AL GORE and the now President-elect George W. Bush.

I think as Americans we were all honored by their statements last evening: A clear statement of vision and reconciliation on the part of the Vice President and, I have to imagine, the most difficult speech that gentleman has ever delivered in his life; at the same time, a speech from President-elect George W. Bush which I think demonstrated the full weight of understanding he has about his role as the President of our country—that he is President for all of the people. And that burden humbles him a great deal. We all look forward to working with him in the coming months and years as we continue to work in behalf of our country.

Certainly the prayer delivered by our Chaplain this morning clearly speaks to the concerns we have had and the wounds that must be bound and, of course, the actions that will be taken in behalf of leading this country.

I think all of us look forward to the opportunity of working with President George Bush in the coming days.

—

CONGRESSMAN JULIAN C. DIXON

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, the House is not in session because of the funeral of Congressman Julian Dixon.

Many here in the Senate did not know the Congressman, but I did. I had the great opportunity to serve with him in the most difficult of circumstances. We served on the Ethics Committee together during the period in which Jim Wright was examined for what was believed to be, and what was later found to be, unethical activities for which he finally resigned.

Julian Dixon was a fine American. Oh, yes, he was a partisan. But when it came to the responsibility of leadership, there was no question that his chairmanship of the Ethics Committee during that time was fair, equitable, and responsible. I must tell you that in working with him during those long hours and difficult times, I grew to respect him a great deal. I must say that we have lost a great public servant in the death of Congressman Julian Dixon. I will miss him. I think all of us will.

—

JULIAN DIXON

Mr. REID. Mr. President, before coming to the Senate, I was a member of the California congressional delegation. Even though I am from the State of Nevada, they allowed me to be part of their deliberations and, in fact, when I came here, I was secretary-treasurer of the California congressional delegation. As a result of that association, I got to know Julian Dixon very well. He was a fine man. He came to Nevada for me on a number of occasions. He was an outspoken advocate of doing good things for the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia lost a very powerful voice when Julian Dixon's heart stopped beating.

He also, as I indicated in my conversation with the Presiding Officer today, served very valiantly as a member of the Ethics Committee in the House of Representatives. In fact, the Presiding Officer served as a Member with him. In short, Julian Dixon, who was a great advocate for political causes throughout his entire political career, was a person who believed in the Congress. He believed in our form of government. His loss is a loss to our Nation. I extend my condolences to his entire family, recognizing that we lost a great patriot in Julian Dixon.

—

LESSONS FROM THE HAGUE

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, recently, I attended the Sixth Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP–6) at The Hague, in the Netherlands. I went to observe Undersecretary of State Frank Loy and the rest of the U.S. negotiating team confront the complex issues associated with the requirements of the 1997 Kyoto Protocol to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The experience brought into clearer focus for me some disturbing themes that appear to be behind the intense international pressure brought to bear on the United States to reach agreement on some profound economic, social, and environmental issues.

At the outset, let me make clear that I did not arrive at The Hague without first studying the climate issue. For several years now, I have closely followed the progress of the climate change debate.

I have sought the input of nationally recognized scientists credentialed in the disciplines of atmospheric, ocean, and computer modeling sciences. I have reviewed scientific reports, most notably the document entitled Research Pathways for the Next Decade, prepared by scientists affiliated with the National Academy of Sciences Board on Atmospheric Sciences and Climate.

In addition, I have traveled to institutions such as the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute in Massachusetts and met with ocean scientists who are very involved in climate research.

All of these scientists have, for many years, studied and disagreed on how much our planet is warming, and whether it was driven by natural causes or by carbon dioxide emissions from industry, and other human activities.

Scientists from around the world have had legitimate disagreements on how drastic a problem global warming is likely to be in this century and beyond. The debate has been further complicated by politically motivated ''junk science'' predictions of ''imminent'' environmental catastrophes capitalizing on weather events that most scientists agree are not linked to current temperature increases.

The emotional intensity of this debate cautioned many policymakers not to take sides early. However, as Republican Policy Committee Chairman, I felt compelled to address the many valid concerns expressed about this issue in a balanced way.

This led me to introduce with my colleagues, Senators MURKOWSKI, HAGEL, and others, over a year ago, comprehensive legislation that I believed, and still believe, provides the framework for some responsible and immediate consensus action on this issue.

A few days before leaving for The Hague, I met with the Director of the National Research Council's Board on Atmospheric Sciences and Climate, and other scientists on the Board to discuss the status of the scientific research on climate change. Prior to that date, the NRC was reluctant to agree with earlier summary scientific assessments of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) that humans were contributing to increasing temperatures recorded around the globe—the so-called ''anthropogenic effect.''

Indeed, at a Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee hearing held just last Spring, Dr. Joe Friday, testifying on behalf of the NRC stated that the ''jury is still out'' on why global temperatures are rising. The NRC was clearly unable at that time to state on the record that it had detected clear evidence of an anthropogenic fingerprint on the warming trends of earth's climate.

At our meeting a few weeks ago, the NRC scientists were less passionate in their refusal to acknowledge the ''anthropogenic effect.'' I took from our discussion that day that there was increasing evidence that land-use practices and human emissions of greenhouse gases were having some contributing effect to the increased land surface temperatures monitored around the globe.

To be sure, the scientists did not suggest or imply that temperatures would reach dangerously high levels during the next 50 to 100 years. Indeed, the scientists offered their opinion that the rise in temperature would more likely be closer to 1.5 degrees rather than the 5 to 10 degree high range predicted for later this century by the IPCC.

Moreover, the NRC scientists underscored the uncertain nature of the computer modeling results on which most, if not all, predictions depend. They cautioned against fully embracing any set of predictions because of the uncertain nature of input data and the ability of computers to fairly and adequately handle the many variables that are included in computer programs.

They further noted the need for continued technological advancement in super computer capability.

What was clear to me after that meeting was that the issue of human contributions to increasing temperatures was reaching some consensus within the National Academy of Sciences.

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 greenhouse 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 inexpensive.

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 decision 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