Clinton Presidential Records
Digital Records Marker

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

This marker identifies the place of a tabbed divider. Given our digitization capabilities, we are sometimes unable to adequately scan such dividers. The title from the original document is indicated below.

Divider Title: **Byrd Resolution**

EXPRESSING SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING U.N. FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE (Senate - July 25, 1997)

S. Res. 98

Whereas the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (in this **resolution** referred to as the `Convention'), adopted in May 1992, entered into force in 1994 and is not yet fully implemented;

Whereas the Convention, intended to address climate change on a global basis, identifies the former Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe and the Organization For Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), including the United States, as `Annex I Parties', and the remaining 129 countries, including China, Mexico, India, Brazil, and South Korea, as `Developing Country Parties';

Whereas in April 1995, the Convention's `Conference of the Parties' adopted the so-called `Berlin Mandate';

Whereas the `Berlin Mandate' calls for the adoption, as soon as December 1997, in Kyoto, Japan, of a protocol or another legal instrument that strengthens commitments to limit greenhouse gas emissions by Annex I Parties for the post-2000 period and establishes a negotiation process called the `Ad Hoc Group on the Berlin Mandate';

Whereas the `Berlin Mandate' specifically exempts all Developing Country Parties from any new commitments in such negotiation process for the post-2000 period;

Whereas although the Convention, approved by the United States Senate, called on all signatory parties to adopt policies and programs aimed at limiting their greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, in July 1996 the UnderSecretary of State for Global Affairs called for the first time for `legally binding' emission limitation targets and timetables for Annex I Parties, a position reiterated by the Secretary of State in testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on January 8, 1997;

Whereas greenhouse gas emissions of Developing Country Parties are rapidly increasing and are expected to surpass emissions of the United States and other OECD countries as early as 2015;

Whereas the Department of State has declared that it is critical for the Parties to the Convention to include Developing Country Parties in the next steps for global action and, therefore, has proposed that consideration of additional steps to include limitations on Developing Country Parties' greenhouse gas emissions would not begin until after a protocol or other legal instrument is adopted in Kyoto, Japan in December 1997;

Whereas the exemption for Developing Country Parties is inconsistent with the need for global action on climate change and is environmentally flawed;

Whereas the Senate strongly believes that the proposals under negotiation, because of the disparity of treatment between Annex I Parties and Developing Countries and the level of required emission reductions, could result in serious harm to the United States economy, including significant job loss, trade disadvantages, increased energy and consumer costs, or any combination thereof; and

Whereas it is desirable that a bipartisan group of Senators be appointed by the Majority and Minority Leaders

of the Senate for the purpose of monitoring the status of negotiations on Global Climate Change and reporting periodically to the Senate on those negotiations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that--

(1) the United States should not be a signatory to any protocol to, or other agreement regarding, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change of 1992, at negotiations in Kyoto in December 1997, or thereafter, which would--

(A) mandate new commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions for the Annex I Parties, unless the protocol or other agreement also mandates new specific scheduled commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions for Developing Country Parties within the same compliance period, or

(B) would result in serious harm to the economy of the United States; and

(2) any such protocol or other agreement which would require the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification should be accompanied by a detailed explanation of any legislation or regulatory actions that may be required to implement the protocol or other agreement and should also be accompanied by an analysis of the detailed financial costs and other impacts on the economy of the United States which would be incurred by the implementation of the protocol or other agreement.

THIS SEARCH	THIS DOCUMENT	THIS CR ISSUE	GO TO
Next Hit	Forward	Next Document	New Search
Prev Hit	Back	Prev Document	HomePage
Hit List	Best Sections	Daily Digest	Help
	Doc Contents	[Part] Contents	CR Issues by Date

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JULY 25, 1997 No. 107

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, Sovereign of our land and source of courage, we thank You that You know our needs before we ask for Your help, but have ordained that in the asking we would find release from the anxiety of carrying the burdens of leadership on our own shoulders. Help us to remember that You are the instigator of prayer. It begins with You, moves into our hearts, gives us the clarity of knowing how to pray, and then returns to You in petitions You have refined and guided us to ask. We are astonished that You have chosen to do Your work through us and use prayer to reorient our minds around Your guidance for the issues we will face today. We say with the psalmist, "You are my rock and my fortress; therefore, for Your name's sake, lead me and guide me."—Psalm 31:3.

Suddenly, we see prayer in a whole new perspective. It's the method by which You brief us on Your plans and bless us with Your power. May this whole day be filled with magnificent moments of turning to You so that Your purposes, Your glory and honor in America, may be done through us. Give us vision to be dynamic leaders. In the all-powerful name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able acting majority leader is recognized.

Mr. HAGEL. Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEDULE

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, for the information of all Members, this morning, the Senate will begin consideration of Senate Resolution 98, the global warming resolution. Under the consent agreement, there will be 2 hours for debate on that resolution, with two amendments in order. Senators can, therefore, expect a rollcall vote at approximately 11:30 a.m. It is also possible that following the disposition of Senate Resolution 98, there will be a cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 39, the tuna-dolphin bill. If an agreement is reached on that measure, that cloture vote may be vitiated. All Senators will be notified if that vote remains necessary.

I thank Members for their attention.

MEASURE PLACED ON CALENDAR—S. 1065

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The clerk will read the bill for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1065) to amend the Ethics in Government Act with respect to appointment of an independent counsel.

Mr. HAGEL. I object to further proceedings on this matter at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING U.N. FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will now report the resolution.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 98) expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the conditions for the United States becoming a signatory to any international agreement on greenhouse gas emissions under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HAGEL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, the Framers of the Constitution gave the executive branch of our Government authority to negotiate treaties. But they also intended for the Senate's voice to carry weight in negotiations. This morning, the Senate is fulfilling its constitutional responsibility to give its advice to treaty negotiations.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, if my colleague will permit.

Mr. HAGEL. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. I want to inquire, are we now on the divided time, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 hours equally divided on the resolution.

Mr. KERRY. I understand that, and time for the proponents will be managed by the Senator from Nebraska, Senator HAGEL?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KERRY. So we must yield time at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. HAGEL. I yield myself whatever time is necessary, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, the pending resolution, Senate Resolution 98, with its 65 cosponsors, is intended to change the course of negotiations on the new global climate treaty now under discussion.

The need for this treaty is questionable, but the harm that it would cause is certain. Two articles in this Monday's Wall Street Journal, written by

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

Jack Kemp and Dr. Fred Singer, are excellent summaries against the direction the administration is taking in negotiating this treaty. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 25, 1997]

A TREATY BUILT ON HOT AIR . . .

(By Jack Kemp)

—In December, representatives of 150 nations will gather in Kyoto, Japan, to sign a successor treaty to the United Nations' Framework Convention on Climate Change. Today, in anticipation of this momentous event, the Senate is scheduled to debate the Byrd-Hagel resolution, a non-binding measure sponsored by 65 senators that will put that body on record against any treaty that would cause serious economic harm to the U.S. For more than a year the Clinton administration has been promising to provide its economic model of the treaty's effects, but last week it announced that it will not provide any formal estimate—a signal that the treaty won't meet the Byrd-Hagel criteria.

NO RELIABLE CONCLUSIONS

Everyone agrees that we need to keep our planet clean. Healthy plants and animals are valuable, but at the same time the U.S. has a solemn obligation to defend the rights of the people who inhabit our planet. It seems that the officials representing the U.S. in the treaty negotiations have lost sight of that duty.

The international negotiations focus on global warming, the theory that greenhouse gases in the Earth's atmosphere are steadily and dangerously warming the planet. Some of our leaders, most notably Vice President Al Gore, have bought into the theory even though scientists have reached no reliable conclusions about global warming (see story below). Yet the 150 nations involved in these talks are rapidly moving toward signing a treaty that would wreak havoc on the U.S. economy and, ironically, on our environment. U.S. negotiators appear to be asking American workers and families to foot the bill for massive reductions in greenhouse gases.

This treaty would require a drastic and sudden cut in energy use that would be legally binding only on developed nations, not on major international trade competitors—including three of the 10 biggest carbon-dioxide producers, India, South Korea, and China. By excluding developing nations, not only will we be missing an opportunity to make further environmental gains, but we'll also be working against the very purpose of the treaty.

Studies show that the high-growth developing nations excluded from the proposed treaty's requirements are more likely to increase their greenhouse-gas emissions in order to pick up the demand left unmet by developed nations, where production would be restricted. The AFL–CIO's Executive Council has declared that an agreement that fails to bind developing nations to the same commitments made by the U.S. cannot possibly work.

The treaty's impact on America's workers and economy, meanwhile, could be severe. First, U.S. industry would face increased production costs for virtually all goods. The net cost just to stabilize U.S. emissions at 1990 levels could reach hundreds of billions of dollars annually, and many nations are pushing to reduce emissions below 1990 levels, at an even more oppressive cost. The resulting higher prices would make American products less competitive on the world market and less affordable at home.

Second, the treaty would send high-paying jobs in mining, manufacturing, transport and other important sectors abroad. Charles River Associates, an econometric modeling firm, has estimated that the administration's plans would increase U.S. unemployment by 0.25% and reduce the gross domestic product by 3.3%. The likely result: 250,000 American jobs lost.

Third, the treaty would saddle Americans with higher energy bills as we are forced to tax energy use. Some have estimated that such a "carbon tax" could increase the cost of gasoline by as much as 60 cents a gallon, and of home heating oil by 50%. What's more, as the AFL–CIO has recognized: "These taxes are highly regressive and will be most harmful to citizens who live on fixed incomes and work at poverty-level wages."

This burden of drastically increased heating, cooling and transportation costs could hardly come at a worse time for lower-income families. The working poor, and people just getting off welfare and beginning to pay their own way, are already challenged to make ends meet in today's economy. But our diplomatic negotiators have spared little attention for the potentially devastating consequences that their proposals would have for millions of lower-income Americans.

FAR PAST TIME

It is time for the American public to be told exactly what their government is proposing to give away in the global climate change treaty. It is far past time for the Clinton administration to give Congress a detailed economic analysis of the mandatory cutbacks in energy usage that our negotiators are offering on the altar of environmentalist politics. Until the public and the Congress are given the facts, the talk at the global conferences on greenhouse gas emissions will remain as little more than hot air.

. . . NOT SCIENTIFIC CONSENSUS

(By S. Fred Singer)

Yesterday, in opening a White House conference on global warming, President Clinton announced, "The overwhelming balance of evidence and scientific opinion is that it is no longer a theory but now a fact that global warming is real." In support of this contention, the president and other politicians have been busy citing the "2,500 scientists" who supposedly endorse the U.N.'s 1996 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report, and thus a forecast of catastrophic global warming.

Actual climate observations, however, show that global warming is mostly a phantom problem. Perhaps that's why Mr. Clinton and Vice President Al Gore harp so much on a "scientific consensus"—which sounds so impressive to nonscientists. Yet science doesn't operate by vote.

How did the IPCC come up with 2,500 scientists? If one were to add up all contributors and reviewers listed in the three IPCC reports published in 1996, one would count about 2,100. The great majority of these are not conversant with the intricacies of atmospheric physics, although some may know a lot about forestry, fisheries or agriculture. Most are social scientists—or just policy experts and government functionaries. Every country in the world seems to be represented—from Albania to Zimbabwe—though many are not exactly at the forefront of research. The list even includes known skeptics of global warming—much to their personal and professional chagrin.

The IPCC report has some 80 authors for its 11 chapters, but only a handful actually wrote the Policymakers' Summary; most of the several hundred listed "contributors" are simply specialists who allowed their work to be cited, without necessarily endorsing the other chapters or the summary. Contrast these numbers with the nearly 100 climate scientists who signed the Leipzig Declaration in 1996, expressing their doubts about the validity of computer-driven global warming forecasts. It takes a certain amount of courage to do this—given that it could jeopardize research grants from U.S. government agencies that have adopted climate catastrophe as an article of faith, and managed to convince Congress to ante up about $2 billion a year.

Even some IPCC climate scientists, in the report itself or in a May 16 Science article headlined "Greenhouse Forecasting Still Cloudy," have expressed doubts about the validity of computer models and about the main IPCC conclusion, that "the balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate"—whatever that ambiguous phrase may mean. A Dec. 20, 1996 Reuters report quoted British scientist Keith Shine, one of IPCC's lead authors, discussing the IPCC Policymakers' Summary: "We produce a draft, and then the policymakers go through it line by line and change the way it is presented. . . . It's peculiar that they have the final say in what goes into the scientists' report." The Science and Environmental Policy Project conducted a survey of IPCC scientific contributors and reviewers; we found that about half did not support the Policymakers' Summary. Parallel surveys by the Gallup organization and even by Greenpeace International produced similar results.

Of course, scientists do accept the existence of a natural greenhouse effect in the atmosphere, which has been known since the 19th century and is not to be confused with any influence from human activity. Another accepted fact is that greenhouse gases have been increasing as a consequence of an expanding world population: carbon dioxide from burning fossil fuels, for instance, and methane from raising cattle. But the climate warming of the past 100 years, which occurred mainly before 1940, in no way supports the results of computer models that predict a drastic future warming. Even IPCC Chairman Bert Bolin has admitted that the pre-1940 warming is likely a natural recovery from a previous, natural cooling. Most important, though, is the fact—not mentioned in the IPCC summary—that weather satellite observations, independently backed by data from balloon-borne sensors, have shown no global warming trend whatsoever in the past 20 years.

The discrepancy between calculated predictions of warming and the actual observations of no warming has produced a crisis for many scientists. Those who believe in global warming keep hoping that proof is just around the corner. Consider this passage from the May 16 Science article: "[M]any scientists say it will be a decade before computer models can confidently link the warming to human activities."

It is ironic that an environmental lobbying group, the Environmental Defense Fund, would admit in a brochure on global warming: "Scientists need to do considerably more work to sort out which [hypotheses] are most likely to be true." The EDF complains, however, that the "skepticism and constant questioning that lie at the heart of science" sometimes "cloud the debate." Perhaps so; but more often they advance the science.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following members of my staff be granted the privilege of the floor during debate on

Senate Resolution 98: Derek Schmidt, Ken Peel, Kent Bonham, David Kracman, and Tom McCarthy.

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

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, we have more than a dozen Senators on this side who want to speak on this issue. Under the time agreement, however, we have only 1 hour for proponents to debate. I, therefore, encourage Senators to insert their statements in the RECORD so they will be fully available to our negotiators before next week's meeting of the ad hoc group on the Berlin mandate in Bonn, Germany. I also hope to discuss this issue further on the Senate floor at a later date.

Mr. President, I thank the majority leader and the minority leader for their leadership in bringing this resolution before the Senate. I also thank the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee for their leadership as well. I particularly thank the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia. It has been a privilege for me to work on this important issue along side one of the Senate's giants.

We are here today to debate a very important issue, one which will have a major impact on the future of this country. How our Nation addresses the global climate issue may prove to be one of the most important economic and environmental decisions of the next century.

Let me say from the outset, this is not a debate about who is for or against the environment. We all agree on the need for a clean environment. We all want to leave our children a better, cleaner, more prosperous world. Nor is this debate about motives, personalities or politics. It is about finding the truth. What are the problems? If there are problems, what is the best solution? What are the costs? What are the consequences? And what do we need to do now?

The debate on the Senate floor today is about the path the administration is taking on this issue. I believe they are on the wrong path in their negotiations for any treaty to be signed in Kyoto, Japan, this December.

That is why my distinguished colleague from West Virginia and I have offered the Byrd-Hagel resolution. Senate Resolution 98, with its 65 cosponsors, puts the administration on notice that an overwhelming and bipartisan majority of the U.S. Senate rejects its current negotiating position on a proposed new global climate treaty. It is so important, as my friend, Senator BYRD, has repeatedly pointed out, that we in the U.S. Senate forcefully practice our constitutional role of advice and consent over these important negotiations. The credibility of the United States is not enhanced when the administration negotiates a treaty that has no hope of ratification in the U.S. Senate.

The Byrd-Hagel resolution is a strong bipartisan wake-up call to the administration. This resolution rejects the United Nations' current negotiating strategy of binding United States and other developed nations to legally binding reductions without requiring any new or binding commitments from 130 developing nations, such as China, Mexico, and South Korea. In addition, this resolution rejects any treaty or other agreement that would cause serious economic harm to the United States.

A simple reality of the current situation is that a core group of negotiators in the State Department has brought us near a point of no return. What this broad bipartisan coalition of 65 Senators is saying is "we need a new direction in these negotiations."

I approach this issue, Mr. President, believing that any action this serious that is undertaken by the United States must be based on sound science and common sense. This proposed treaty is based on neither.

If anything has become clear during congressional hearings on this issue, it is that the science is unclear, that the scientific community has not even come close to definitively concluding that we have a problem.

I mentioned earlier this morning, in the Wall Street Journal today, the very interesting article by Dr. Fred Singer about the science on this issue. Dr. Singer is professor emeritus of environmental sciences at the University of Virginia. I have already requested this be printed in the RECORD.

