

If this becomes law, we will have wind farms in New Mexico. Frankly, the power produced from those wind farms, in my view, will likely be cheaper than the power produced from some of these gas generating plants if the price of gas goes up where I think it is likely to go over the next 10 to 15 years.

All of these estimates about how much this is going to cost, and that it is going to cost these enormous amounts, all assume a very low price for gas. If you think the price of gas is going to stay below \$3 per MCF, then you have no problem with using natural gas from now on.

I am concerned, though, when the price of natural gas goes to \$5, goes to \$6, goes to \$8, where it was before. In those circumstances, people are going to be very glad they have some alternative sources for energy so they can moderate the increase they will see in their utility bills. That is what we are trying to do.

There are great environmental benefits from using renewable energy sources. We all know that. Also, I think it is just smart. We are having a lot of debates about Enron and pensions. We had a hearing this morning in the Health and Education Committee. Everybody said: Everyone knows you ought to diversify your investments, you ought to diversify your portfolio, that you should not put all your eggs in one basket. That is common sense when you are making investments. It is also common sense when you are looking for a portfolio of energy sources. It is common sense to say: Let us diversify so we are not too dependent upon any one source of power.

That is exactly what we are trying to do with this amendment. I think my underlying amendment is a good one. The Kyl amendment just takes the guts out of it. The Kyl amendment is very simple. I cited this earlier in my comments. This is classic. It says:

Each electric utility shall offer to retail consumers electricity produced from renewable sources, to the extent it is available.

I favor that. That is what they are doing today. They are offering it to the extent it is available. The Kyl amendment is just a prescription for the status quo. What we are saying is, let's make it available, and let's make it available in large quantities. There are a lot of Americans who would like to buy more power from renewable sources. Let's make it available. That is what our renewable portfolio standard tries to do. The Kyl amendment would undo that.

For that reason, I oppose it strongly and urge my colleagues to oppose it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, until we can get a better read from the leadership as to whether they have additional business to transact, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the Kyl amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be allowed to speak as in morning business.

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

The Senator from Oregon.

(The remarks of Mr. WYDEN pertaining to the introduction of S. 2037 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I know the hour is late, but I want to take just a couple of additional minutes to talk about the campaign finance legislation that passed today. I very much appreciate the indulgence of the Presiding Officer. I just have a few minutes I want to use to discuss the landmark bill that passed today.

First, as so many colleagues, I salute Senators McCain and Feingold. They are a model of what it takes to get a tough proposal through the Congress. They simply would not take no, literally. From the time I came to the Senate, both of them double-teamed me and made it clear they were going to stay at it until I had come around to the value of supporting their legislation. In fact, I went on record in support of the legislation as soon as I came to the Senate, and I wanted to talk to them about some additional ways to strengthen the bill.

One of those additional proposals has become a part of the legislation that passed the Senate today. I want to touch on it briefly.

I offered this proposal with our friend and colleague, Senator Susan Collins of Maine. It is called the stand-by-your-ad requirement. It is a significant step forward in promoting accountability in the political process. It will provide a meaningful step to slow the corrosion of the political process and essentially the corrosion that springs from a lack of Federal responsibility when Federal candidates take to the airwaves to win elections but do not want to be held accountable.

The stand-by-your-ad proposal that was included in the legislation we voted on today is straightforward. It says simply that to qualify for the special advertising discount given to candidates now for Federal office, those candidates have to personally stand by

any mention of an opponent in a radio or television ad by placing a photo on the screen and stating he or she personally approved the broadcast or personally identify themselves in a radio ad and reading a statement saying they have approved the ad.

First amendment rights are protected under this proposal. Candidates can say anything they please. They just have to personally stand by their remarks to get the discount. They can say anything they want, however far-fetched and however extreme. As long as it is allowed under Federal law, they can still say it. To get the discount, if they are going to attack their opponent—of course, that is almost invariably what happens when you mention an opponent in an ad—they have to stand by that ad and personally be held accountable.

If a candidate chooses not to stand by a reference to an opponent, they will buy their ad time at a rate comparable to that charged a commercial user at the station.

Take Nebraska, Oregon, or any part of the country. What happens now, in effect, is the local car dealer or restaurant or other private sector firm has to pay more for various ads because there are subsidies that are given for political campaigns. We are saying that to get those subsidies, to get those discounts, you have to stand by your ad. A candidate who is going to say something positive or negative about an opponent has to own up to it, not just edit together a bunch of shadowy pictures to cover up the fact he or she is the one making the statement.

What this means is that if you want to get the discount with respect to your campaign, you are not going to be able to hide anymore behind those grainy pictures and bloodcurdling music. You are not going to be able to paint your opponent as somebody who looks like they just came out of prison and has not had a chance to get cleaned up and has had every possible dastardly act impugned to them. You are not going to be able to do that any longer. You are going to have to own up to what you say and not just run these grainy pictures and frighten kids and families with bloodcurdling music in an effort to score points at your opponent's expense.

As the Chair knows, we are all campaign veterans in this body and know a little bit about how in a campaign the sucker punches happen. They are not made on the stump while the candidate stands there with the band and bunting all around. They are made on TV; they are made on radio when the announcer's voice comes on in the most sinister way and shadowy pictures appear saying a vote for your opponent is pretty much a vote to end Western civilization. That is what happens in a campaign. You have again and again portrayed your opponent not as somebody with whom you disagree on the issues but someone who is going to be a threat to the American way of life, and

the accusing candidate's face and voice are nowhere to be found, and it is easy for folks to forget—conveniently to forget—who is doing the attacking.

