

pay the massive cost from powerplant emissions, both environmental and health related.

For instance, recent studies have shown that emissions from coal-fired plants lead to a massive 12-percent increase in lung cancer. Obviously, if you are using wind, you do not have any ramifications.

The Senator from Alaska, who just came back to the Chamber, points to a large "footprint" from wind turbines. Let me show you this picture, which shows how wind turbines are indeed "multiple use" in the best sense, with farmers able to raise crops and graze livestock beneath them.

The wind energy alone from a 20-percent renewable standard will provide \$1.2 billion in new income for farmers, ranchers, and rural landowners. That is \$1.2 billion in income to our farmers.

My amendment of a 20-percent standard by 2020 is achievable, good for the economy, good for consumers, and good for the environment.

I urge all Members to please support my amendment. We have to make progress. It has been some 30 years that we have been working on renewables. The successes are growing, and they are spreading throughout world. But we are not maximizing it. In this Nation, we are not taking anywhere near the advantage we should in renewables.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for my amendment. Hopefully, this will lead to a much more prosperous future for not only the energy users but for those who produce the energy, such as those on our farms.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. How much time is remaining prior to the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 4 minutes 12 seconds under the control of Senator CRAIG.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

My colleague was referring to millions rather than billions. I think he used the term "billions of dollars saved." I think on the chart it shows "millions." But nevertheless, I—

Mr. JEFFORDS. The total was \$1.2 billion.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. So \$1.2 billion. The chart said \$125 million.

Mr. JEFFORDS. That was only for that farm.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Just that farm?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Yes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Senator.

I want to make a point on renewables because renewables certainly have a value. But this isn't the first time we have come to find the contribution of renewables.

We have expended \$6.4 billion on renewables in the past 5 years. We are going to continue to do that at a relatively high rate.

We have had \$1.5 billion for R&D, \$500 million for solar, \$330 million for biomass, \$150 million for wind; and \$100 million for hydrogen; almost \$5 billion

in tax benefits, and \$2.6 billion in reduced excise taxes for alcohol fuels.

I support renewables, as does virtually every Member of this body. But the question in my mind, of increasing to the point that the Senator has suggested—an aggressive 10 percent to 20 percent—will cost an extraordinary amount of money when you consider that nonhydro renewables make up less than 4 percent of our total energy needs and less than 2 percent of our electricity consumption.

So we need a realistic national energy strategy that includes renewables as part of a balanced energy portfolio. But let's not fool the public into thinking that renewable energy can replace coal, oil, natural gas, and nuclear anytime soon.

Even if we adopt an aggressive 10- to 20-percent RPS, where will the other 80 to 90 percent of our electric needs come from? Fossil and nuclear, clearly.

Even with 3 to 5 percent renewable fuels, the other 95 to 97 percent would still come from oil. Let's move it. Let's recognize the world moves on oil.

As a consequence, Mr. President, I encourage Members to reject the proposed doubling of renewables simply because the cost-benefit ratio is so far out of line with what is technically achievable.

I think the National Research Council that reviewed the Department of Energy's renewable energy programs would substantiate that substantial improvements in performance and reductions in the costs of renewable energy technologies certainly have been made. But deployment goals for renewable technologies are based on unreasonable expectations and on unrealistic promises, and to mandate this would put an extraordinary cost on the consumer. And I assure you, that is where the costs would have to be passed.

So I encourage Members to reject the proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the Jeffords amendment No. 3017. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 70, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 50 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Baucus
Boxer
Cantwell
Chafee
Clinton
Collins
Corzine
Daschle
Dodd
Durbin

Feingold
Feinstein
Fitzgerald
Harkin
Jeffords
Kennedy
Kerry
Leahy
Lieberman
Mikulski

Murray
Reed
Reid
Sarbanes
Schumer
Snowe
Specter
Wellstone
Wyden

NAYS—70

Akaka
Allard
Allen
Bayh
Bennett
Biden
Bingaman
Bond
Breaux
Brownback
Bunning
Burns
Byrd
Campbell
Carnahan
Carper
Cleland
Cochran
Conrad
Craig
Crapo
Dayton
DeWine
Domenici

Dorgan
Edwards
Ensign
Enzi
Frist
Graham
Gramm
Grassley
Gregg
Hagel
Hatch
Helms
Hollings
Hutchinson
Hutchison
Inhofe
Inouye
Johnson
Kohl
Kyl
Landrieu
Levin
Lincoln
Lott

Lugar
McCain
McConnell
Miller
Murkowski
Nelson (FL)
Nelson (NE)
Nickles
Roberts
Rockefeller
Santorum
Sessions
Shelby
Smith (NH)
Smith (OR)
Stabenow
Stevens
Thomas
Thompson
Thurmond
Voinovich
Warner

NOT VOTING—1

Torricelli

The amendment (No. 3017) was rejected.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CRAIG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELLSTONE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, there will be no more votes tonight.

In consultation with the Republican leader and the managers of the bill, and Senator REID, I do not believe we are in a position to come to any further conclusions on amendments tonight. So I do not expect there will be any additional rollcalls.

There will be a rollcall vote on one of the two judicial nominations pending on the calendar tomorrow morning at 9:15. Then there will be an additional vote on the second judicial nomination on Monday at 6 o'clock. So Senators should be made aware that tomorrow morning we will have a vote on a judicial nomination. It appears that may be the only vote we will have scheduled tomorrow, unfortunately. Then, on Monday, we will have a second vote which may or may not be the only vote. We are not sure at this time.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT
AGREEMENT—H.R. 2356

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we have been working with colleagues on both sides of the aisle with regard to the campaign finance reform bill. I am now in a position to announce that we are able to reach a unanimous consent agreement on the motion to proceed to the campaign finance reform bill.