The science is inconclusive and contradictory, and predictions for the future range from no significant problem to global catastrophe. The subcommittee I chair, International Economic Policy Export and Trade Promotion, has held two hearings on this issue. In the first hearing, we heard testimony from Dr. Patrick Michaels, a very distinguished climatologist and professor of environmental sciences at the University of Virginia, who noted conditions in the real world simply have not matched changes projected by some computer models. Most of the warming of this century occurred in the first half of this century, before significant emissions of greenhouse gases began. And 18 years of satellite data actually shows a slight cooling trend in the world.

Before the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee Dr. Richard Lindzen, professor of meteorology at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, testified that "a decade of focus on global warming and billions of dollars of research funds have still failed to establish that global warming is a significant problem."

At the same hearing, Dr. John Christy, an associate professor in the Department of Atmospheric Science at the University of Alabama, stated: "The satellite and balloon data show that catastrophic warming is not now occurring. The detection of human effects on climate has not been convincingly proven because the variations we now have observed are not outside of the natural variations of the climate system."

It is clear that the global climate is incredibly complex. It is influenced by far more factors than originally thought when some early crude computer models first raised alarms about the possible threat of imminent catastrophic global warming. The scientific community has simply not yet resolved the question of whether we have a problem with global warming.

I suggest, again, that common sense dictates you don't come up with a solution to a problem until you are certain that you have a problem. However, the Clinton administration has proceeded to negotiate a solution before we have a confirmation that there is a problem.

They have proposed that the United States and other developed nations submit to legally binding controls of greenhouse gas emissions. But they will not be asking for legally binding commitments from more than 130 "developing nations," including, as I mentioned before, China, Mexico, South Korea, India, Singapore, and others.

Mr. President, this makes no sense, no sense at all, given that these nations include some of the most rapidly developing economies in the world and are quickly increasing their use of fossil fuels. By the year 2015, China will surpass the United States as the largest producer of greenhouse gases in the world.

It is the United States and other developed nations who are currently doing the most to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It is the developing nations that will be the biggest emitters of greenhouse gases during the next 25 years. It is complete folly to exclude them from legally binding emissions mandates. How could any treaty aimed at reducing global emissions of greenhouse gases be at all effective when it excludes these 130 nations? It won't. If these nations are excluded, greenhouse gas emissions will continue to rise, and we would see no net reductions in global greenhouse gas emissions. The exclusion of these nations is a fatal flaw in this treaty.

Some analysts have even cautioned that the unequal treaty being negotiated at the United Nations could increase. the emission of greenhouse gases. As industries flee the United States and other industrialized countries, they would reestablish themselves in developing countries that have much weaker environmental standards, like our neighbor to the south, Mexico.

A draft economic report commissioned by this administration, this administration's Department of Energy, concluded that:

Policy constraints placed on six large industries in the United States—petroleum refining, chemicals, paper products, iron and steel, aluminum and cement—would result in significant adverse impacts on the affected industries. Furthermore, they conclude:

emissions would not be reduced significantly. The main effect of the assumed policy would be to redistribute output, employment, and emissions from participating to nonparticipating countries.

Therefore, the U.N. Global Climate Treaty as being negotiated now by the Clinton administration cannot pass the first test of Byrd-Hagel. It will not include legally binding commitments from the developing nations.

What about the second test of Byrd-Hagel, serious economic harm, serious economic harm to this country and our future generations? One of the notable aspects of this issue is that it has united American business, labor, and agriculture support. In my hearings, we heard testimony from the AFL–CIO, American Farm Bureau, National Association of Manufacturers, and many noted economists. They all agree on one very definite thing—the draft U.N. treaty now under consideration would have a devastating effect on American consumers, workers, farmers and businesses. Estimates of the proposed treaty's damage to our economy vary, mainly because the administration continually refused to offer its own economic assumptions. This, after the administration promised for more than a year to provide an economic model. However, last week the Clinton administration threw in the towel and gave up on even attempting to provide an economic model.

At a hearing before the House Commerce Committee, Janet Yellen, chair of the Council of Economic Advisers for the President, admitted that the administration's long-awaited economic study had failed and claimed that it would be futile to attempt to assess the economic impacts of legally-binding emissions controls on our developed nations. So now the Clinton administration is proceeding to negotiate a treaty without any assessment of what it would do to the U.S. economy. That is incredible; absolutely stunning. But the bottom line is very clear. Even using conservative assumptions, Charles River Associates, a leading economic modeling firm, for example, has estimated that holding emissions at 1990 levels would reduce economic growth by 1 percent a year, rising to 3 percent in the later years, and that does not even consider Under Secretary of State Tim Wirth's long-term goal, which he stated during our hearings, of achieving a 70 percent reduction from current emissions levels.

What this means to everyday Americans is very clear. The AFL–CIO has estimated the treaty would mean the loss of 1.25 to 1.5 million jobs. Energy prices will rise dramatically. Individual Americans will pay for this treaty either in their electric bills, at the gas pump, or by losing their jobs. Jerry Jasinowski, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, testified that the proposed treaty:

> . . . would hurt America's manufacturers, workers and families with little or no environmental benefit since new restrictive policies in the U.S. simply would force the flight of U.S. investment to developing countries. Millions of Americans would lose their jobs and American manufacturers would take a severe hit in the marketplace.

What about the effects on American agriculture? It is little known that American agriculture produces 25 percent of our Nation's greenhouse gas emissions, which would make this critical sector of our economy vulnerable to the kind of major reductions envisioned by the U.N. global climate treaty. The American Farm Bureau has called the treaty a back-door Btu tax that would drive up fuel and overall energy costs as much as 50 percent. Again, this is outrageous. This would bankrupt many of our American farmers. Therefore the U.N. global climate treaty has no hope of satisfying the second test of Byrd-Hagel. It would clearly cause very serious economic harm to the United States.

Mr. President, beyond the fairness and economic harm issues that are addressed in Senate Resolution 98, I am also very concerned about any treaty that would bind our Nation's economy to control by some U.N. multilateral entity. Who will administer a global climate treaty? Who will police it? Will we have an international police force, an agency capable of inspecting, finding, possibly shutting down American companies? No one has addressed these questions. The implications are most serious for our national security interests, national sovereignty interests. One of the biggest users of fossil fuels is the U.S. military. How would this treaty affect our military operations and our national defense capabilities? There are serious national sovereignty issues and other issues that we have not even begun to touch.

I said at the outset that I believe any action taken by this Nation should be based on sound science and common sense. The current track of negotiations for the U.N. global treaty does neither. Why is this administration rushing headlong into signing a treaty in Kyoto this December? The scientific data is inconclusive, even contradictory. The economic costs are clear and devastating. This treaty would be a lead weight on our Nation's future economic growth, killing jobs and opportunities for generations of Americans to come.

We need to take global climate issues seriously. Obviously we agree with that. We in the United States have made tremendous strides in cleaning up our environment. We will continue to make progress in the future. We are all concerned about the state of the environment and what we leave to our children and our grandchildren. But when we take actions that will reduce our children's and our grandchildren's economic opportunities, we must ensure that the benefits are real and that they would justify this very real economic hardship that we would be passing on to these future generations.

I urge my colleagues to support Senate Resolution 98, the Byrd-Hagel resolution. I am grateful for the time tha my colleagues have given this effort.

At this time, I yield the floor to m distinguished colleague, the senio Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen ator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank m distinguished colleague, Mr. HAGEL, fo his excellent statement. I thank him for joining with me in the preparation development and promotion of this resolution. And I thank him for the time that he has yielded to me.

Mr. HAGEL and I, along with 63 othe cosponsors, developed S. Res. 98, which was reported favorably from the Senat Foreign Relations Committee, and i pending before the Senate today. The resolution seeks to provide the Sen ate's views as to the global climat change negotiations now underway These negotiations have, as a goal, a revision of the 1992 United Nation Framework Convention on Climat Change, known as the Rio Pact.

Mr. President, my years of recollec tion go back farther than that of mos Senators. I am not a scientist, but have lived long enough to see what believe are some very definite change in the climate pattern affecting ou country. Droughts, floods, storms ap pear to me to be more erratic, more un predictable, and more severe in thes later years of my life than in my ear lier years. I can remember when ther were no air conditioning units in Wash ington or anywhere else where I lived We have recently seen heat waves—se vere. We have seen droughts—severe They seem to be happening more fre quently. So I believe in my own min and heart that something is happenin out there. Something is happening Something is happening to our climate As I say, I am not a scientist, but th majority of scientists who study cli mate patterns tell us that there appar ently are changes going on in the cli mate pattern and that anthropogenic interference is probably the cause o some of this change.

All the data are not in, but I, for one believe that there is sufficient evidence of, first, a probable trend toward in creased warming of the Earth's surfac resulting from human interference i natural climate patterns. I believe tha a steady increase in accumulation o carbon dioxide and other greenhous gases in the atmosphere is takin place. I believe that there is some rela tionship between the warming tren and such accumulations, enough to jus tify our taking some action and takin it now. The scientific foundation o this case is plausible enough, in m personal judgment, to put into motion a sound global program, because the trends and the effects are long term Certainly the Senate, under the Con stitution, is obligated to communicat its views and advice on the treaty ne gotiations. The Constitution, in outlin ing the powers of the President, say he—meaning the President—shall hav power "by and with the Advice and

Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties"; "by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties. . . ." It doesn't just use the word "consent" of the Senate. It also uses the word of "advice." All too often we let ourselves to be limited to consenting to or rejecting treaties. But we have an obligation to advise the administration as to the Senate's views concerning a treaty, especially this treaty which can have such far-reaching ramifications.

I do not think the Senate should support a treaty that requires only half the world—in other words, the developed countries—to endure the economic costs of reducing emissions while developing countries are left free to pollute the atmosphere and, in so doing, siphon off American industries. There are those who say that the United States is responsible for the situation that has developed. They claim that the United States should bear the brunt of the burden. But the time for pointing fingers is over. In this particular environmental game there are no winners; the world loses. And any effort to avoid the effects of global climate change will be doomed to failure from the start without the participation of the developing world, particularly those nations that are rapidly developing and will rapidly increase their carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions. Count me as a global environmentalist, who insists that all nations that spew forth major concentrations of carbon dioxide, or that will be spewing forth major concentrations of carbon dioxide, must step up to the plate in these negotiations and make good-faith, specific, binding commitments to control and reduce these emissions right from the start.

Industry is fueled, in large part, by fossil fuels, which are the primary—primary—cause of greenhouse gas emissions. Let us examine the role of China in that regard. As a percentage of total world consumption in the year 2015, China alone will account for 42 percent of all the coal burned worldwide while the United States will account for only 16 percent. The increase in China's use of coal should alarm every environmentalist who is concerned about global warming.

So, if you are a true environmentalist—I am not talking about fanatics—if you are a true environmentalist, as I am, then you should be alarmed about the situation that I have just mentioned with respect to China. And there are other countries, such as India, Mexico, Indonesia, Brazil, that are classified as developing countries. I say they need to step up to the plate, just as we do, just as the annex 1 countries do, just as the developed countries do, when the negotiations are taking place and make binding, specific commitments to reductions of greenhouse gases and to make those commitments to start now, not somewhere in the future.

From 1995 to 2015, China will increase its coal consumption by a huge 111 percent, compared to only 22 percent for the United States. Yet, despite its future role as the world's leading contributor to the problem of carbon emissions, China has indicated steadfast refusal to apply any type of binding obligations upon its own economy and industry. I believe that, if the treaty does not commit the developing nations like China to binding commitments, there will be no incentive for China and the other nations of the developing world to make responsible and environmentally sound choices as they develop.

The committee report that is before the Senate contains a brief but accurate summary of the history of the global change negotiations. Most of the nations of the world signed up at the Earth summit in Rio in 1992 to a Treaty that set voluntary goals for nations to start limiting their carbon dioxide emissions. Unfortunately, most nations of the world, ourselves included, failed to take the actions needed to meet those voluntary goals.

As a result of this failure, the parties met again in Berlin in 1995 and sought to impose a timetable whereby legally binding limits on national carbon dioxide reductions would be put into place. Unfortunately—unfortunately—a fundamental error—I would use the word "blunder"—a fundamental blunder was made in Berlin in that only the so-called developed nations, or Annex I nations, were to impose such a legally binding regime on themselves. Developing nations got a free pass.

The concept which is embodied in the Byrd-Hagel resolution is that developing country parties should join the developed world in making new specific scheduled commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions within the same compliance period.

Now, does this mean that the Senate is insisting on commitments to identical levels of emissions among all the parties? Certainly not. The emissions limitations goals, to be fair, should be based on a country's level of development. The purpose is not to choke off Mexico's development or China's development. The purpose is to start addressing the greenhouse gas problem in the only meaningful way we can, that is, through globally and through binding commitments up front. The timeframe could be 5 years, 7 years, 10 years or whatever. The initial commitment to action, starting upon signature in Kyoto, could be relatively modest, pacing upwards depending upon various factors, with a specific goal to be achieved within a fixed time period. There are plenty of tools to encourage the developing world to make meaningful commitments.

The message to U.S. negotiators is that all nations—that is the message of this resolution—particularly those that are making and will in the future make a significant contribution to greenhouse gas emissions need to make commitments at Kyoto that unequivocally demonstrate a tangible action program—action, not just words—to tackle the problem of climate change, and the need to start with their best efforts to act on those commitments immediately, not 5 years down the road, not 10 years down the road but immediately, and not settle for vague promises to return to a future negotiation to get serious.

American industry has expressed concern that a treaty without developing country commitments would encourage capital flight and a loss of jobs in the United States. We do not as yet have available the administration's current best assessment of the economic impacts of various levels of emissions targets in the United States. However, preliminary work done by the Argonne Laboratory on this matter is worrisome in that its worst case scenario shows a very negative economic impact on American industry.

Mr. President, as I have said, we do not yet have a clearly articulated economic assessment by the administration, and so it is impossible to make specific judgments as to the economic impacts on particular industries and how they can be mitigated by other tools that could be included in the treaty. Dr. Janet Yellen, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, stated in a hearing before the Environment Committee on July 17, the administration has not settled on a particular set of policies to reduce emissions and intends to engage all interested parties in a White House conference on climate change this fall.

The American people need to understand the situation and the actions to be taken. The President is committed to this major public education campaign, and I note that he yesterday convened a meeting of scientists at the White House to discuss the evidence regarding global warming and to begin that educational process.

There surely will be costs if the United States is to make the changes to our existing industrial base and to our lifestyle necessary to meet the goals of the treaty. Our smokestacks must be cleaner and our automobiles more efficient. There are many ways to achieve these goals, but we must be able to tell the American people what will be required to meet any proposed commitment.

The Senate is doing the right thing in addressing the negotiations in a principled way without attempting to micromanage those negotiations. It is possible that the Senate will have a binding revision to the Rio Pact presented to it within a year. Given the tremendous implications for this agreement, the Byrd-Hagel resolution also suggests that the leadership create a bipartisan group of Senators to monitor the negotiations and report periodically to the full Senate on the nature of the agreement as it is being shaped by our negotiators. The nations of the world are all in this global boat together. It is not a boat of which only half will sink while the other half stays

afloat. Unless we all pull our oars in the same direction and plug the large leaks as well as the small leaks, our ship will flounder and surely sink. This resolution will give the Senate and the American people a seat at the negotiating table and add strength to our U.S. negotiating team.

I thank all Senators for their attention, and I hope the resolution will be adopted by a substantial majority.

Now, some of the Senators who have signed on to the resolution may have differing views about the treaty, but there is one thing that we are in agreement on—one or two things. These are set forth in the resolution beginning and concluding with the resolving clause. One, that all nations, all nations must take steps now, at the time of the signing of the treaty, to begin limiting their emissions of greenhouse gases. Mere promises will not be sufficient. Mere promises will not get by this Senate. A treaty will have to have the approval of a two-thirds supermajority in this Senate, and that is what we are telling the administration. We are letting the Administration know that this Senate is not just going to consent or not consent on a treaty. This Senate is going to fulfill its constitutional obligations not only to consent but also to "advise" and consent. And the resolution also provides that such a treaty must not result in serious harm to the economy of the United States.

So I suggest that all Senators read the resolution's resolving clause. That is where we come together. That is where Mr. HAGEL's views, my views, the views of others who are signatories of the resolution blend and constitute a consensus.

Mr. President, I thank my friend and I yield the floor.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I thank Senator BYRD very, very much.

I yield up to 5 minutes to my friend and distinguished colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, it is always good to work with my longtime friend, Senator BYRD, on a project that we both believe very strongly in, and it is good to work with a newfound friend. I have had an affection for people from Nebraska for a long time, and Jim Exon and I worked together as Governors and then here. I appreciate the Senator's friendship and getting to know each other. And so I thank him for his cooperation and help here this morning.

Mr. President, there is an old saying that when you run out of luck, you better get a new pair of dice. As far as I am concerned, we have lost every roll of the dice during the climate change negotiations, and we better get ourselves a new pair. Otherwise, American workers will be out of luck. That is why I rise today to support Senate Resolution 98 which Senator BYRD and Senator HAGEL now have before the Senate.

