barriers to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. If any exist with regard to nuclear power, I would expect GAO to find them and highlight them, along with all others.

I considered folding into S. 1776 the most important step toward securing long-term reliability of nuclear power's contribution, namely, nuclear waste legislation. I did not do so because of the President's repeated vetoes. My goal from the beginning remains unchanged: to find consensus, not division, on climate change.

On a separate complementary track, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee I have strongly supported DOE's Nuclear Energy Plant Optimization program and Nuclear Energy Research Initiative.

7. *Law to give businesses protection against being penalized down the road when they take real, tangible actions today to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions—*

Unlike some other proposals, my legislation actually accomplishes this in hard currency immediately when such actions are taken. My tax incentives, all of which are available for the year in which the qualifying investments are made, are all predicated on reporting the reductions achieved by those investments under Section 1605(b) of EPAct, as amended by S. 1776.

8. *Help states and local communities undertake efforts to encourage innovation and reduce greenhouse gases—*

With the same stated purpose, but in contrast to the Clean Air Partnership Fund's top-down approach, S. 1776 explicitly preserves state-initiated climate change responses by protecting them from future federal preemption. It works as follows. If a state has a program that has as one of its effects the reduction (or sequestration) of greenhouse gas emissions, it remains in effect despite future federal enactments to the contrary. The only exception: when a future Congress recites in future legislation the specific section number in my bill as either (1) being repealed outright, or (2) as not applying to the specific state program. I have been assured that this provision passes Constitutional muster. I am confident that future Congresses will look long and hard before deliberately and conspicuously tampering with states' rights and climate change programs.

9. *Diplomatic effort to complete the unfinished business of the Kyoto Protocol—*

While our perspectives on this bullet in your letter to me do not match, my legislation is silent on the subject. Again, this is because my primary objective was to explore policies on which consensus with the President and others is possible. Let's not let our differing perspectives get in the way of policies we can and do agree on.

However, as an aside, I do believe that both an international and domestic consensus on Kyoto is achievable and, in fact, emerging. As months and years pass since Vice President Gore personally negotiated its terms and the President signed it, several governments have distanced themselves from—or, in Norway's case—impaled itself on Kyoto. A sure way to resolve the issue once and for all here in the United States is for the President to submit the Treaty for Senate ratification. Sweeping in scope as my legislation is, however, treaty ratification would not be germane to my bill.

Finally, in the same spirit of sharpening our mutual understanding, let's focus on an area where you seem to see even more agreement between us than I do. Interpreting our legislation as reflecting "a shift in the terms of the debate from whether there is a problem to what actions we can take to address it," you take it one step further by quoting Texaco: "protracted debate about the adequacy of the science is something [we need] to move beyond."

On the question of the adequacy of the science, I side with the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences. In the March 30, 2000 hearing before the Senate Energy Committee, Dr. Elbert W. (Joe) Friday, speaking for the National Academy, stated plainly: "the jury is still out." What portion of the warming signal is attributable to anthropogenic effects and what to natural variability he declined to speculate on, except to explicitly refuse to say that Mankind's contribution is primary. Nor did he, speaking on behalf of the science community, indicate that any proposed suite

of climate change response policies would appreciably alter global temperature trends. Instead, he focused the Committee's attention on the milestone Pathways Report published just last Fall by the National Academy of Sciences.

The fundamental gaps in climate science underscored in that report are the foci of the science title of S. 1776. Having worked closely with leading U.S. climate scientists on these issues, I am now convinced that the United States (and, therefore the world) has the potential capability to solve these riddles. However, resources and hard work will be required to do so. The science community has consensus: climate science has a long way to go. Instead of pretending that we have learned everything we need to learn as many advocates on both sides of the climate change issue do for quite different reasons, I advocate aggressive exploration and resolution of these uncertainties.

In the meantime, my bill does stand for the proposition that we needn't wait for that resolution to take immediate, no regrets, steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Additionally (and perhaps, even more importantly), I set out the elements to put into place an inter-branch process by which all relevant information—science, economics, and technology—can be marshaled to guide conscientious, contemporary public policy in a fast-changing world.

Should it turn out that sacrifice by American citizens—even the stark sacrifices such as those portended by Kyoto—are warranted, we must have confidence that all the information is in, integrated, and understood, not only by elected officials, but also by the people we are privileged to serve.

I look forward to getting together soon to explore ways for real progress—consensus action—this year.

Sincerely,

LARRY E. CRAIG,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Under the previous order, the Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for 15 minutes, and that when Senator KENNEDY speaks, that he also be given 15 minutes in morning business.

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

Mr. CRAIG. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mrs. MURRAY. Absolutely.

Mr. CRAIG. The Senator has been very patient. I appreciate that.

MEASURE PLACED ON CALENDAR—S. 2742

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk due for its second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2742) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase disclosure for certain political organizations exempt from tax under section 527 and section 501(c), and for other purposes.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I object to further proceedings on this bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The Senator from Washington.

HANFORD REACH

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have come to the floor today to talk about a challenge the people of Washington State face. It is an environmental challenge, a legal challenge, and a moral challenge. That challenge is to rescue a symbol of the Pacific Northwest.

That challenge is to recover our wild Pacific salmon.

As anyone who lives in Washington State can tell you, the salmon of our region are more than a symbol. They are part of our culture, our heritage, our recreation, and our economy.

Unfortunately, the salmon that were once so abundant in our rivers and along our shores are now in danger. In fact, today several species of salmon are threatened with extinction.