I bring a special awareness to this issue because in the Senate special election with Senator SMITH, with whom I work on a great many issues and publish a bipartisan agenda at the start of each Congress, meeting me more than halfway as a colleague and friend in the Senate, he and I were in a campaign that was completely and totally out of hand, and many Oregonians simply did not want to vote. They got to the point where they said: The stench in this debate on both sides is so great, we are turned off the political process altogether.

I made the judgment in that race that I was going to take all the ads off the air about Senator SMITH. I said: This is not what I went into public service for—to attack somebody else. The reason I got involved with the Gray Panthers—and I was codirector of the senior citizens group for 7 years before I was elected to the House—is because I was interested in ideas, the best ideas. I did not care if they were Democratic or Republican ideas. Oregon on a bipartisan basis came up with breakthroughs in home health care and a variety of other ways to serve senior citizens.

I looked at what was happening in the Senate special election and said: This is completely contrary to everything I have stood for since my days with the Gray Panthers and contrary to all the reasons for which I went into public service. I went into public service to offer ideas and creative suggestions for making my State and my country a better place, and all of a sudden in that Senate special election, I was not recognizing what was being said in my name because all of it was just the opposite of positive. It was just attack, attack, attack.

My colleague, Senator SMITH, to his credit, shares my view that our campaigns got completely out of hand.

For about 3 weeks, the people of Oregon had balance in their hand. I made no reference to Senator SMITH at all. I took all of the ads off the air that mentioned his name and talked only about the kinds of initiatives I wanted to pursue, issues we talked about in the Senate today such as the bipartisan proposal Senator SNOWE and I have on prescription drugs.

I admit I come to this question of attack ads colored by a truly searing experience I had in 1996 and it is why Senator COLLINS and I felt so strongly about trying to make this change.

I think owning up to statements about what a candidate says about their opponent is going to make a difference. I think it is going to cause a candidate to think twice before they go forward with these negative blitzes on their opponents. I am going to be frank. That is what I wanted to see American politics be all about after 1996. That is why I have tried to keep it

positive and to focus on areas where in the public policy arena people can be helped, people can be empowered, and they can make choices that make a difference for their lives.

Certainly the debate on campaign finance reform has been contentious, but I think we can all agree that reasonable ideas can help clean up this process, reasonable ideas can help drain the swamp that has become the way political campaigns are financed and run in much of this country.

I believe the stand-by-your-ad proposal, which holds candidates accountable, and which I was honored to have a chance to work with Senator COLLINS of Maine, is going to help clean up campaigns. It is going to help make candidates more accountable and make the politics and political discourse in this country more positive and more open.

I yield the floor.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be excused from presence in the Senate starting at 5:30 tomorrow evening until the Senate reconvenes after the Easter recess.

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

46TH ANNIVERSARY OF TUNISIA INDEPENDENCE

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the country of Tunisia, which is celebrating the 46th anniversary of its independence from France.

I appreciate Tunisia's economic achievements. Tunisia's Gross Domestic Product has increased an average of 5.5 percent in the past 4 years, and inflation is slowing. The government has worked to increase privatization, and its prudent approach toward debt is commendable. The United States in 2000 exported approximately \$350 million in goods to Tunisia, and I believe our diplomatic ties will strengthen as our trading activities increase. Stability in the Middle East is of paramount importance to both our countries, and I thank Tunisia for its past efforts to work toward peace.

Tunisia's policies toward women's rights and non-Muslims' religious freedoms are exemplary in the Arab world, and I hope the nation's leaders will continue to work toward promoting greater political freedom and respect for human rights throughout the region.

More than 200 years ago, the United States and Tunisia signed a Treaty of Peace and Friendship, and I look forward to many more years of cooperation between our nations.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the forty-sixth anniversary of Tunisian Independence from France.

The Republic of Tunisia is a great ally of the United States. Since her independence, Tunisia has become a

model for economic development. The Tunisian economy has been opened up to the outside world, and in 1995, Tunisia became the first country south of the Mediterranean to sign a free-trade agreement with the European Union.

Tunisian President Ben Ali has been instrumental in implementing a stable and effective constitutional government, protecting democracy and increasing political participation by all citizens. The Republic of Tunisia also has a commendable record on human rights, protecting all citizens. In addition, Tunisia has actively contributed to the search for a lasting peace in the Middle East, offering unwavering support to the Middle East peace process.

While Tunisia has become a great contributor to the world both economically and culturally, as Americans, we must also remember the tremendous role Tunisia played during World War II as part of the Allied Force and the support Tunisia offered the United States during the Cold War. For this, we will always be grateful.

The United States was the first country to recognize Tunisia's independence in 1956, and it is only fitting that we take the time to reflect on Tunisia's contributions to the world. I congratulate the Republic of Tunisia and its citizens, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE INTER-STATE TRANSPORTATION AND LOCAL AUTHORITY ACT OF 2002

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, yesterday I joined as an original cosponsor of legislation introduced by my Midwestern colleague, the Senator from Ohio, Mr. VOINOVICH. This legislation is similar to legislation introduced by the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Indiana, Mr. BAYH, in the previous Congress. I am pleased to be working with the Senator from Ohio on this very important issue. I know that he, as a former Governor, is intimately aware of the concerns that the growing trash trade poses for the States that we represent.

We in the Midwest, especially those of us fortunate enough to be from the Great Lakes States, enjoy a very high quality of life, beautiful scenery, small, neighborly towns, and spectacular natural resources. We hold it as a particular point of pride that we, in many instances, have the luxury of avoiding many environmental problems, and we have structured our State and local governments in Wisconsin to try to be sure that we continue to avoid them. We in Wisconsin, however, are unable to protect our communities, which have done a good regulatory job, from having to deal with the solid waste mess created by our neighboring communities in other States. Instead, my State has been forced to accept other States' municipal solid waste in ever increasing amounts.

We need to enact legislation to give back to States the power to be able to