If you take a good look at the global climate change treaty currently being negotiated, you will discover that developing nations are the high rollers while the developed nations keep coming up with snake eyes and the big loser is the global environment. That is because only developed nations would be legally bound by the treaty hammered out by negotiators, the so-called "Berlin Mandate" produced back in 1995. Developing nations are off the hook.

That decision contained two glaring errors. First, negotiators agreed to complete negotiations for the post-2000 period by the artificial deadline of 1997 before they began implementation of the 1992 convention and before there was an understanding of the complexity of those negotiations.

Second, negotiators succumbed to the demands of China and other developing countries that any agreement reached in Kyoto in 1997 for post-2000 commitments must exempt Asian economies such as China and India and the rest of the developing world. Right now, developed nations and developing nations have about equal levels of carbon emissions, but within 5 years of the deadline developing nations will have more than 1½ times the 1990 level of the developing world.

So because of those bad rolls of the dice, the treaty is heavily weighted against America and especially against American workers. That is because the U.S. will have to make the steepest reductions and suffer the costliest and most damaging consequences. Preliminary estimates put the loss as high as 600,000 American jobs each year. And 600,000 jobs is probably a low estimate because the treaty creates an enormous incentive for American businesses to shift more and more jobs overseas to avoid the expensive emission reductions that U.S. businesses will have to meet.

The impact in Kentucky would be especially bad. Not only miners working in the coal fields of eastern and western Kentucky suffer job losses but many of the businesses and factories that have created a "golden triangle," as we refer to it, between northern Kentucky, Louisville and Lexington would be forced to close, and every single Kentuckian will experience and face higher electric bills and higher gas prices. The sad thing is we will not even get a cleaner environment. That is the sad thing. We will not stop global warming. We will not even reduce carbon emissions. That is because every ton of reduced emissions in the United States and other developed nations will be made up and then some in the developing world.

The way I see it we have been stuck in a game with loaded dice. You have a treaty with devastating consequences for the American economy. You end up with virtually no environmental benefit. It looks like nothing more than a massive foreign aid package paid for with American jobs.

It is clear that many American interests are being neglected by our negotiators and that we must come up with a better solution for the problem of global emissions. But time is limited for the Senate to send a message that the treaty as currently reported is not acceptable.

The answer is clearly not, as proposed by the State Department, a Kyoto protocol and then a second agreement of some kind after Kyoto in 2005 or even later. That scenario ignores the fact that we have no assurances China and other developing countries will become parties to any agreement with a commitment to simply start discussions for a third agreement.

I believe Senator BYRD's and Senator HAGEL's resolution is the right method. It sets commonsense parameters for our negotiators to work from and assures that any treaty meets the goal of reduced emissions without penalizing one country over another.

I hope my colleagues will join us in sending this important message, not only to our negotiators, but to the American people that both the global environment and our national interests must be protected.

I thank my friends and yield the floor.

Mr. KERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The Senator from Massachusetts.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Scott Bunton and Gregg Rothschild, of my staff, be permitted access to the floor during the resolution deliberation.

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

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from West Virginia for raising an issue of common sense and a very legitimate issue regarding the U.S. negotiating position with respect to global climate change.

I have not been a cosponsor up until this point of the resolution because I shared with Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator CHAFEE concerns about some of the phrasing and the meaning of some of the resolution with respect to the negotiating process. We thought it was important to seek clarification with respect to those points before having a vote.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I raised those concerns during the markup. I voted to send this resolution to the floor for consideration today. Pending the ultimate discussion that we have on the floor here today, it is my intention to vote for this resolution because I think it embraces common sense.

That common sense is the notion that if you are really going to do something to effect global climate change

and you are going to do it in a fair-minded way that will permit you to build consensus in the country, which is important, and to build the necessary support to ratify a treaty, we are going to have to do this in a way that calls on everybody to share the burden of responding to this problem. That means that we need to have an agreement that does not leave enormous components of the world's contributors and future contributors of this problem out of the solution.

It is simply wrong to assume that facing the difficulties we have had since the Rio treaty, the agreement in Rio, which 155 nations signed, that we are going to be able to now face up to those greater responsibilities without bringing everybody into the solution. The notion that China or India or other enormously rapidly developing countries, who will before too long also be adding very significantly to this problem, and already are to some degree, are going to somehow later negotiate their participation I think is contrary to common sense. So I have joined in the notion that it is appropriate to reconsider the Berlin Mandate and to discuss how the U.S. Senate properly thinks we should approach these negotiations.

But let me also make it clear that, in this strange hybrid of Senators who have signed on as cosponsors to this resolution, there are some who do not want any treaty. There are some who do not think it is a problem. There are some who do not accept the science. There are some for whom the effort is one to really have nothing happen. I am pleased that Senator BYRD is not one of those and that many of those who will vote for this resolution, the sense-of-the-Senate resolution, join me and others in believing that this is a serious problem with science that supports it.

It is not my purpose to debate the science very deeply here this morning because the science is not at issue in this resolution. This resolution is a question of negotiating tactics. This resolution is about how we will approach the question of reducing greenhouse gases, not whether. It is a question not entirely based on science.

But nevertheless, the Record ought to reflect as we approach these issues that the science overwhelmingly documents the notion that a phenomenon known as global warming is already occurring, it is occurring. There is no debate among scientists as to whether or not it is happening. There is some debate as to what the impacts will be. There is debate about the models and how much those models show with certitude it is going to happen in what part of the country.

Can we predict what will happen to Nebraska? The answer is no. Can we predict what will happen to my State of Massachusetts and the coastal zones? Well, to some degree some scientists are suggesting you can, but some people remain questioning that.

Let me make it very clear—someone raised the question about how the Panel on Climate Change now predicts the global warming of only 1 degree to 3.5 degrees Celsius over the coming century. People say that is not really that bad and it is hardly a cause for concern. Let me point out to my colleagues that the global average temperature has changed by less than a degree Celsius up or down for 10,000 years. We know that. So the projected warming is expected to exceed any climate change that has occurred during the history of civilization.

In addition, even apparently small global average temperature changes will be accompanied by much larger regional climate shifts. For example, a warming which is twice as large as the global average is projected to occur at high northern latitudes. Apparently, small global average changes have also led to very large climate shifts in the past.

Moreover, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, representing the consensus of climate scientists worldwide, has concluded:

> the balance of evidence suggests that there is a discernible human influence on global climate. And the year 1995 matched 1990 as the hottest year on record.

What we know to a certainty also is that from the 1980's on we have been recording these increasingly heated periods. We then saw Mount Pinatubo's cooling effect. We saw that cooling effect begin to diminish as the impact of that volcanic disruption between the Sun's rays and the Earth dissipated. So we have begun to return to the high readings that we saw characteristic of the late 1980's. March through December of 1994 were the warmest periods on record according to the National Weather Service climate analysis.

I could go on. The National Academy of Sciences has reported that despite uncertainties, greenhouse warming poses a potential threat, "sufficient to merit prompt responses * * *. Investment in mitigation measures acts as insurance protection against the great uncertainties and the possibility of dramatic surprises."

In addition, the panel suggested that substantial mitigation could be accomplished at very modest costs; in other words, insurance is cheap, they said.

Let me point out one other fact that was set forth at the hearings we had in the committee.

We know that we are the world's greatest emitter of greenhouse gases. We know that carbon dioxide is the most significant of those. We know that the oceans mitigate the increase of carbon dioxide that we put into the atmosphere. The oceans consume the carbon dioxide.

But what we have also learned as a matter of science is that there is some level at which there is this potential of saturation of the oceans. We do not know where that is. The oceans recirculate it. And the question remains whether or not you might have an extraordinary, dramatic impact because of the reaching of this saturation point.

Some people may want to tempt that. Some people may not feel any kind of generational responsibility or any kind of global responsibility and suggest that, well, all of these thousands of scientists, all of the consensus reached by 155 nations—they may want to choose to ignore it.

But when scientists tell me that the oceans are already rising and they are already rising at a discernible and measurable rate and that we are continuing a process of warming and that between now and the middle of the next century oceans will rise 1 to 3 feet and that the impact of that will be devastation on the coast of Florida, the loss of island nations, and the remarkable impact on wetlands all around the planet, I think we have a responsibility to say, well, we ought to try to think about that. And that is exactly what this effort to deal with global climate change is trying to do.

Now, I am not going to debate all of the science and the models and what can or cannot be done here. But it is clear that one of the chief sponsors of this resolution, Senator BYRD—and you have heard him speak—agrees, and Senator LIEBERMAN and CHAFEE and others do, that the prospect of human-induced global warming as an accepted thesis with adverse consequences for all is here, and it is real.

There are some Senators, as I have said, who want to debate that science; and so be it. That is not what this resolution is about. This resolution is a question of how our negotiators will negotiate. What we ought to be seeking in Kyoto, as we pursue what most people have decided, is a legitimate concern.

Senator BYRD's resolution makes a first step toward tackling the issue of changing the balance of how we approach this. As I have said, Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator CHAFEE, and I would have worded some things differently. But we are convinced in our discussions with Senator BYRD that the intent here is similar, which is to guarantee that our negotiators have a changed position, a tougher position, but a reasonable position in negotiating how we will come to agreement in Kyoto.

Let me point out a couple of those areas where we had some concerns. There is language in the resolution about the developing nations accomplishing their reductions within exactly the same compliance period as the developed nations. I have come to the conclusion that these words are not a treaty killer that some suggested it might have been.

I am encouraged to learn that Senator BYRD's objective is to support entering into a binding international agreement to address climate change, and he also agrees that all nations, developed and less developed, ought to participate in this significant effort.

We both recognize that, as a matter of global and national environmental protection, the global warming issue is not going to be able to be addressed effectively if any major emitting nation or group of nations stays outside the agreement. So, ultimately, all major emitting nations will need to reduce greenhouse emissions if we are going to make significant progress on global warming.

I heard one of my colleagues talk earlier about who is going to police this, and how do you enter into this international agreement. Well, the fact is we enter into international agreements all the time. We have trade agreements. We have arms control agreements. We have environmental agreements. We police them by arriving at mutually agreeable means of being able to raise the issues with each of those nations that might be offending, and we have done so without ever giving up our sovereignty. So, that is just a red herring in this issue. We know that we can do that, and we will do that.

We also know that we are trying to seek an equilibrium with other nations so we are not losing jobs while other people are gaining some foothold in the marketplace. We understand that. We are not seeking to consciously enter into an arrangement that will disadvantage the United States of America and our economy.

On the other hand, every environmental agreement and every agreement we have reached so far requires some change in the way we do business. That change has generally produced more jobs, not less jobs. One of the fastest growing industries in Massachusetts has been environmental technology, as we develop new means of producing clean coal or scrubbers or as we create other kinds of mitigation for toxins or chemicals. I think that the same thing can happen here. If the United States is smart, we will be the provider of these technologies to the world.

There still appears to be a little bit of uncertainty as to what this phrase within the same compliance period actually means. But after a number of discussions with Senator CHAFEE's and Senator BYRD's staffs, I believe that we have reached an understanding that it means essentially that we want countries to begin to reduce while we are reducing, we want them to engage in a reasonable schedule while we are engaged in a reasonable schedule, but that if a developing nation needs more time to get a plan in place or needs to have more time to raise the funds and be able to purchase the technology and do the things necessary, that as long as there is a good-faith track on which they are proceeding, that if it took them a number of years, 2 years, 3 years, 5, or longer to be able to reach a particular goal, that certainly means within the same compliance period they are operating similarly to try to meet the standards that we want to set out. We believe that, given that less-developed countries are not currently projected to emit more emissions than industrial countries until at least the year 2015, it is reasonable to permit some flexibility in the targets and the timing of compliance while at the same time requiring all countries to agree to make a legally binding commitment by a date certain. That is reasonable. But I think most of my colleagues would agree that if some country simply doesn't have the capacity, the plan, the money, or the technology, it may be they have to take a little more time and we should want to be reasonable in helping them to do that because the goal here is to get everybody to participate, not to create a divisiveness that winds up with doing nothing.

There is a second issue here, and that is the issue of emissions trading. While this resolution includes provisions that address developing countries' participation, a number of us are critical of the fact that it is silent on the question of flexibility, a question of what market tools or what market access tools ought to be permissible for use by all countries. I believe that the record is clear that emissions trading is a vital market mechanism that will benefit the United States.

Emissions trading not only advantages the U.S. business, but it would provide developing countries with incentives to sign up to binding legal commitments that most people believe are important in this treaty. I would like to point out to my colleagues that, currently in the negotiations, Europe is trying to create a bubble over Europe itself, trying to create a separate agreement where Europe will be able to have emissions trading among European countries, but we and others would not be able to engage in that trading. The result would be that you might have Belgium required to do a 10-percent reduction in 2010 for CO_2 and CH_4 and NO_x. But at the same time, Greece would be able to increase by 30 percent. Spain would increase by 17 percent. Ireland would increase by 15 percent. Portugal would be able to increase by 40 percent. This is because they are trying to set up a structure where they can trade amongst each other for emissions without us having that same capacity.

Now, if anything disadvantages American industry, it would be to have Europe create a bubble for itself to the exclusion of the United States to be able to emissions trade. I am against that. I think that is anticompetitive and it is anti-United States. This is silent on that. I hope my colleagues will agree with me that we want the United States to be able to trade with one of these countries. We want the United States to be able to trade with one of the less developed nations so that we can do what we have done in the United States.

Let me point out, here is the impact. Referring to this chart, these are what we have done in the United States. This black line represents the actual SO_2 emissions in the United States, and this was the projected rate of reduction if we were to engage, under the Clean Air Act, in emissions trading, and this pink line was what we projected. But because emissions trading has been such an effective market tool, this yellow line represents the actual rate of reductions in SO_2 emissions. So we have had a phenomenal success through emissions trading in reducing emissions in our country. And it would be simply against common sense to have a negotiation which precluded the capacity of the United States to engage in this emissions trading.

This chart shows the growth indicators and emissions. The black line represents the gross domestic product increase of the United States of America from 1985 to 1995. The electricity demand in the United States is the pink line, and the electricity demand went up almost concomitantly with the gross domestic product. At the same time, because we engaged in these tradings within our States, here is what happened with the emissions trading effect. The SO_2 emissions dramatically went down, even as electricity demands went up.

So it is a proven tool, it is a market force tool, and it is one that will enhance the economic competitiveness of the United States. I am pleased that, in my discussions with Senator BYRD, he has indicated that there is nothing in this resolution that precludes the capacity of our negotiators to pursue this as a tool in our negotiations and, conceivably, as one of the ingredients of a Kyoto treaty.

Mr. HAGEL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERRY. For what purpose?

Mr. HAGEL. I would like to respond, if I could.

Mr. KERRY. I will finish up, and then I want to reserve some time for Senator CHAFEE, and others. If I can complete, then and the Senator, on his time, can certainly ask any question that he wants to.

Let me just say that we believe very strongly that we need to put a structure in place that will provide incentives for nations and industries to reduce their emissions of greenhouse gases. And we believe, obviously, the developing world is poised to undertake a massive infrastructure investment in energy, transportation, and other potentially high-emitting sectors. These investments are going to have long-term capital stock lifetimes, and if we were to exclude that discussion of them being part of this, it would be an enormous error of judgment, I think, for the longrun of this effort.

One final comment I will make on the science. Even if we were to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions today to 1990 levels, you will still continue to have the greenhouse gas warming effect, because the life of these gases in the atmosphere will go on for 75 years, or longer, into the future and because of the cumulative effect and the lack of

knowledge about where you may have a saturation point or a devastating impact, caution and common sense predicate that we should do everything possible in order to avoid the potential of that kind of catastrophe.

I reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. HAGEL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I yield myself whatever time I need. I just would like to make a quick response to my colleague. I noted that my colleague from Massachusetts keeps employing the name of Senator BYRD. I assume that Senator BYRD is going to have an opportunity to speak for himself on this.

First, let's be very clear. This is all interesting, but it does not at all have anything to do with the Byrd-Hagel resolution. That is No. 1. Two, I am saying—and I think much of what we are talking about on the resolution that legally binding commitments are pretty tough, and we want to understand about those legally binding commitments before anybody gets legally bound, regarding if we are talking about a European bubble, or whatever.

Mr. KERRY. Let me answer the Senator by saying we don't disagree with that at all.

Mr. HAGEL. This is interesting, I say to the Senator, but again it does not reflect on what the Byrd-Hagel resolution reflects.

Mr. KERRY. How doesn't it reflect on it?

Mr. HAGEL. We don't talk about the European bubble. More important, we don't talk about European trading and joint implementation. If Senator BYRD wants to say that, he can. This Senator wants to make it clear that I am not in favor of any sort or form of emissions trading or joint implementation.

Furthermore, any kind of implied United Nations bureaucracy with the power to come in and inspect and penalize and fine and shut down American companies, which obviously is the legitimate logical conclusion of this, I want to be on record right now in saying I oppose that. Obviously, Senator BYRD can speak for himself.

Mr. KERRY. To answer the Senator, since he wanted to engage in this discussion, no one has suggested any such thing, and I would be against that, also.

Second, the Senator would have to agree with me that this resolution is silent on the issue of emissions trading. That is what I said; I said it is silent.