So I ask unanimous consent that, at 3 p.m., Monday, March 18, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 318, H.R. 2356, the campaign finance reform legislation, and that the cloture vote on the motion to proceed be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we will continue to take this matter one step at a time. We are encouraging Senators to express themselves on campaign finance reform tomorrow, or on energy tomorrow. My hope is that the Senator from Arizona, Mr. KYL, and other Senators who wish to be heard on their amendments, will offer them tomorrow, will debate them tomorrow, will make sure that we use the day we have available to us tomorrow to move the legislative process along. That is also true on Monday. We will come in at 3. We encourage Senators to offer amendments on the campaign finance reform bill on Monday. We will have further discussions, of course, with our colleagues with regard to the campaign finance reform bill. I will say, if there are amendments to be offered, we will have debate and further consideration of those amendments on Monday and Tuesday.

It would be my expectation to file cloture on the bill for a cloture vote on Wednesday, as we currently expect it. That would then require the vote, as I have said on many occasions, no later than Friday, which would accommodate our schedule for the balance of next week.

I have said, and will repeat, if there is a way we can resolve whatever other outstanding procedural questions between now and Monday, or between now and Wednesday, I am certainly more than ready to do so. But I appreciate at least this progress. We will have more to say beginning Monday.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. DASCHLE. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Assuming, Mr. President, the schedule of campaign finance being resolved Wednesday, is it the majority leader's intention, then, to go back to energy?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. My hope is we can finish this bill sometime soon. It would be my desire to continue to work on it until we do so, with the exception, of course, of the campaign finance reform bill.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. And, Mr. President, recognizing that may be extended, I gather the agreement is still under consideration, but if it is prolonged, do you intend to proceed and conclude campaign finance and then ultimately go back to energy?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair. I thank the leader.

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

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

NATIONAL LABORATORIES PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001—Continued

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, let me inquire about the parliamentary situation. Is the energy bill still pending, and is there an amendment pending at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The energy bill is pending, and the Bingham plan to the energy bill is pending.

NOMINATION OF CHARLES PICKERING

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, notwithstanding that, and after a discussion with Senator DASCHLE, I will take leader time to make some remarks about the vote just taken in the Judiciary Committee. I yield myself leader time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, this is my 14th year in the Senate. There have been a lot of high moments and low moments in that tenure. I certainly worked very hard, and in my position as majority leader, I learned a lot of lessons. As you go along, sometimes you do things that Senators agree with, and sometimes they do not—on both sides of the aisle. I understand that.

But I must say that I feel about as bad about the Senate right now as I have in the years that I have been watching the Senate and that I have been in the Senate. I think the Senate Judiciary Committee just participated in a miscarriage of justice. I am very much concerned about the effect it is going to have on the Senate, and on our relationship on both sides of the aisle.

The Senate Judiciary Committee just voted against the nomination of Judge Charles Pickering from Mississippi to move from the Southern District Court of Mississippi to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. They voted against, as I understand, reporting out his nomination unfavorably, and they voted against reporting out his nomination without recommendation. That was not exactly the sequence, or exactly the motion. The fact is they have voted against the nomination of this very fine man.

I think for the Judiciary Committee to take the action as they did is very unfortunate and very unfair to a man I have known directly and personally for about 40 years.

I know him as an individual. I know his family. I have been in his home. I have been to football games with him. I have been to campground rallies with him, and I know him very well. He certainly is qualified and certainly deserves better treatment than he has received in this process. I think this is a continuation of the politics of personal destruction. I think his character has been smeared. I think a lot of incorrect information and misleading information was put out about the judge. That was wrong.

Now a number of Senators are saying: Well, yes, we realize that information is not right but voted against him anyway. As a matter of fact, this judge has been very courageous and has been a moderating force and a leader in trying to bring about reconciliation and bringing people together—not drive them apart, particularly in the area of race relations in our State.

I think one thing that strikes me so hard and has hurt me about this is because, once again, I believe this is a slap at Mississippi, my State. I think that some people thought: Oh, well. Good. This is a Federal district judge. He is a known conservative. He is a known Republican. He was selected on the recommendation of TRENT LOTT and THAD COCHRAN by President George W. Bush, and he is from Mississippi. This is one we can nail. He surely must have a bad record over his lifetime, being from that State, on race relations.

Now, people and members of the media that had earlier been critical of him said: No, no, no. We didn't mean that. We never really said that. We take it back. Maybe he has been OK in this area, but now our complaint is something about his demeanor on the bench that we don't like.

But I think, once again, there are people trying to use the ghosts of the past to keep us from rising up and looking toward the future together in a positive way.

When you have African Americans, women, and just about every Democrat in the State saying this is a good man and he ought to be confirmed, you ought to begin to ask yourself something. In fact, somebody said: Well, the national NAACP said he shouldn't be confirmed. However, the local people within the NAACP who know him best say he should be confirmed. When asked about that, and about the response of the people who know him best, one of the critic's responses was: well, they were duped. You don't dupe a lot of people when you live in Laurel, MS, on issues such as race relations. Everybody knows everybody. Everybody knows where you were in 1967, where you were in 1980, and where you have been in the 1990s.

So I take it personally. I am hurt by the attacks on this fine man. He does