When it comes to saving salmon, solutions are not easy to find.

There are so many different viewpoints to consider. Everyone from recreational and commercial fishermen to Native Americans and conservationists, to State, local, and Federal officials, along with private property owners have a role to play in helping us meet this challenge.

In my time here in the Senate, I have always worked to bring people together, and to find solutions that help us meet this challenge while still keeping our economy strong.

Today, I have come to the floor to share with my colleagues and the American people some progress we have recently made in meeting this challenge.

I am proud to report that just last week, we took a major step forward to save wild salmon. Seven days ago, the President designated a vital salmon spawning ground—known as the Hanford Reach—as a national monument.

I was proud to stand on the banks of the Columbia River, beside the Vice President, when this historic announcement was made. It was a dream come true. For a long time, many of us have dreamed of preserving the Reach. There are few places in the world like it.

For me and my family, as for many families throughout the region, the Columbia and Snake Rivers hold deep personal meaning.

My grandfather settled in the Tri-Cities in 1916. My dad grew up there. He watched his hometown become the home of a secret factory—a factory now known as the Hanford Nuclear Reservation, a factory that would give America the tools to win World War II.

When my dad came back from his military service in the Pacific theater, he was injured, and he had lost a lot of friends in combat. He wasn't the same. And the place he came back to wasn't the same either.

He knew that his hometown—perhaps more than any other—contributed to

winning the war by producing the weapon that ended World War II. And he took a lot of pride in that fact.

In my own life, I have spent a lot of time in the Tri-Cities. Growing up, I remember during my summer vacation getting in our car and driving to the Tri-Cities to see my Grandma—watching the hydros and swimming in the river with my six brothers and sisters.

When I was in college, I spent a great summer working at Sacajawea State Park at the confluence of the Snake and Columbia Rivers. I came to respect the history of the area, and the people who lived in the community.

The first time I floated down the Hanford Reach of the Columbia River, I was with my daughter, Sara. We were so impressed with the beautiful landscape, the fish and the wildlife, and the reminders of the vibrant Native American culture that abounds along the Hanford Reach.

As we floated along, we saw the reactors, and I told her about the role the Tri-Cities played in helping America win World War II and about her grandfather's part in that important piece of history. We were both deeply affected by that day on the river, and it is a memory I cherish.

When I started fighting to protect the Hanford Reach, my dad told me he thought it was great that I was working to give something back to a community that had given so much to our family and to our country. So last Friday, when Vice President GORE announced the designation of the Hanford Reach of the Columbia River as a national monument, the toughest part of that day for me was that I had lost my father a few years ago and he was not there to see it happen.

The national monument designation doesn't just enable us to remember our past, it allows us to capture our future—in large part by saving wild salmon.

The Hanford Reach spans only 51 miles of the Columbia River's 1,200 miles, but it spawns 80% of the wild fall Chinook produced in the entire Columbia Basin.

Thanks to the designation, this vital breeding ground has been protected.

The designation also preserves the unique history of this area.

Generations of Americans will be able to learn about the sacrifices that the people of the Tri-Cities made to help America win World War II, and generations more will be able to learn about the long Native American history along the Columbia River.

In addition, the designation will ensure that families can use the river for recreation for years into the future.

This is the right thing to do. And doing the right thing also means keeping your promises.

The people of the Tri-Cities have been given too many broken promises. I do not intend to be another link in that chain.

The designation is not the end of the process, but the beginning.

As I told the people of the Tri-Cities last week, I will continue to work with local leaders to ensure that their voices are heard. Working together—with an open dialogue—we can reach the best solution.

Over the years, a lot of people helped make the designation possible.

Mr. President, I want the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to forever reflect the tireless work of people like Rick Leaumont, Rich Steele, Bob Wilson, Laura Smith, Mike Lilga, Jim Watts, and Dave Goeke.

I thank the person who worked side-by-side with me in the House as we developed legislative solutions for how to protect the Reach, Congressman NORM DICKS, and also JAY INSLEE, who has worked hard on this issue.

I also thank the members of my advisory committee, the tribes, and so many members of my staff who spent countless hours to save this valuable resource.

I thank Governor Gary Locke for his leadership.

I thank Secretary Babbitt for recognizing the unique value of the Hanford Reach, and Secretary Richardson for his help over the years on this and other issues related to Hanford.

Of course, we owe a debt of thanks to the President and the Vice President.

Over the years, we have asked much of the Columbia River, and it has always given generously. It has given us affordable energy, turned a desert into a farming oasis, and provided a highway for international commerce.

It is amazing how so very few times in our lives we are given the opportunity to truly give something to future generations. That is what we are doing with the designation of the Hanford Reach as a National Monument.

Today, I take a moment to thank a person who deserves a tremendous amount of credit for the progress we have made in the Pacific Northwest.

Time and again the Vice President has demonstrated his commitment to protecting our Nation's natural resources while ensuring that we have the strongest economy in our Nation's history.

He helped us develop habitat conservation plans that allow us to conserve our environment while providing stability to our economy. He made our salmon treaty with Canada a priority for the U.S. Government, and for the past two years he has led the fight to save struggling salmon runs.

To meet the challenges that we will undoubtedly face in the coming years, we will need a strong partnership at every level—from the folks on the ground to local, State, and Federal officials. There is no person—no one—who is better qualified to provide the leadership to bring us together and to help us solve our toughest problems than AL GORE. The people of Washington State are grateful for his leadership and appreciate the gift that this designation is to future generations.

Before I close, I believe it is important to address one final point on this