Mr. HAGEL. That is what I have said. I said I could not support that, will not support that, and I want to make sure my colleagues understand that, and that we stay focused on this.

Mr. KERRY. We will let the Senator from West Virginia speak for himself. But it is my understanding that the Senator from West Virginia has a different view.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. HAGEL. Thank you, Mr. President. Senator KERRY, is it your intent to enter into a colloquy with the Senator from West Virginia on this issue?

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, not necessarily. I am going to wait until I have had a moment to discuss this with Senator CHAFEE. But we can proceed with the debate. There are people on this side that would like to speak. I will reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. HAGEL. I thank the Senator. I would like to yield to my friend from Kansas 2 minutes for his comments on this issue as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, might I inquire of my distinguished colleague from Nebraska, was that 4 minutes or 2 minutes?

Mr. HAGEL. It is 2 minutes. It was 4 minutes 2 minutes ago, and I am sorry about that. I might add that we intend to continue this dialog and colloquy, hopefully, next week because as a result of the fact that we were given less time late last night than what was originally agreed to, even though I happen to be standing in this position, there is not much I can do with that. I live by the law. So that is why you have 2 minutes, and probably less.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, might I inquire whether that dialog came out of my time? I assume I have an additional 2 minutes. I was merely questioning the distinguished Senator from Nebraska on the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the Chair. I am upset. Talking about global warming, I have a little global warming underneath the collar. Two minutes and one hour of debate for such a terribly, terribly serious question.

I rise in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 98, and that is a fancy word that puts the Senate on record against any U.N.-sponsored, legally binding greenhouse treaty. I come to this issue as the former chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, where we spent years trying to address our emission policies with sound science, reasonable cost-benefit considerations, and I want to wake up farm country because that is not what is going to happen.

A U.N. scientific panel now blames agriculture, under the auspices of this plan, for 20 percent of human-caused greenhouse gas emissions. They propose the following things, Mr. and Mrs. Farmer, so get your pencil out, get your yellow tablet out. We don't have time to really discuss this—Senators want to leap on their airplanes at 12 o'clock—in terms of an issue that will affect every life and every pocketbook in America. But we are here talking about it, and I probably have 30 seconds.

Wake up. Mandatory increased fuel economy requirements. Phaseout of diesel fuel. How are our tractors going to run? I don't know. Limitations on production. Been there, done that. We passed a new farm bill. Mandate for no-till; no-till farming, forcing farmers to buy all sorts of new equipment. Here's a good one: Restrictions on livestock production to reduce methane emission for the United Nations. We are going to control what goes into the cow and now, evidently, we are going to have a U.N. observer trying to control what comes out of the cow. And restrictions on processing and transportation of food products.

This is uncalled for. Many of my colleagues joined to send a letter to the administration to say, how on Earth are we going to do this and still feed America in a troubled and hungry world? That answer has not been forthcoming. We recommended five considerations, and then we follow with the letter that was sent to the President last November by every major agriculture group.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 8, 1996.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Last summer, participants in the second Conference of Parties of the United Nations' Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) agreed to negotiations for legally binding numeric limits on greenhouse gas emissions. This dramatic shift from voluntary to enforceable caps on greenhouse gases was led by the U.S. According to your spokespeople, there is now a consensus in the world scientific community which demands urgent action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

There is less than agreement outside the United Nation's scientific body. Furthermore, there is still a lively debate among respected scientists about the human versus natural sources of greenhouse gases and their effect on climate. Controversy notwithstanding, the climate change treaty is moving full-speed ahead with the Administration's enthusiastic support. A final agreement is scheduled to be completed in December of 1997, with ratification by individual countries beginning in 1998. If ratified by the U.S. Senate, the treaty will be binding on the U.S. and other developed countries and may be incorporated into U.S. law. However, developing countries will not have to comply.

Of great concern to agriculture are reports under consideration by the U.N. scientific panel which blame agriculture for more than 20 percent of human-caused greenhouse gas emissions. Specifically, we are concerned about proposals for the following: fuel economy requirements, reduction or phaseout of the use of diesel fuel, limitations on production per acre for some crops, requirements for "plowless" soil preparation, mandatory fallowing of crop land, limits and restrictions on livestock production to reduce methane emissions, restrictions on use of fertilizer, restrictions on timber harvesting, restrictions on processing, manufacturing and transportation of food products.

Unfortunately, these proposals ignore agriculture's positive role in reducing greenhouse gases by removing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere through photosynthesis. Most importantly, they cavalierly disregard the most valuable function of modern agriculture—feeding a hungry world. Ironically,

rice production has been singled out as the number one culprit in human-caused methane emissions.

We are very concerned that these recommendations or similar ones will be incorporated in the final climate change agreement, ratified and imposed on U.S. farmers and ranchers through U.S. laws. Binding and enforceable controls would apply only to developed countries and would severely disadvantage U.S. farmers and ranchers in today's global markets.

Moreover, we are deeply concerned and surprised that the Administration has not actively consulted with agriculture as the agreement has been developed. We respectfully request that the Administration take the following actions:

(1) The Administration must fully and actively consult with agriculture. Agricultural interests have not been considered by the Department of State and other U.S. agencies which are closely involved with the development of the climate change agreement. The agreement must include an open and extensive public debate which involves agricultural producers and members of Congress, USDA and other agencies.

(2) The Administration should withdraw its support for legally binding and enforceable caps on emissions until here is a stronger consensus from the scientific community that they are justified. If it is determined that controls are justified, they should be accomplished voluntarily or in ways which minimize disruption of U.S. agricultural producers.

(3) The final climate change agreement, scheduled for completion in December of 1997, must be delayed to provide sufficient time for consultation with agriculture and for adequate risk, cost and benefit assessment.

Without proper scientific and economic analyses and assessment, U.S. farmers and ranchers may be placed at a serious disadvantage with agricultural producers in countries which do not plan to reduce greenhouse gases.

If the Administration does not adequately address the above concerns, we may raise them with Congress during the ratification process.

Sincerely,

American Farm Bureau Federation, American Crop Protection Association, American Sheep Industries Association, American Soybean Association, CENEX, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton Council, National Food Processors Association, National Grange, National Milk Producers Federation, National Pork Producers Council, The Fertilizer Institute, United Agribusiness League, United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, USA Rice, Western Growers Association.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join a bipartisan majority of my colleagues today in support of Senate Resolution 98 that puts the Senate on record against any United Nations-sponsored global climate change treaty that would be binding on only developed nations.

It had been U.S. policy until last year that the United States would pursue voluntary programs to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels. This made sense, the science is not clear on global warming and no nation should risk their economic well being because of environmental extremism that ignores the call for sound science.

However, Deputy Secretary of State Tim Wirth last year at the Berlin meeting of the Conference of Parties of the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change suddenly changed the voluntary course of action. Under the White House's supervision, Deputy Secretary Wirth proposed global warming treaty language that would force the United States and smaller developed nations like Great Britain and Germany to control their greenhouse gas emissions, but purposefully exempts so-called developing nations such as China, India, South Korea, Mexico, and Brazil from the binding treaty language.

It is fact that China and India will exceed United States greenhouse gas emissions early next century, but they will be exempt from this U.N. designed treaty. These developing nations will have no international authority regulating their industries or way of life. As a result, the White House is meekly declining to be forceful in its negotiations and would rather unilaterally disarm our economy that is based on power. If Deputy Secretary Wirth and others supporting this treaty are so concerned, perhaps they can tell me how stopping United States carbon dioxide emissions while letting China and India pollute will help their environmental cause. What is the benefit? There is none under this treaty if these nations are not brought into the same global scheme as the United States.

Mr. President, we are really talking about a legally binding greenhouse gas treaty. Sounds like Washingtonese to Mr. and Mrs. America, but what it really means is the White House is telling the world that developed nations feel guilty about their strong and vibrant industrial base, therefore they must be causing global warming. Deputy Secretary of State Tim Wirth in his June 19 testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee admitted that because the United States produces 20 percent of the world's carbon emissions and has only 4 percent of the world's population that Congress, "without sound science on global warming, mandate that business and consumers stop using their cars, trucks, combines, trains, and boats, not to mention shutting down factories to ease the pain of others about our quality of life." In 1990, the United States produced more than 26 percent of the world's goods and services, while producing only 20 percent of its carbon emissions. Deputy Secretary Wirth also failed to show that America's air is getting cleaner because in the Environmental Protection Agency's report National Air Quality and Emissions Trends Report, 1995 documented improvement in air quality over the past 9 years. This improvement in air quality seems to baffle the EPA and supporters of the binding treaty because our air quality keeps improving despite the growth of the U.S. population, more automobile use, not to mention the growth in our gross domestic product.

And, what are the particulars of t globally binding treaty? Perhaps th are reluctant to tell the folks in Dod City, America, this treaty will esta lish a global greenhouse trading em sions system. This means some int national body, probably the United N tions, will be responsible for tracki our use of fossil fuels in the Unit States. The United Nations will be r quired to know how much jet fuel a diesel the Marines, Air Force, Arm and Navy use. The White House has n even discussed the national securi implications of this treaty with t Senate Armed Services Committee.

Wake up, farm country, the U.N. s entific panel blames agriculture f more than 20 percent of human-caus greenhouse gas emissions and has pr posed the following proposals for ag culture:

Increased fuel economy requir ments, meaning that pickups will lighter and cannot carry as much fe and seed;

Phaseout of diesel fuel. What do the President propose we burn in tra tors?

Limitations on production per acr been there done that.

Mandate for no-till, forcing farme to use planters that may not be rig for their crops or soil;

Restrictions on livestock producti to reduce methane emission. Evident the United Nations does not like co flatulence;

Restrictions on fertilizer; and

Restrictions on processing and tran portation of food products.

This is uncalled for and I joined wi my Senate colleagues on the Ag iculture Committee in a letter to t Vice President on March 14 expressir our deep concern that the White Hou greenhouse proposal was ignorant the likely mandatory restrictions c the world's food and fiber supplier. O agriculture policies are the responsibi ity of the U.S. Congress in consultatio with the President. The United Natio should have no say whatsoever planting, tilling, or harvesting. In o letter we asked the administration t analyze and brief us on the followin points regarding agriculture.

First, the potential effect of clima change on U.S. agriculture and liv stock production.

Second, the estimated greenhous gas emission resulting from the pr duction of crops and livestock in th United States.

Third, the net contribution of U.S forests and crops soaking up green house gases.

Fourth, actions and controls ne essary to reduce agricultural green house gas emissions to comply with ob ligations that may arise under th treaty and an economic analysis c their impact on U.S. farmers an ranchers.

Fifth, whether and to what exten greenhouse gas emission control would disadvantage agriculture produc ers in this country compared to pro ducers in other countries with fewe

stringent emission controls or no controls at all.

The silence from the White House about our concern is evident that they are waiting until December when Congress is safely at home that they will reveal the treaty includes a carbon fuel tax. Fortunately, my astute colleagues in the Senate have been able to extract pieces of this plan through congressional hearings. The White House will impose a Btu tax on energy sources like gasoline, diesel, and electricity. According to congressional testimony by Dr. Janet Yellen, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, that a $100 tax for every ton of carbon produced from fossil fuels will be needed to reduce U.S. greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels. I know that some of my seasoned colleagues recall that this is the same administration that in 1993 proposed a complicated Btu tax on fossil fuels.

Mr. President, a Btu tax is unneeded and goes against everything the Congress and White House has been struggling for over the past 2 months, a balanced budget with income-tax breaks. What would this Btu tax cost the family, the small businessman, or farmer? Well, some economists believe that to reach the 1990 level of U.S. carbon dioxide emissions that the Btu tax would be comparable to an increase of at least a quarter, if not two, in the Federal gas tax. That's a lot of money for the pizza man or the single mother shuttling kids between school and soccer practice. The same thing happens on these folks' power bills every month because coal or natural gas is used to generate electricity that provides them a warm home in the winter and a cool house in the summer.

Coming from an energy-intensive State where we have to drive long ways to reach home or work, this tax is senseless. Specifically, it will hurt our farmers, who EPA Administrator Browner called earlier this week the "backbone of America." A Btu tax will dramatically affect the bottom line of farmers and ranchers. An analysis of the 1993 Btu tax proposal by the Kansas State University Department of Agriculture Economics determined that would have cost Kansas farmers from $1,311 to $4,531 depending on their location in the Sunflower State. That is a lot of money, and if the crops are bad, it hurts producers' bottom line even more.

Here are some specifics from the report that need to be closely examined because they will mirror what the White House will be proposing. A Rice County, KS, farmer planting continuous cropped wheat under the 1993 proposed Btu tax cost per acre would have increased by $1.45. For a northeast Kansas dryland milo farmer in Brown County, his cost per acre would have risen by $2.90. The same Brown County farmer growing corn, which Kansas is increasing its acreage under freedom to farm, would have paid $3.58 per acre for corn under a Btu tax. A Miami County farmer raising hay and alfalfa costs per acre would have gone up $2.91. why can't the White House give us this information about their treaty proposal?

What concerns me is that the administration is paying attention to the questionable science on global warming and is blindly putting the U.S. agriculture industry in an uneconomical production straitjacket that will do more harm on a global scale. The Kansas State University study determined that the majority of a Btu tax will be passed on in the price of fertilizer, ag chemicals, fuels, and grain drying costs. I would like to quote directly from the study: "[I]n return, the manager will not be able to pass these costs on in terms of higher commodity prices. Farm managers may reduce the use of energy-intensive inputs to some degree, resulting in smaller production and increased commodity prices." While I am never one to question higher wheat prices, I would if it meant forcing farmers from using diesel or fallowing fields because the United Nations suggested it to meet the treaty's requirement.

The study summary goes on. "An increase in the costs of production will reduce the supply of farm crops." We, the United States, who proudly supplies the rest of the world with wheat, corn and almost every imaginable natural product, probably cannot provide food to these developing nations clamoring for international food aid if our production costs increase. If our production goes down, our domestic market will become paramount and the United States may have to ignore the poor and hungry of other nations that we have been feeding for tens of years.

My colleagues, the administration was in the process of trying to develop a specific economic model to predict what the costs of this binding treaty would be on America, not only farms, but all industries. But, the administration told the Congress they specifically wanted the model to be peer reviewed to ensure there would be no questions about its results. However, when they presented it for peer review, the reviewers told the White House that their model did not work and, if they did find one, it would clearly show the treaty would substantially hurt the economy. The White House refuses now to speculate what the impacts would be. Could it be they are afraid of spooking Wall Street and its meteoric rise above 8,000? Why should companies invest in plants and people only to be taxed more here in the United States? As you can see, this treaty will cost jobs.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose any weakening amendments to the resolution. This strongly worded sense of the Senate needs to be shared not only with the appropriate administration officials but world leaders in developed and developing nations. I know that there will be a meeting in Bonn, Germany, in several weeks and I hope the administration will reveal to the world that if they propose such a misguided treaty to the U.S. Senate, it will fail.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I support Senate Resolution 98, the sense-of-the-Senate resolution on the Global Climate Change Treaty submitted by Senators BYRD and HAGEL and supported by nearly two-thirds of the Senate. Like many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I have many serious concerns about the economic impact that this treaty would have on our Nation.

By adopting this amendment, the Senate will be exercising its constitutional role of advising the executive branch as part of a treaty process. The President should take this resolution as a serious and constructive step in the treaty process.

Before we take another step toward ratification, I believe that the Senate must insure that the economic impact and inequity of this international agreement be fully aired for the American people.

As written, this legally binding treaty would require the United States and other developed countries to reduce their carbon dioxide and greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2010. In order to meet these targets, the United States would either have to issue new regulations or levy huge taxes on all fossil fuels in proportion to their carbon contents. Economists have suggested that stabilizing emissions at 1990 levels with a tax could cut America's gross domestic product by $350 billion. Further regulations would likely take even billions more from our economy.

And what would the developing nations contribute?

What would our neighbors in Mexico have to do to help stop global warming? Nothing.

What about other so-called developing nations like Korea, China, India, and Brazil?

The treaty lets them off the hook.

Mr. President, this is not an equitable international policy.

This is not a level playing field for the United States.

Simply put, I believe the United States should not ratify this treaty as it stands.

I do not believe that this Nation has been a bad actor when it comes to characterizing our environmental public policy. In fact, I believe America has already set the example. An example which all Americans have through their taxes and prices on many commodities has already paid for. Unless all the citizens of the globe are involved, there is a clear inequity.

Mr. President, this does not mean I do not want to address the issue of curtailing carbon emissions.

It means that we should only participate in a fair, balanced equitable agreement where all nations must participate.

Is there such a thing as global warming?

We must admit that there is no consensus among scientists about the validity of this theory. While some cry that the polar ice caps are melting as we speak, others point out that the lower atmosphere has shown no statistically significant warming in the past 19 years.

I do not believe this is the place to launch a debate on the quality of the scientific data. I simply point out that the science is not settled or certain. So why rush into signing a legally binding and economically damaging international agreement?

This much is certain—in order for America to reach the treaty's goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2010, the United States will have to reduce their fossil fuel use by at least 25 percent.

How do those who advocate this treaty think this will impact our country?

Mr. President, let me give my colleagues some illustrations of what our Nation could face: First, energy taxes on energy use which would reduce economic growth by nearly 3 percent annually, increasing consumer costs by $110 billion; second, the loss of under 2 million American jobs, most of which will actually move overseas; and third, harm to the steel, basic chemicals, petroleum refining, aluminum, paper and cement industries, which would be targeted for severe restrictions by the treaty.

The Byrd-Hagel resolution states that the United States should not be a signatory to any agreement that would result in serious harm to the economy of the United States." I believe this is a reasonable and responsible action.

Mr. President, this treaty imposes very serious burdens on our economy with little environmental gain. This is just not a sound public policy.

I have but one question for those who want to sign the treaty: How can America help the global environment by wreaking havoc and permanent harm on our own economy?

This administration says that the United States—all alone—should decrease its energy use for 40 years before the developing nations are required to participate. There is no guarantee that these developing nations will be any more interested in curtailing their energy use then than they are now. Today, China is accelerating its use of fossil fuels, and by 2015, will likely pass the United States in total carbon emissions. Is it fair to let them off the hook now while we are subject to such stringent regulation?

The Byrd-Hagel resolution would require developing nations to comply with the same regulations at the same time in the same treaty as the United States. This is not only equitable, it is the only way that there can be any real benefit to the global environment.

Mr. President, the debate over global warming is tremendously important to the future of all Americans. The threat of losing 2.5 percent of our GDP will impose enormous hardships on the average consumer. The treaty is essentially an attack on America's life style.

The United States has already spent more than a trillion dollars to clean the environment. American taxpayers must be assured that any new environmental programs actually provide benefits that outweigh their costs and that are grounded in sound science. At the same time, we must not enter into any international agreement that puts the United States at a significant disadvantage in the global arena.

Mr. President, I believe the Global Climate Change Treaty is unacceptable as it stands at the very least it needs the Byrd-Hagel correction.

I would like to thank and commend Senators BYRD and HAGEL for their dedicated efforts to educate our colleagues on this issue. I appreciate their leadership and thoughtful consideration of this important international environmental issue. Thank you, Senator BYRD and Senator HAGEL.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting the Byrd-Hagel resolution.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Byrd resolution.

I will vote for this resolution, first, because the concerns of American workers and industry must be considered in any treaty into which this country enters. This resolution unequivocally sends that message.

Second, it should be without dispute that developing nations must control their emissions if we are to reduce greenhouse gas. This resolution strengthens our bargaining position to ensure real, attainable standards are established for developing countries, too.

I want to make it clear, however, that I support a negotiated global warming treaty. I believe science and common sense mandate that we work to reduce emissions and increase forest conservation to offset emissions.

Regarding the developed-developing nation debate, I believe it is also clear that we developed nations have historically emitted more greenhouse gases per capita than have developing countries. In addition, we are economically more able to absorb whatever increased costs occur based on the need to reduce emissions. Therefore, we should assist our neighbors through technology transfer, economic assistance, and joint ventures in meeting whatever emissions goals are established.

I offer my strong support to the administration as it continues negotiations to reduce greenhouse gases worldwide. I thank Senator BYRD for strengthening the American bargaining position with this resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Byrd/Hagel resolution. This legislation expresses the sense of the Senate regarding the conditions for the United States to become a signatory to any international agreement on global climate change. Consideration of this legislation is critical to shaping the upcoming debate on global climate issues and amending the Framework Convention on Global Climate Change. An upcoming meeting in Kyoto, Japan, has the potential to cripple our economic potential, while allowing the emissions from less developed nations to grow unchecked.

The Rio Treaty signed by President Bush called for industrialized nations to voluntarily reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels or lower by the year 2000. All but two countries will miss the goals, including the United States which missed the mark by 11 percent. The administration blames this on low fuel prices and a strong economy. Mr. President, this is not a liability or something the United States should apologize for.

Nonetheless, in an effort to reverse this success, the Clinton administration signed on to the Berlin mandate in 1995. This is an agreement of industrialized nations to further reduce emissions after 2000. Unfortunately, this agreement exempts 130 developing countries from reductions or commitments in greenhouse gases. This enormous loophole will guarantee the failure of this agreement. In 1996, the administration decided that it would use the Berlin mandate to create a new treaty with legally binding mandates on emission levels.

Mr. President, I am very concerned with the administration's intention to sign an agreement that commits the United States to legally-binding emissions levels that will not achieve significant environmental gains. The fatal flaw of this agreement is that it exempts developing nations, including China which is estimated to exceed the United States in greenhouse gas emissions by 2015. By 2010, the share of U.S. global emissions will fall from 20 percent to just 10 percent as developing nations continue to grow in population and industrial capability. By the year 2100, developing nations are estimated to produce three-quarters of the total greenhouse gases.

In testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on July 21, Under Secretary Tim Wirth argued this agreement was like a row boat and the United States should "pull a heavier oar at the beginning; over time, we must all pull together."

Mr. President, anybody who has ever operated a rowboat knows that when you pull harder on one oar you end up going in circles. And that is precisely what this agreement will do. It won't achieve any net environmental gains and worse, will succeed in sending our economy into a tailspin.

Left unchanged, this agreement will provide a significant advantage to our competitors. In order to achieve lower emission levels, new energy costs and other costly regulatory burdens required to reduce energy use reduce our competitive advantage in all industries. It is likely to force our most energy-intensive industries like steel.

aluminum, chemicals, refining, and paper production to move overseas. Mr. President, this is unacceptable.

Study after study has demonstrated that this agreement would cripple our economy. A DRI/McGraw Hill study shows our Nation's GDP would be reduced annually by 2 to 3 percent. According to the AFL-CIO, between 1.25 million and 1.5 million U.S. jobs would be lost. These jobs would reemerge in other countries where, as a result of the flawed agreement, emission levels and high energy taxes are not a concern. On top of this consumer costs would rise by $50 to $100 billion annually. Higher energy prices would mean increased costs on all goods including groceries, electricity, and gasoline.

Mr. President, I represent a State that this treaty puts right in the cross hairs. There are 25,000 people whose jobs are tied directly to the coal industry. Higher energy taxes, like the Btu tax proposed by this administration, hits coal harder than any other energy source. Thousands of well-paying jobs would be lost in my State as this administration seeks to eliminate coal as our primary energy source, while giving developing nations an unfair advantage.

It is important to keep in mind that coal provides over 50 percent of our power needs nationwide. This is the low cost fuel source that helps maintain this Nation's competitive edge and reduces increased dependency on foreign oil.

Not only would the Kentucky mining industry be devastated, but industries across my State would feel the impact of higher energy prices. As I noted earlier, industries like chemical, steel, paper, and aluminum would be greatly impacted. Three of our leading manufacturers General Electric, Ford and Toyota use significant amounts of energy. The 30,000 jobs at these facilities would all be threatened by our foreign competitors.

The Byrd/Hagel resolution addresses the unfairness in the agreement being considered by the administration. This resolution mandates specific scheduled commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emission for developing nations, with the same compliance period.

If every nation doesn't agree to the same emission levels and timetables, what incentive will they have to negotiate in the future when they have an overwhelming competitive advantage? It is important that we not bargain away the economic advantages we have worked so hard to achieve.

Passage of this resolution will send a clear message to the administration when they begin negotiations in Kyoto. I am hopeful this will prevent the administration from signing an unacceptable agreement that puts the burden of cleaning up the environment on American workers just to have these gains wiped out by developing nations.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join me in sending a strong message to the administration by voting for the Byrd/Hagel resolution. This is a vote for jobs and a vote for the environment.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, later this year the 166 countries that signed the 1992 climate change treaty will meet in Kyoto, Japan. They will be seeking stronger measures to control a potential threat to the future of our planet and to the lives of everyone living today and children yet to be born.

The threat is easy to understand, even if the science is complicated and a bit uncertain. In hearings before the Environment and Public Works Committee earlier this month, a panel of respected scientists gave us their assessment of the problem.

They told us that man-made emissions of greenhouse gasses, such as carbon dioxide, have led to a distinct warming of the Earth over the past 100 years. More troubling, however was their prediction.

If left unchecked, the continued growth in these emissions, which trap the sun's heat, will have potentially serious effects. These consequences include shifting climate patterns and more frequent violent weather events, such as floods and droughts.

Now most areas of the country experience extreme weather conditions from time to time. But permanent shifts in climate patterns can seriously alter our lives and our economy.

For instance, in an agricultural State, such as Montana, the prospect of more flooding and longer dry spells is a threat to the livelihood of our farming and ranching families and their communities. And, if weather patterns change, crop yields can be seriously decreased.

These kinds of threats to our future are serious enough that we must take action to avoid them. We can begin by controlling our greenhouse gas emissions. And if we start with modest steps now, instead of waiting, we will likely avoid any serious economic disruptions.

In 1992, the Rio summit asked developed countries to lead the way. The climate change treaty committed these countries to voluntarily reduce their emissions of carbon dioxide to 1990 levels by 2000.

Unfortunately, the voluntary actions didn't work. The good intentions of most countries never translated into concrete results. So if we are to control these emissions, the new treaty must contain binding limits on emissions.

However, we also need to make another change in the 1992 treaty.

We certainly need binding controls on developed countries, which currently emit about 60 percent of global greenhouse gases. But we also need them on developing countries, which are responsible for the remaining 40 percent.

We simply can't reach a solution by addressing only 60 percent of the problem. Furthermore, unless all countries participate, we run the risk of giving our economic competitors an unfair advantage.

Yet developing countries are resisting such efforts. So how can we change their thinking? Perhaps by broadening our own.

Let me take one country, China, as an example. Why China? For one, because over the next 20 years, China will be responsible for one-third of the increase in greenhouse gas emissions.

For another because the United States has a lot of issues to deal with China on. Trade, human rights, regional security, and environmental protection, to name a few.

So despite fundamental disagreements on some issues, we share many mutual interests, including climate change.

China has more people potentially at risk from rising sea levels and violent weather than any other nation. It also has an urgent need to increase its domestic energy supplies. If we consider the broad array of interests we share, I suspect we will find ways to gain their support on climate change issues.

After all, China is a growing part of the problem, it must be part of the solution.

Another aspect of encouraging developing nations to participate in new emission controls is to include in the treaty flexible, market-based strategies, such as joint implementation and emissions trading.

Market-based strategies have been very successful here at home. For instance, the acid rain program in the 1990 Clean Air Act included trading of sulfur dioxide emissions credits.

This program stimulated technological innovation. It also reduced sulfur dioxide emissions at a cost that was less than one-tenth that predicted by industry.

By including similar programs in a climate change treaty, we can achieve greenhouse gas reductions at the lowest possible cost. It gives U.S firms the flexibility to comply with emission targets in a way that makes the most sense for them. And it will protect our worldwide economic competitiveness.

For developing countries, emission trading can give them access to new technology and financial support that will make it easier for them to comply with their new obligations.

The language contained in Senate Resolution 98 will help achieve the goal of including all countries in the new treaty.

It requires that the treaty mandate new specific scheduled commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions for developing country parties within the same compliance period as developed countries.

But since developing and developed nations are starting from different places, it makes sense to require different targets. Here again, the language crafted by Senator BYRD helps. It does not specify that developed and developing countries meet the same targets and timetables.

When Under Secretary of State Tim Wirth recently appeared before the Environment and Public Works Committee, he spoke in support of Senator BYRD's resolution. I believe he said it was "largely on the button." He added that the administration "very much agrees with the thrust of what [Senator BYRD] is saying related to developing country commitments."

So although the language of the resolution requires new commitments from developing countries, the administration should seek emission targets that are more consistent with their level of industrialization.

I plan to follow the treaty negotiations carefully to be sure that developing countries have agreed to commit to controlling their greenhouse gases.

And while the resolution unfortunately omits any mention of the need for market-based strategies to achieve the emissions targets, I believe the treaty must include them. They simply make much more sense for all countries than the command-and-control approach being advocated by some.

In closing, Mr. President, let me say that the toughest issues for democracies to handle are those in which the threat to society builds gradually, but inexorably, over time, such as with global climate change. We deal well with immediate crises.

My hope is that by debating this issue today, by passing this resolution, we will elevate the public discussion about climate change and avoid the need for a future crisis to spur us into action.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to comment on the resolution now before the Senate. It is clear from the number of Members who are signatories to this resolution that the majority of this Chamber has significant reservations, as it should, about the ratification of any international agreement on greenhouse gas emissions under the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change. I intend to vote for the resolution, but I must say I believe it does not go far enough in bringing to light the faults of the convention. I'd like to amplify some points that are touched upon only briefly in the resolution.

I am very concerned about the call to move away from voluntary goals, as framed in the original convention, toward legally binding emissions-limitation targets and timetables for the United States, as well as the other developed, or annex I, countries that are party to the convention. The 1992 treaty, ratified by the Senate, called for the economically developed countries to undertake voluntary actions to aim to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions. Unfortunately, the only major developed nations that will meet this voluntary target of 1990 levels by 2000 are Britain—because it switched its fuel for electricity production from heavily subsidized coal to North Sea natural gas—and Germany—because it is able to count efficiency gains from replacing its ancient East German powerplants. Despite the facts that the United States is expected to miss its own target by about 10 percent, the administration, by signing the Berlin mandate in March of 1995, now believes it is a good idea to pursue additional emissions reduction targets after the year 2000. The Berlin mandate, which was not presented to the Senate for approval, sets up a process to negotiate a new treaty that will: First, commit the United States, and other developed countries to a legally binding agreement—contrary to the earlier approved agreement; and second, specifically exempt the 130 developing countries, including the emerging economies of China, Mexico, and Korea, from any additional commitments.

It does not make sense, either environmentally or economically, to focus on the nations which are already spending billions on pollution control and making substantial progress, while ignoring the so-called developing countries. U.S. companies, using the best available technology, are able to eliminate a great deal of pollution from their emissions. To achieve an additional increment of pollution reduction requires a much larger amount of money to be spent. Because of the law of diminishing returns, the costs will heavily outweigh any benefits. However, in developing countries, where the pollution control technology is not be as advanced or widespread as it is here in the United States, a dollar spent on pollution control will stretch much further and achieve far more significant reductions in overall pollution. Thus, the cost/benefit ratio favors significant pollution reduction in developing, not developed, countries.

In addition to the simple cost/benefit analysis, many scientists predict the greatest increase of future greenhouse emissions will come from developing countries like China, Mexico, Brazil, and Korea. As much as 60 percent of global carbon emissions are expected to come from such countries in the next few decades, with China becoming the single-largest emitter in the near future. Since these countries are expected to produce the bulk of future greenhouse emissions, exempting them will not reduce net global emissions. Both cost-benefit analysis and common sense say that the most effective way to reduce net global pollution is to reduce emissions in the developing nations.

While I presume many supporters of this resolution agree that under no circumstances should the United States be subjected to legally binding emissions limitations, I believe the resolution is somewhat unclear. As I read it, it says the United States will agree to legally binding emissions if "the protocol or other agreements also mandates new specific scheduled commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions for developing country parties within the same compliance period." Unfortunately, I believe this condition is not sufficient. As many of you know, it has been interpreted by different people in different ways. Some read it to mean that the Senate will not approve a treaty that does not include identical emissions level and target date requirements. Others, however, have read the same language and determined that it means any treaty must have equal commitments when it comes to setting time tables but not emissions levels. Unfortunately, it is easy to set developing countries on a time table and allow them to continue to pollute in any amount they desire. The emissions levels can be easily set so that the developed countries have very stringent, and perhaps unattainable levels, while the developing countries have very lax, easily reached goals—all the while, all countries are operating within the same time table. The time table alone does not determine the amount of pollution emitted; the emission level is more important. Setting the developing countries to the same timetables without meaningful emissions limitations will not preclude them from emitting larger amounts of greenhouse gases. This approach, I believe, defeats the purpose of the treaty ratified by the Senate, which is to voluntarily reduce greenhouse-gas emissions on a global scale. The original intent was not to legally bind the annex I countries to set timetables and emissions levels while only requiring the developing countries to comply with parallel timetables but not the same emissions standards.

Also of concern is the fact that the administration is basing its climate-change policy on questionable science. The science on climate change is very much an open inquiry into an as-yet-unconfirmed phenomenon over which the scientific community remains sharply divided. Discrepancies exist in the evidence now being considered. So, before the administration binds the United States legally to costly, and possibly unnecessary, standards and goals, shouldn't we allow for the science on this matter to first evolve and, in turn, allow for us to base our decision on facts?

Finally, there is the question of why the United States would embark on a course of action that many scientists say would do little environmental good. A report released in January of this year, January 10, 1997, by the Congressional Research Service poses the question: "Given the scientific uncertainties regarding the magnitude, timing, rate, and regional consequences of the potential climatic change, what are the appropriate policy responses?" I believe the appropriate response is to wait for the science to evolve; not to leap into legally binding emission limits that, if developed, would not necessarily improve the environment and would cost American citizens billions of dollars.

Confirming this approach, Dr. Robert C. Balling, Jr. of Arizona State University issued a report entitled "Global

Warming: Messy Models, Decent Data, Pointless Policy." In it he states, "Global warming is presented as a crisis that can be stopped or minimized with appropriate policy actions. However, the evidence suggests that realistic policies are likely to have minimal climatic impact. Recent research also suggests that a delay in implementing policy responses will have little effect on the efficacy of global warming mitigation strategies." He continues: "It is absolutely imperative that the policies developed for the global warming issue be built on the best science." Mr. President, I could not agree more.

This December in Kyoto, Japan, the administration will further commit itself to the convention; it will be offering protocols to that instrument that lack the necessary support of the scientific community. Because we do not know enough to support these terms and allow for the administration to exploit the ends to justify the means for climate-change policy, the responsibility to ensure that the United States is not legally committed to reducing greenhouse-gas emissions will be placed in the hands of the U.S. Senate. We must preserve the right to question the validity of these protocols. Congressional oversight of the negotiations is crucial and any agreement reached in Kyoto must be brought before us for advice and consent. Once the science on this issue has evolved, we will then be able to base our laws on the science and avoid the costly mistake of basing the science on the laws.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Byrd resolution on global climate change and I urge my colleagues to support it. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution.

This resolution explains what the ground rules should be if the United States is to become a signer of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. This resolution would prohibit the ratification of any treaty that would seriously threaten the economy of the United States. It says that both industrialized nations and developing countries must share the burden of any globally binding treaty on climate change equally.

I support the Byrd resolution for one simple, but very compelling reason—jobs. For those of you who thought you'd hear a vacuum sound pulling jobs overseas following NAFTA implementation—you ain't heard nothin' yet. The only thing this treaty will do, the way it is written now, is destroy American industry as we know it. I will not be a party to any treaty or agreement that sends American jobs overseas. Business won't have any incentive to maintain or build new factories in the United States.

Let me be clear: I support international efforts to improve the environment. But the effort must truly be international if we are to make any progress. I do not believe efforts to control or reduce global warming will be successful unless rapidly developing countries are forced to take the kind of tough steps that the United States will have to take.

We cannot be a part of a binding international agreement that lets countries such as China, South Korea, and India off the hook. Developing nations do contribute to global warming. If we exempt them from the restrictions mandated for the industrialized nations, we will simply see a shifting of pollution, not a reduction. This is not what anyone wants to see happen.

The objective of the treaty being negotiated is to curb global climate change. The United States has already taken steps to achieve this goal. At the beginning of President Clinton's first term, he released his administration's version of a domestic climate change action plan.

This plan relies on a comprehensive set of voluntary actions by industry, utilities, and other large-scale energy users. It also promotes energy efficiency upgrades through new building codes in residential and commercial sectors. Large-scale tree planting and forest reserves are encouraged, as well as increased use of hydroelectric power sources.

These are important steps which will have a positive impact on our global climate. We certainly must continue to research causes of global climate change, and come up with scientifically sound solutions. Our viability as a nation and planet depends on it.

But we cannot throw away American jobs based on a plan that could have only a marginal impact on climate change. Coming up with the right plan should have little effect on the American economy, because it will mean an overall sustainability of the global environment, and the continuation of the United States as a leader of technological and industrial innovation.

Once again, Mr. President, I support this commonsense resolution, which will simply ensure that American jobs won't be lost as we address the issue of global climate change. I am hopeful we can pass this resolution and move on to the next stage of protecting our global environment. I thank the Chair.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support and, as an original cosponsor, of Senate Resolution 98, the Byrd-Hagel global warming resolution.

I want to thank the Senate leadership and Senators BYRD and HAGEL, for scheduling floor time for this important initiative before negotiators begin talks in Bonn, Germany.

The administration's current go-at-it-alone plan regarding global climate change is grossly unfair to the United States.

I am opposed to setting legally binding targets and timetables on the United States and other developed countries to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, while at the same time exempting China, Mexico, Brazil, South Korea, and India from those identical regulations.

This will only worsen the problem the administration claims it wants to fix.

Developing countries are projected to continue increasing their use of fossil fuels.

And by the year 2015, China alone is expected to surpass the United States in total carbon emissions.

The Clinton administration's plan will also drive the economy down and send jobs overseas.

The AFL–CIO estimates that between 1.25 and 1.5 million American jobs would go overseas.

And the plan would put the United States at a severe competitive disadvantage and reduce our GDP by $200 billion.

Nevertheless, the administration—led by Under Secretary of State Tim Wirth—is on a mad rush to sign a legally binding treaty in Kyoto, Japan, this December.

This is in spite of:

Uncertain global warming science;

The administration's unwillingness to reveal its final targets and timetables for emissions reductions; and

The fact that they have now thrown out their economic analysis models, which were supposed to help guide policy makers.

The Byrd-Hagel resolution addresses these discrepancies.

It would direct the United States not to sign any agreement that would:

"Mandate new commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions, unless it also mandates specific scheduled commitments to reduce gas emissions for developing countries within the same compliance period"; and

"Result in serious harm to the economy of the United States."

Sixty-four of my colleagues have cosponsored this initiative and I urge their support of this resolution.

Mr. President, I strongly encourage the administration to listen to the concerns being expressed by this Chamber. Be honest with us and the American people, and realize that we will not ratify any treaty which commits the United States to one set of standards to reduce gas emissions, but will let China, India, Mexico, and other developing countries off the hook.

We ought to focus on bringing all of the countries of the world to the table. Everyone ought to contribute to the cause.

Asking all nations to contribute—within the same compliance period—will help the environment and help U.S. industries stay competitive.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my support for Senate Resolution 98 regarding the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change. Like my colleagues in the Senate, I too am concerned about the effects on the economy of any national or international agreements that the United States enters into. I am particularly concerned with any agreement that may impact the well-being of the American public and the ecological balance of this Nation. The U.N.

Framework Convention on Climate Change has the potential to do both.

The United States is scheduled to join with leaders of 160 nations in Kyoto, Japan in December of this year to conclude negotiations on a global climate change treaty. The Kyoto summit is the latest in a series of meetings that have been held since this body ratified the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change in 1992. At Kyoto, the United States and other countries hope to adopt a protocol or legal instrument to deal with the threat of climate change in the post 2000 period.

It is my belief that the United States must take the leadership role in these negotiations, and steer the course to achieve an equitable, reasoned approach to global climate change mitigation, an approach that seeks inclusion of all countries and that offers a solution to the issue. While I believe the resolution before us will allow such an approach, I want to emphasize to the administration the essential nature of a negotiated framework to which all countries can accede.

Before I summarize my analysis of the need for global action, let me review the facts. First, global climate change is real. If it were not, 160 countries would not be meeting to address it. However, there are uncertainties about the effects of global climate change—uncertainties relative to the timing, the magnitude, and regional patterns of climate change. We must acknowledge these uncertainties, but acknowledge also that they do not justify inaction.

As stated recently by Dr. William Nordhaus of Yale University: "The results (of studies) definitely reject inaction; uncertainty alone cannot justify waiting for the revealed truth to act, particularly when the revealed truth, if it ever comes, is probably going to arrive at the point where the effects are irreversible."

Second, a leading indicator of climate change is increased emissions of global greenhouse gases. Concentrations of atmospheric carbon dioxide—the largest component of greenhouse gas emissions—are about 26 percent higher now than they were 100 years ago. Also, globally averaged air temperatures at the Earth's surface have warmed by nearly 1 degree Fahrenheit over the last 100 years.

Increased emissions of greenhouse gases are virtually entirely due to the activities of man. As a general rule, a country's greenhouse gas emissions rise in concert with increased industrialization. It is no surprise, then, that the United States is the greatest emitter of greenhouse gases, both in terms of gross and per capita emissions. However, the emissions of some developing countries are rapidly escalating, and the emissions of some are expected to surpass that of this country in the first quarter of the next century.

Which takes me back to my call for U.S. leadership. As the world's industrial leader, the United States should take a clear lead in negotiating a framework for all countries to participate in global climate change abatement. A global approach, and global participation, is requisite to a successful outcome. This approach may require a new framework and a fresh look at timetables and current directions. My understanding of the data is that we have time to do this—we have time to assess where we are and how best to craft equitable policies. But inaction is not appropriate.

The resolution before us requires commitments of developing countries to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions in the same timeframes as developed countries. This may resonate as promoting a policy that discourages the participation of many developing countries. However, the resolution will allow developing countries appropriate flexibilities in commitments to address global climate change abatement. The United States and other developed countries must accord newly developed and developing countries flexibilities and incentives to participate, and these need not create economic disadvantages to the United States or any other developed country.

I cannot emphasize enough the importance of this point. Without all countries on board, inaction becomes inevitable, because emission reductions achieved by one country will soon be offset by increased emissions from another.

An equitable approach that encourages commitments by all parties and that offers incentives to developing countries is needed. Market-based solutions to curb emissions will allow continued economic growth with minimal impacts. Developed countries are in a better position to implement emissions-curbing activities and technologies at low cost and impact, and to also transfer these abilities and technologies to developing countries and to aid in their economic advancement in a way that tempers emissions growth.

While measures to stabilize greenhouse gases at a certain level will inevitably lead to some energy price increases, an international emissions-trading scheme could substantially reduce the potential costs. What is needed, however, is a policy to ensure that incremental costs of reducing or stabilizing emissions are equalized across firms, across sectors, and across countries. This can only occur if we take into account the economies, emissions and abilities of countries to participate, and if we assign actions accordingly and in appropriate timeframes.

Market mechanisms can reduce cost impacts of emissions reductions agreements. A preferable policy would be to set short- and long-term goals to stabilize greenhouse gas emissions, and to set quantity limits on emissions that are linked to prices. Targets and timetables for emission limitations cannot operate independently of market prices. An international tradeable emissions permits system, with price caps and floors, would have revenue potential and would be cost-efficient.

Technology transfer and development is an important policy aspect for the abatement of global climate change. The United States and other developing countries have within our current capabilities technologies which can lead to dramatic reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. We can increase the efficiencies of industry, of transportation, of many energy-intensive activities, all with what we already know. By implementing these capabilities and by transferring these technologies to developing countries we can curb emissions significantly. Continued technology development is also necessary.

Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, we must continue to advance the science related to these policies and to allow policy changes as the data warrant.

Mr. President, I conclude my remarks by repeating that I, too, am concerned about any agreements or policies that effect the well being of this country. However, I believe it is in our best interests and that of the world community to approach global climate change in an inclusive, proactive manner that seeks continued economic growth. That approach demands action, and global coalition building, and it is incumbent upon the United States to steer that course.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senate Resolution 98. The negotiations on limiting post-2000 emissions of greenhouse gas emissions which are scheduled to conclude in December in Kyoto, Japan, will have significant impact on all Americans. This resolution addresses concerns that the administration has chosen to ignore while pursuing an international agreement that will bind the United States for decades to come.

Science should lead policy. Once again, the administration is pursuing an environmental policy that is based on insufficient research and analysis. Many in the scientific community believe that we are still years away from computer models that can confidently link global warming to human activity. Yet without strong scientific data the administration is ready to commit the United States to binding action that will impose economic and social burdens on every American.

Recently, the Department of Energy released a report by the Argonne National Laboratory containing several troubling findings on the effects of the proposed treaty on our economy. Among the conclusions, the study found that without requiring developing countries to meet the same emissions standards as the rest of the world, up to hundreds of thousands of U.S. jobs will move overseas to so-called developing countries that have refused to participate in any new climate agreement. Higher energy prices will lead manufactures to produce les

at higher costs resulting in job loss, higher consumer prices and an inability to compete in a global marketplace. This will devastate our Nation. Yet, the administration is pushing to commit the American people to participate.

The developed countries should not shoulder the responsibility for reducing greenhouse gas emissions around the world. It seems obvious that in the long-run increasing emissions in developing countries will far outweigh any actions taken by the developed countries. Any binding actions by the United States must be accompanied by binding commitments from developing countries. I believe a majority of Americans would agree that devastating our Nation's economy by promoting industry flight overseas is not the answer to a global issue.

The public has a right to know how the administration's commitments requiring them to reduce fossil fuel energy will be accomplished and how their lives, jobs, and futures will be affected. I am greatly disturbed that the administration has not sought, and therefore has not received, support from Congress or the American public on this matter.

Mr. President, the American people deserve an open, objective and honest debate on the development of U.S. climate change policy. Without that, I can not and I will not support committing the United States to limiting post-2000 greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Senate Resolution 98. I believe climate change is a serious problem that requires credible action by the international community. Negotiations on an international agreement to limit greenhouse gas emissions will conclude this December in Kyoto, Japan. This is an essential step in the long-term, global efforts to deal with climate change. While I support Senate resolution's call for increased involvement of developing countries in the Kyoto agreement, the resolution does not take into account other key components of the treaty that are essential to its success, particularly for the United States' business community.

The scientific basis for moving forward with an international agreement to limit greenhouse gas emissions is compelling and significant. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change—a group of 2,500 expert scientists representing more than 50 countries, the ever-increasing emissions of greenhouse gases from human activities are changing the global climate. Given the potential impacts of climate change predicted by the IPCC—more droughts, more floods, sea level rise, water scarcity, and increased incidence of infectious diseases—it is not surprising that nations of the world agreed to find more effective ways to understand and deal with the problem. If we don't agree to long-term greenhouse gas limits soon, and instead wait to see how our climate changes, it may be too late. Greenhouse gases remain in the atmosphere for decades to centuries, and there is a long lag time between when gases are emitted and when the climate consequences of those emissions appear. So we need to begin reductions soon to have any long-term effect. And, a new generation of energy-efficient technologies requires a long lead time for development and implementation. This won't happen without clear signals to the market that an international agreement on climate change would provide.

Senate Resolution 98 focuses on the role of developing countries in the Kyoto agreement. The principles expressed in the resolution regarding developing countries are on target. Climate change cannot be solved by the developed countries alone—we are indeed all in the same boat.

New commitments by developing countries regarding their performance under the Framework Convention on Climate Change, of course, need to be consistent with their historic responsibility for the problem, as well as their current capabilities. The ground rules for the negotiations—the Berlin mandate—recognize these common, but differentiated responsibilities.

It is clear that the Berlin mandate can be carried out in a way that is consistent with Senate Resolution 98. The resolution says that developing countries can start with a commitment that is lower relative to the industrialized countries at first. Over time, however, the commitments of developing and developed countries must become comparable to ensure that every country does its fair share to address the problem.

Senate Resolution 98 states that developing countries have to start making quantified emissions reductions objectives within the same compliance period as developed countries. This means that at a stage to be negotiated over the compliance period of the Kyoto agreement, developing countries must begin to make quantified emissions reductions objectives. Senate Resolution 98 says that it is entirely appropriate for industrialized countries to start making quantified emissions reductions first, as long as developing countries also commit to making quantified emissions reductions before the end of the time period worked out for the Kyoto agreement. I agree with this basic approach—the sooner developing countries take on quantified emissions reductions targets, the sooner we can achieve a global solution to the climate problem.

At the same time, I am concerned that the resolution does not take into account other key components of the treaty that are essential to protect U.S. competitiveness. I am concerned that elevating one issue to a level of importance that will overshadow other key matters may harm the United States' efforts to ensure that the climate agreement is realistic, achievable, and will not harm the U.S. economy. For example, the need for flexibility in implementing a treaty is critical to protect U.S. competitiveness. Some countries, such as members of the European Union, would prefer highly prescriptive policies and measures to meet reduction targets. The United States' negotiating team has made flexibility an absolute prerequisite for any agreement, and I want to commend them for this approach. I believe that, to be acceptable, our businesses must have the most flexibility possible to find the least-cost ways to reduce emissions. This means the agreement must contain provisions that are so important to our business community: emissions trading, joint implementation between nations, and appropriate credits for those countries that have already made certain emissions reductions. Senate Resolution 98 is silent regarding these provisions.

As we grapple with the human judgments and values that inevitably will determine how we handle climate change, we must base our actions on the facts—the scientific evidence of climate change, the physical effects that are likely to result from it, and the ways we can credibly address this problem on a global basis. While Senate Resolution 98 is only part of a bigger picture that needs to be addressed, it is a step toward adressing this global issue.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for the Byrd-Hagel resolution regarding global climate change. I was an original cosponsor of this bipartisan resolution, and I believe it sends an important, commonsense message that we cannot enter into a treaty that requires the United States to limit its emissions of greenhouse gases without requiring developing countries to also agree to limitations on their emissions. Such a proposal would not make environmental sense and it certainly would not make sense for our Nation's economy.

This resolution is very simple. It says that a treaty will not be ratified by the U.S. Senate if it does not include both developed and developing countries in binding timetables and emission limitations. It seems to me that the only way the world will be able to stabilize the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere is if every nation participates in a meaningful way in limiting its emissions. The resolution does not say that all countries must make identical emission reductions; only that they must be participants in limiting greenhouse gas emissions in the same timeframe as the developed world.

Mr. President, I fear that a treaty that requires us to place significant restrictions on our economy will only lead to a flight of jobs and capital from this country to nations that do not face greenhouse gas emissions limitations. That could be a potential disaster for our Nation's economy, for its

workers, and for our long-term economic stability and growth. So the Byrd resolution also requires the administration to develop a detailed analysis of the potential financial costs and other impacts on our economy. That is not an unreasonable request. We would clearly need to know the potential consequences of any treaty on our Nation's economy before the Senate could be asked to ratify such a treaty.

Mr. President, the U.S. Senate has a constitutional duty to advise and consent on treaties negotiated by the administration with other nations. This is a responsibility I take very seriously, and I know every other Member of this body considers it one of our most important duties. I hope the administration will listen carefully to the debate on this resolution, and pay close attention to the guidance provided in the Byrd-Hagel resolution as it negotiates with other nations in preparation for a final meeting in December in Kyoto, Japan.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, does Senator KERRY wish to go forward? Is he prepared?

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, might I inquire? How much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-five minutes.

Mr. KERRY. How much for the other side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has 16 minutes.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, if I may, I would like to ask if I might be able to enter into a colloquy with the Senator from West Virginia at this time.

Mr. HAGEL. May I ask? Point of inquiry. Is this on the time of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, this is on my time.

Mr. HAGEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I would like to ask the views of the Senator from West Virginia on the proposal by the Europeans to erect the so-called European bubble, and its effect on U.S. competitiveness.

It appears to me that this proposal is driven more by economic considerations than concern for limiting carbon dioxide emissions.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. KERRY. I yield to the Senator for his views on that.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator has asked this question. Earlier he had indicated that we had agreed on certain things. We agreed on one thing: that we would enter into a colloquy. And I always reserve the right to express my own views on matters, and not necessarily agree to the expressions of others as to how they think and what they think I say.

May I say that I am only expressing a personal viewpoint here. The Senator said earlier that there were Senators in this body who signed onto the resolution who want to kill the treaty. That may be so. This Senator is not one of those. I am not out to kill the treaty. But what I was out to say—and the reason I got behind this effort—was to send a message to the administration that if the Senate is not included in the takeoff, if the Senate is not included at the beginning, if the Senate is intended to be shut out of doing its constitutional responsibility of advising as well as consenting in making a treaty, then count me out.

If you want to really kill this treaty, abide by the Berlin Mandate and let the developing countries off the hook until some future time. That is what will surely kill the treaty, and I will join in stabbing it in the heart, if that is the case. If that treaty comes back here and the developing countries are left off the hook, count me in on the assassination of the treaty. It will be done in public view. It won't be behind a bush.

Mr. President, the Senator raised an important point. The Europeans have erected what they call a bubble, which is simply a mechanism for them to trade off emissions levels from one country to another so long as they honor overall an average which conforms to the treaty-imposed cap on developed country emissions. This is viewed by some, including me, as a technique to maximize the economic competitiveness of European countries by keeping emissions reductions to a minimum as a result of the trades that would be available under the bubble from one country to another within the European Union.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, let me just also say to the Senator that I agree completely with his notion, as I said earlier, of the importance of our advising here about the importance of other countries being part of the solution.

But I ask if the Senator would agree that the United States is placed at a disadvantage by this concept of the European bubble, and that the inclusion of free-market mechanisms in a treaty—particularly emissions trading schemes and so-called joint implementation—could be used to counter that challenge.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Senator would yield.

Mr. KERRY. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I believe that if the United States is going to enter into binding commitments to limit or reduce our greenhouse gas emissions, we need to remain competitive vis-a-vis the Europeans, and everybody else, for that matter. Therefore, an emissions trading mechanism whereby we can exchange our higher level emissions by buying emissions credits from, let us say, Russia or other nations with lower emissions, is an example of one potential tool that the U.S. negotiators might explore in the climate change negotiations.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator agree further that an emissions trading scheme also has the beneficial effect of easing the economic cost that might be incurred by U.S. industry as a result of a regime of binding commitments entered into at Kyoto?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I personally believe that it could have such an effect. There are a number of other tools that are under development, and these, in my judgment, should be further explored for inclusion in the proposed treaty in order that our own economic growth not be penalized by the treaty. These tools include joint implementation involving partnerships among industries in the developed and developing countries. There are, as well, many areas where other U.S. programs and initiatives could be enhanced to further the same objectives, such as cooperative technology ventures and enhanced research and development of both fossil fuel development technologies and alternate fuel technologies. These tools and programs may also have an advantage in encouraging the developing world to make meaningful binding commitments. So they should be explored as a natural companion to provisions establishing binding commitments.

The purpose would be to level the competitive playing field so that the United States is not placed at a disadvantage and to help insure that all the world's economies will share the responsibilities to tackle the global warming problem.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his explanation and his views.

I believe that the administration must pursue the development of these tools and initiatives and their inclusion in any binding treaty that is arrived at in order to reduce any negative impact of higher energy prices on our economy. And I believe this would certainly enhance the prospects of Senate approval of any treaty that is arrived at.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator will again yield, in general, I personally agree with this overall proposition, although I would note the administration has not yet settled on its specific policies regarding the negotiations, and it leads to further work on developing and explaining the workings of these market mechanisms so that they will be more fully understood.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia for those views and for entering into this colloquy with me.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, the issue of the extent to which human-induced global climate change is occurring, and the proper societal response

to this change, is one of the most difficult public policy issues facing us today.

We are emitting into the atmosphere an unprecedented amount of the gases that we know trap heat in the Earth's atmosphere, and thus result in what is known as the greenhouse effect. At the same time, the connection between this artificial elevation of greenhouse gas levels and changes to the world's climate is only slowly coming into view. The global climate system is extremely complex, and we are still making major scientific discoveries about the components of that system. The consensus of the world's climate scientists on the human contribution to global climate change has recognized both these uncertainties and the growing evidence that there is a human fingerprint on climate change. The key conclusion of the most recent consensus report of the global change scientific community is as follows:

(Our ability to quantify the human influence on global climate is currently limited because the expected signal is still emerging from the noise of natural [climate] variability, and because there are uncertainties in key factors. These include the magnitude and patterns of long term natural variability and the time-evolving pattern of forcing by, and response to, changes in concentrations of greenhouse gases and aerosols, and land surface changes. Nevertheless, the balance of evidence suggests that there is a discernible human influence on global climate.

The current state of uncertainty should not be a cause for comfort. There is a substantial lag in global climate response, so even if we were to magically reduce our greenhouse gas emissions to zero tomorrow, the world's climate would still be responding, over the next few decades, to past emissions. It is also clear that the global climate system is not a well-behaved linear system, like traveling on a straight road over a gentle predictable hill. It is more like a wild mountainous road, full of unexpected curves and cliffs. In such a situation, ignorance of what might lie ahead is not bliss, and it is prudent to slow down until you have a better appreciation of what you are dealing with.

For this reason, we are engaged in international negotiations to discuss how the world might arrive at a joint international plan for slowing down the emissions of the principal greenhouse gas, carbon dioxide, into the atmosphere. Because of the central role that burning carbon plays in our energy, transportation, and economic systems, it is important that such discussions focus on sophisticated, as opposed to simple-minded, approaches to the problem.

I believe that the Clinton administration deserves credit for having put forth, in the current negotiation, what is easily the most complete and sophisticated proposal of any that has been advanced to date.

The administration's proposal rejects the command-and-control approaches put forward by many of the other parties.

The administration's proposal, instead, relies on market-based mechanisms for controlling the rate of future emissions of greenhouse gases, extending our successful experience to date in this country with such mechanisms for controlling emissions of sulfur dioxide.

The administration's proposal allows for maximum flexibility on the part of each participating country in designing and implementing greenhouses gas control measures that make economic sense for that country.

The administration's proposal encourages the development and use of advanced technologies.

These approaches—market-based mechanisms, individual flexibility, and more reliance on advanced technologies in place of command and control—are precisely the approaches that so many of my colleagues said should be at the basis of all regulatory policy, during consideration of the Dole-Johnston regulatory reform bill in the last Congress. It is commendable that the administration has made these approaches the foundation for its negotiating position.

The central issue for us today is the role that the United States and other developed countries will play in any effort to control greenhouse gas emissions, compared to the role that developing countries will play. Here, too, the administration has shown considerable sophistication, compared to other parties in the negotiations. All developing countries are not alike—there is a world of difference between South Korea and Gambia, despite the fact that both are non-annex-I countries. The world should expect more from South Korea, which aspires to join the OECD in the near future, than it should from Gambia. But there should also be a minimum level of expectations mandated by the upcoming agreement, even for countries like Gambia.

I believe that a careful examination of the proposal put forward by the administration shows that it is trying to make these principles part of the protocol. We should go on record, in this resolution, in support of such principles. But we need to do so in a careful and sophisticated way, befitting the complexities of the problem of human-induced global climate change, and the international policy response to it.

I did not cosponsor the resolution that is now before us because of my concerns about how it expressed the relationship between what the United States should do and what the developing countries should do. It used the words "new commitments" for both developed and developing countries in a way that suggested to me, at least, that the intent of the resolution was that the United States should not agree to any commitment that was not also going to be agreed to and implemented simultaneously by the world's poorest countries. That would seem to be a rather simplistic approach. We shouldn't ignore legitimate differences between countries at vastly different stages of development.

I was greatly encouraged by the remarks on this issue made by the sponsor of this resolution, the senior Senator from West Virginia, when he testified before the Committee on Foreign Relations. At that time, he stated that countries at different levels of development should make unique and binding commitments of a pace and kind consistent with their industrialization, and that the schedule for these commitments should be aggressive and effective, but also consistent with a fair sharing of any burden. These are principles that I support, and the senior Senator from West Virginia and I have entered into a colloquy that seeks to establish that the explanation of the resolution on this point that he provided in his testimony is, in fact, the normative one for the administration to heed, once we pass the resolution. With this clarification, I believe that I can support the resolution now before us, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I would like to engage in a colloquy with the senior Senator from West Virginia regarding the correct interpretation of the language of the resolution on one particular point of importance. The resolution refers to "new commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions for the Annex I Parties" as well as to "new specified scheduled commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions for Developing Country Parties." Would it be correct to interpret the use of the words "new commitments" in both phrases as suggesting that the United States should not be a signatory to any protocol unless Annex I Parties and Developing Country Parties agree to identical commitments?

Mr. BYRD. That would not be a correct interpretation of the resolution. In my testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations on June 19, I made the following statement and deliberately repeated it for emphasis: "Finally, while countries have different levels of development, each must make unique and binding commitments of a pace and kind consistent with their industrialization." I believe that the developing world must agree in Kyoto to binding targets and commitments that would begin at the same time as the developed world in as aggressive and effective a schedule as possible given the gravity of the problem and the need for a fair sharing of the burden. That is what the resolution means. The resolution should not be interpreted as a call for identical commitments between Annex I Parties and Developing Country Parties.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I thank the Senator. I agree with him that a fair sharing of responsibility for actions to address global climate change is crucial to any agreement, and that such commitments should reflect the pace and type of industrialization that those countries have achieved.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, earlier this week I met with Senator BYRD to discuss S. Res. 98, which, of course, deals with climate change. In this measure, the Senator has identified one of the more important features required to address this global problem, namely, global participation.

Gradually, many have come to the conclusion that man is indeed contributing to changes in the global climate. Human activities—particularly the burning of fossil fuels—have increased atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide and other trace greenhouse gases. These gases, combined with the natural levels of CO_2 and water vapor, act like panes of a greenhouse and retain the Sun's heat around the earth.

The burning of fossil fuels has continued to grow, at least in ever greater amounts of CO_2. Global carbon emissions from fossil fuels reached a record of just over 6 billion tons in 1995.

The Earth's climate has remained stable for the past 10,000 years. But, as Ambassador Paul Nitze said in the Washington Post earlier this month, "Global warming threatens the stability that fostered modern civilization."

What is being done about this threat? Of the 35 industrial countries that committed themselves under the 1992 Framework Convention on Climate Change in Rio, they agreed there to hold their greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels in the year 2000. In other words, by the year 2000 we would get the levels down to what they were in 1990.

But, regrettably, Mr. President, only a handful of the countries are expected to meet that target. The United States will miss its target by an estimated 13 percent. In some developing countries, emissions are on a course to nearly double between 1990 and 2000.

The failure by many industrialized countries to meet these voluntary aims is what is leading us to this debate today. This debate is over the imposition of legally binding greenhouse gas emissions reductions. In other words, should we enter something that is binding?

Because of the link between greenhouse gases and activities fundamental to industrialized and developing economies, many anticipate, or at least fear, that the costs of limiting their emissions will be high.

Unlike most other ambient air and water pollution problems, there is no pollution control technology for CO_2. In many of the emissions problems we have dealt with in the past, technology can reduce the amount of emissions. But we don't have that for CO_2. You either make CO_2 or you don't.

Some have argued that the United States and, indeed the entire world, should wait to address the looming threat of climate change. In other words, don't do anything. Let's wait awhile. The scientists are divided on this. How much has the temperature gone up? Has it indeed risen in the last 100 years by 1 degree Fahrenheit? There are arguments over that. "Time is on our side," some say, believing that if we simply wait long enough, new and inexpensive technologies will come along to make this solution painless.

But the citizens of my State, for example, have concerns. We are a seabordering State. There are possibilities of rises in the sea level which would affect us dramatically. Indeed, they would affect all but one major city in our country because all but one major city in our country occupies tidal shorelines. I know that if the Atlantic Ocean begins to warm and expands as it warms, rising sea levels will be with us for centuries.

I am also concerned about the economic consequences of actions to address global warming. Senator BYRD has addressed these, and I salute him for that. He is concerned about the issue of U.S. competitiveness in relation to developing countries. And I join with him in urging our negotiators to recognize that we are serious about the concerns Senator BYRD is expressing.

The position taken by the European Union is a major concern. As representatives of the Global Climate Coalition indicated to the Foreign Relations Committee last month, the prospect of European Union bubble, which was just addressed here, with no ability for the United States to address similar alliances with other nations, would permit the European Union to steal a competitive march on the United States.

This concerns me. In trade terms, our bilateral trade with the European Union, of course, is mammoth certainly when compared to the trade that we have with China. Last year we had $128 billion in exports to the European Union, more than 10 times of that going to China.

I believe our negotiators in Kyoto would fail us if they did not bring home an agreement with developing country commitments as described in the resolution and with the market-based tools of joint implementation emissions trading and emissions banking.

I want to say that many countries in the U.S. are already taking steps to address these problems. Farsighted companies like Tucson Electric are going ahead with a pilot joint implementation project in cooperation with the city of Sava in Honduras to display diesel-fired power generation with biomass fuels. Companies like American Electric Power, which is the largest electric utility in West Virginia, and British Petroleum are getting together with the Nature Conservancy and the Government of Bolivia to offset some of American Electric Power's coal-fired plant emissions by expanding parks and sustainable forests in Bolivia.

The Southern Co. has joined forces with State forestry commissions in planting 20 million trees in Georgia, Alabama, and the Florida Panhandle. These projects boost environmental protection while lowering costs. But on their own, the voluntary projects will not be sufficient to address the potential problem. We need legally binding measures to spur technological innovation that will be needed to solve the greenhouse problem.

The resolution makes clear that an exemption for developing countries would be inconsistent with the need for global action.

In light of the seriousness of the issue, Mr. President, I welcome the concern that Senator BYRD and others have shown for the twin goals of environmental protection and economic competitiveness.

Mr. President, I had a brief colloquy I was going to enter into with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. It is as follows:

Senate Resolution 98 includes two important conditions for U.S. agreements to any future treaty to limit greenhouse gases.

Quoting directly from the text of the resolution—that is, Senator BYRD's resolution:

The United States should not be a signatory to any protocol to, or other agreement regarding, the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change of 1992, at negotiations in Kyoto in December 1997, or thereafter, which would—(A) mandate new commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the Annex I Parties, unless the protocol or other agreement also mandates new specific scheduled commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions for Developing Country Parties within the same compliance period, or (B) would result in serious harm to the economy of the United States.

Without losing my right to the floor, I wish to ask the primary sponsor of the resolution a couple of questions.

I am curious as to whether the Senator from West Virginia intends for his resolution to speak to the scientific understanding of global climate change.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield with the understanding that the time——

Mr. CHAFEE. On my time.

Mr. BYRD. I use will not be charged against Mr. HAGEL.

Mr. CHAFEE. Absolutely.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, again, may I say that this resolution has been introduced and developed every step along the way with concurrence between Mr. HAGEL and myself. It just so happens that my name is at the beginning of what is called the Byrd-Hagel resolution. I have no problem if it is called the Hagel-Byrd resolution; we are both in this resolution. We both believe the words of the resolution, and we both believe that the resolution speaks for itself. And we also understand we may have different views as to specific questions. I respect the views of every Senator. So I will attempt to respond to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. I thank him for his statement which indicates that he is concerned, has studied the matter, and is a reasonable man.

I thank Mr. CHAFEE for this opportunity to discuss in greater detail the

resolution that Mr. HAGEL and I and others of our colleagues have brought to the Senate. In response to the Senator's question, I will repeat a portion of the testimony I delivered on June 19 of this year before the Committee on Foreign Relations. There I stated that the resolution accepts the thesis, which is still the subject of some dispute, that the increasing release of carbon dioxide—CO_2—and its accumulation in our atmosphere are causing a very gradual heating of the globe which has many adverse consequences for us all and I am, indeed, convinced that climate change is a looming threat to the global environment. That is a statement I made at that time.

Mr. CHAFEE. I appreciate the Senator's fundamental candor on this point and agree with his assessment.

With regard to specific provisions contained in the resolution, I am interested in what the Senator intends—and I might say Senator HAGEL has been active in all of this. He is the chief cosponsor of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). Will the Senator suspend. The time allotted, the 10 minutes allotted to the Senator has expired.

Mr. CHAFEE. Could I have 2 more minutes?

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. Senator HAGEL has been active in all of this, and we have dealt with his folks, and wherever I refer to the Byrd resolution, I really should have referred to the Byrd-Hagel resolution and will attempt to make that change in the transcript.

With regard to specific provisions contained in the resolution, I am interested in what the Senators intend on page 4, lines 9 through 11 by the phrase "new specific scheduled commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions for developing country parties."

Is it the Senators' intentions that the developing country parties, irrespective of the national incomes and greenhouse gas emission rates, be mandated to the very same commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions for the annex 1 parties?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, no, that is not my intention. That is not what the resolution says. I have stated previously that under this resolution the developing world must fully participate in the treaty negotiations and commitments and must play a meaningful role in effectively addressing the problem of global climate change. Such participation by the developing country parties could, in my judgment, come in a number of forms. As I stated before the Foreign Relations Committee, while individual countries have different levels of development, the resolution holds that each country must make unique and binding contributions of a pace and kind consistent with their industrialization. The developing world must agree in Kyoto to adopt some manner of binding targets and commitments which would begin during the same compliance period as the

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would observe the 2 minutes allotted to the Senator from Rhode Island have expired.

Mr. KERRY. I yield an additional minute to the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. The developing world must agree in Kyoto to adopt some manner of binding targets and commitments that would begin during the same compliance period as the developed world in as aggressive and effective a schedule as possible, given the gravity of the problem and the need for a fair sharing of the burden.

Mr. CHAFEE. Because greenhouse gas emissions from the developing world will, on a cumulative basis, exceed those of the developed world sometime during the first quarter of the next century, the Senator's position appears quite sound on both environmental and economic grounds, and I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAFEE. I yield the floor.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of our time.

Mr. HAGEL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. HAGEL. I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Oklahoma, Senator INHOFE.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for up to 15 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KERRY. There is objection.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Clean Air Subcommittee, we have had about 40 hours of hearings on this subject, on global warming as well as ambient air quality standard changes that have been proposed by this administration. I think it is unrealistic to try to condense that into 2 minutes. There is not any way it can be done.

I will just say, Mr. President, that as I of the 66 cosponsors of this resolution, I support it, although I would say also it doesn't go far enough. And I would also say that regardless of what happens—this is going to pass, but regardless of that, I am still going to oppose the ratification of this treaty. I am going to do so for two reasons. First, is that the science is not there. This is analogous to the proposal by the administration to lower the ambient air standards in both particulate matter and in ozone, unrealistically costing the American people billions and billions of dollars a year without any science to back it up.

Mr. President, I am going to read real quickly and enter the entire statement in the RECORD, but before my committee, Dr. John Christy of the Department of Atmospheric Science and Earth System Science Laboratory, University of Alabama, Huntsville, said—I don't think there is anyone who is considered to be a greater authority than he is—

The satellite data show that catastrophic warming is not now occurring. The detection of human effects on climate has not been convincingly proven because the variations we have observed are not outside of the natural variations of the climate system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. INHOFE. Could I have 1 more minute?

Mr. HAGEL. I yield 1 minute to the Senator.

Mr. INHOFE. The second reason is the administration has not been honest on this, as well as the ambient air, when they come along and they say, as Mary Nichols, Deputy Secretary, said yesterday, that the cost to the American people for the changes in the ambient air would be $9.1 billion when the President's own Council of Economic Advisers puts the price tag at something over $60 billion and the Reason Foundation out in California has it somewhere between $80 and $150 billion. So anyway, Mr. President, it is not realistic to do this. I would also observe I can't imagine that anyone who would be opposed to the ratification of this treaty wouldn't also be opposed to the changes in the ambient air standards. We will be introducing legislation next week. It will be bipartisan. Senator BREAUX and I will be introducing legislation to reject these changes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks time?

Mr. HAGEL. I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Wyoming, Senator ENZI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. ENZI. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I rise today in support of the resolution offered by the senior Senator from West Virginia and the junior Senator from Nebraska, of which I am a cosponsor, and which concerns the issue of global warming in general and the impending related treaty specifically.

Mr. President, many of us are not surprised by the content of this proposed treaty. We saw the 1992 Framework Convention on Global Climate Change for what it was: The nose of the camel. And now, 5 years later and just as expected, we find ourselves face to face with the whole critter. He's in the tent, he's huge, and he's very frightening.

The agreement signed in Brazil 5 years ago was voluntary. It called for the economically developed nations to undertake voluntary actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to their 1990

levels by the year 2000. Now the administration wants a legally binding agreement that will require a handful of developed countries to reach 1990 levels of fossil fuels emissions by the year 2010. But here is the amazing part, Mr. President. Though the United States and several other developed countries will be subject to the new enforcement regime, the rest of the world will not. Utterly amazing. Where in the world did this administration learn to negotiate? I see a lot of give, but I am still looking for the take.

So we really believe we can place shackles on our economy, leave the economies of our trade competitors unaffected, and not lose countless jobs and industries overseas? It has been all we can do to stop the loss of jobs overseas under the best conditions. Every developing nation has cheaper labor costs than we do. Every developing nation has fewer environmental regulations than we do. Every developing nation has fewer worker protection expenses than we do. These nations are understandably concerned, first and foremost, with elevating the living conditions of their own people. Their leaders would be derelict if they weren't. Does anyone seriously believe they will not take advantage of the new regime at the expense of our workers? Is a little fairness too much to ask? Does the administration find the concept of simple equity so unreasonable?

The AFL–CIO is apoplectic at the prospect of this ill-advised treaty, and with good reason. They understand how many American jobs it will kill. As a representative from the largest coal producing State in the Nation, I know only too well just what it means for the people of my State. This resolution simply calls for all nations to share the burden in the effort to avoid an environmental problem, which, I might add, is supported by a scientific consensus that is generously referred to as unsettled.

This resolution, if adopted, would be a treaty enhancer, not a treaty killer. For this reason, if no other, the administration should embrace it. In its current form the treaty will most certainly not survive this body. We want a good treaty. We are not opposed to a global antipollution effort. But we want a fair treaty. You just cannot have the former without the latter. We need to bring developing countries on board in a responsible fashion. And if the Byrd-Hagel resolution is not adopted the administration will have missed a valuable opportunity to do so.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks time?

Mr. HAGEL. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I thank the Chair.

I would like to begin today by thanking the Senator from West Virginia for his leadership on this issue as well as the Senator from Nebraska. Citizens in my State are extraordinarily concerned about the potential treaty that has been in the media very much lately.

The people of Michigan care greatly about their environment and the ramifications of various emissions that are released into it. At the same time, I believe people of Michigan want agreements negotiated overseas and adopted in Washington to be based upon sound science and hard facts.

They also want those agreements to be ones that require all nations to work toward a common objective rather than singling out developed nations for all the pain while allowing developing nations to gain competitive advantages by continuing practices that might contribute to an international problem.

Mr. President, the people of Michigan are proud of their State, its natural resources, and the industry with which they have made Michigan's economy among the best in the Nation. They want to keep their jobs, to raise their families, and see their children grow and enjoy the opportunities our State provides.

By all accounts, Mr. President, Michigan would suffer disproportionately should a treaty go into effect that does not fairly bind all countries. Whether it is the business community, the agriculture community or organized labor, I have heard concerns from them all, Mr. President.

Therefore, I commend the Senators who have introduced this resolution. I am happy to be a cosponsor. I look forward to supporting it and seeing it passed today so that we might, as a country, work in a constructive way toward resolving these issues while avoiding a path that is detrimental to America and the interests of the hard-working men and women of my State.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HAGEL. I yield 2 minutes of my time to the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Byrd-Hagel resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on international agreements covering greenhouse gas emissions.

I wish to thank and commend my colleagues, Senator BYRD and Senator HAGEL, for their efforts in forging this bipartisan, common sense resolution. I was proud to join them as an original cosponsor.

The Energy and Natural Resources Committee, which I chair, has had significant interest and long involvement in the issue of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change because any attempt to address carbon emissions fundamentally affects energy investment, use, and policy.

Our committee has held a variety of hearings, seminars, and briefings on this subject for the benefit of members, staff, and the public.

Moreover, we have remained closely attuned to the negotiations toward a new climate treaty through close and regular contact with the principal State Department and Department of Energy officials.

My predecessor as chairman, Senator Bennett Johnston, also had a keen interest in this subject and made it a centerpiece of the committee's oversight responsibilities.

So this is not a new issue to us.

Having said that, I believe Senators BYRD and HAGEL have done a superb job with this resolution expressing the Senate's aspirations and concerns with respect to any eventual climate treaty.

This resolution will strengthen the hand of our negotiators during upcoming meetings in August, October, and December.

Although this is not a binding resolution, it conveys the legitimate concerns of the Senate to other parties in the negotiations.

Our negotiators can use this resolution to inform other nations of the elements that must be contained in any new climate treaty that can be ratified by this body.

Turning now to the substance of the resolution, I have a letter from President Clinton, dated August 21, 1996, that contains a statement I very much agree with. And I quote:

> Establishing a sound framework is a critical first step in the negotiating process. We are already conducting additional analyses and technical assessments of our ultimate position will fully reflect economic considerations and our commitment to the principle that environmental protection and economic prosperity go hand-in-hand.

The President is right. Economic considerations are important. We must not proceed down a path that will bring adverse economic consequences, competitive disadvantages, and energy price increases.

The importance of economic considerations, as expressed by the President in his letter, are very much in line with this resolution.

This resolution simply says that any new climate treaty must not result in serious economic harm to the United States.

The Byrd-Hagel resolution also states that any new climate treaty must be global in its approach:

> New commitments on the part of developed countries to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions must be accompanied by new commitments on the part of developing countries to do the same.

The issue of developing countries and their participation is critically important.

According to the Energy Information Administration, an arm of the Department of Energy, carbon emissions from China will exceed ours by the year 2015. Their greenhouse gas emissions are expected to grow 185 percent above 1990 levels.

Emissions from developing nations as a whole will also exceed those from industrialized nations by 2015.

Clearly, this is a global issue that requires a global approach. If further science confirms the fact that carbon emission do indeed have dangerous implications for the climate, then all nations must take meaningful steps.

The industrial nations simply do not have it in their power to do it alone, even if they wanted to.

But here is some good news: We have time to approach this issue in a careful, deliberative manner.

We gain nothing by getting ahead of the science. Indeed, we risk a great deal by moving too quickly.

According to economic analysis by the Stanford Energy Modeling Forum, an orderly, long-term strategy of achieving a scientifically-justified carbon emission reduction costs just one-fifth what it would cost to achieve the same reduction over the near-term.

In other words, you can get the same result 80 percent cheaper by taking a long-term view, and allowing capital equipment to be retired in an orderly fashion as new energy efficient technologies come on line.

Mr. President, there is simply no need to compel working American families to pay five times as much as they need to for the same eventual outcome.

Clearly, there is not a need for extreme actions such as carbon taxes, strict command and control regulations, and one-sided treaties that will impose economic harm.

Let's take the time to do the job right and enjoy tremendous economic savings.

Turning to the broader issue of climate change and climate science, let me say we should all be concerned about increasing concentrations of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gasses in the atmosphere.

It is an indisputable scientific fact that concentrations of greenhouse gasses are on the rise.

Yet significant scientific uncertainties remain.

Some scientists believe that higher carbon dioxide concentrations will bring only moderate change, warmer winters, reduced energy demands, and longer growing seasons.

Virtually every climate scientist will tell you that the warming signal suggested by some data sets are all within the bounds of natural variability, and that climate change is the rule rather than the exception. Throughout the planet's history, the climate has changed.

I will confess to my own personal fascination with the Greenland ice core records that I first became familiar with when the University of Alaska removed an ice core record spanning the entire depth of the Greenland ice cap.

These ice cores are high-resolution records of climate which can be analyzed like the rings of a tree—only these records go back 100,000 years or more.

The Greenland ice core record tells us that the earth's climate has always changed and shifted, often dramatically and over surprisingly short periods of time.

Thus, the investments we've made in the U.S. Global Climate Change Research Program, approaching $2 billion per year and more, are expensive but worthwhile. Because there is much more scientific work to do.

The common refrain that I hear from climate scientists, virtually without exception, is this:

The climate system is remarkably complex, and exceedingly difficult to model.

Meanwhile, our current climate models are comparatively crude.

We lack sufficient data for model inputs, particularly, information about the effects of clouds and water vapor.

And finally, as we have learned more and refined our computer models, estimates of future warming have fallen, not risen.

Clearly, the science is uncertain, and the scientific debate is not over. Nor should it be.

And that brings me to what I see as a troubling trend:

Some who have argued for immediate and urgent action to sharply reduce greenhouse gas emissions have claimed that the science arguing for quick action is unassailable, and that the scientists who express doubts are somehow extreme or out of the mainstream.

Frankly, talk such as that makes me cringe, because the scientific method itself is based on challenge and peer review.

Contrarians should not be shouted down for the sake of political correctness.

Whenever scientists are called out of the mainstream or extreme by a political leader or a journalist, you can bet that an attempted subversion of the scientific method is at hand.

We should condemn any subversion of the scientific method whenever we see it occur in the climate debate. Too much is at stake.

Continued investment in science will only enhance our understanding. We have invested billions in a climate change research program that is only now beginning to yield significant results.

We should not stake our economic future on partial information.

Since extreme, unilateral actions are unwarranted at this point, we have time to encourage developing nations such as China to participate in meaningful commitments.

The resolution before us states that new commitments on the part of developed countries to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions must be accompanied by new commitments on the part of developing countries to do the same.

I believe the Senate would have difficulty ratifying any new climate treaty that imposed legally binding greenhouse gas reduction targets and timetables, which are essentially energy quotas, only on the most developed nations.

Such an approach would be unfair, economically devastating, and ineffective.

To repeat: New energy quotas, imposed only on one set of nations, would be unfair, economically devastating, and ineffective. Let me explain:

One-sided energy quotas would be unfair.

They would allow some nations to gain tremendous competitive advantages over others by encouraging the movement of jobs, manufacturing and capital from nations that are subject to the energy quotas, to nations that are not.

One-sided energy quotas would be economically devastating.

They would require carbon taxes or regulation that would cost jobs, harm our economy, and diminish our standard of living.

One-sided energy quotas would be ineffective.

Because manufacturing, capital, jobs, and even emissions would move from nations that are subject to the energy quotas, to nations that are not, emissions would not diminish, they might even increase.

Moreover, because the total greenhouse gas emissions from developing nations will soon exceed those from developed nations, exempting developing nations wouldn't do anything to improve the problem. Greenhouse gases would still increase. We would suffer economic pain without environmental gain.

What I am saying here today has been confirmed by some of the administration's own economic analysis. A new study produced by the Department of Energy's Argonne National Laboratory contains some surprising and compelling findings. Let me cite some of them:

Increased energy and fuel prices in industrial nations resulting from a new climate treaty that does not contain meaningful commitments for developing nations such as India, China and South Korea would encourage a reallocation of investments away from industrial countries towards the developing countries. To the extent this occurs, emissions would simply be redistributed and could even increase.

Some 20 to 30 percent of the energy intensive basic chemical industry could move to developing countries over 15 to 30 years, with 200,000 jobs lost.

U.S. steel production could fall 30 percent with accompanying job losses of 100,000.

All primary aluminum plants in the United States could close by 2010.

Many petroleum refiners in the Northeast and Gulf Coast could close, and imports would displace more domestic production.

Mr. President, these are serious economic impacts, and I believe we can all agree that this is precisely what we must avoid.

That's what this resolution is about, and that's why I feel it should pass with a broad, bipartisan margin.

Some will argue that we cannot be successful in efforts bring developing nations along in the negotiations in time for the December 1997 meeting in Kyoto, Japan.

But I believe we should try. And if we cannot achieve a new treaty that includes developing nations in this timeframe, then perhaps Kyoto can at least produce a roadmap leading to meaningful commitments by all nations.

Mr. President, there is no need for a headlong rush toward rash policies.

The carbon problem didn't appear overnight. It won't be addressed overnight. We have time to devise and consider balanced approaches that can work.

Time will allow new energy and efficiency technologies to mature.

Time will provide for global solutions that include the developing nations.

Time will allow us to sharpen our science and better understand the true threat of climate change, if it is indeed a dangerous threat.

Yes, the climate issue is a serious one. But it's not a reason to panic.

This resolution helps our negotiators. It sends an important message that this is a global problem that requires the attention and participation of all nations.

I urge the Senate's adoption of the resolution, and I again commend Senators BYRD and HAGEL for their leadership and tireless efforts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. As chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, I am vitally interested in this area because it is our responsibility. I thank my friends, the managers of the bill, and my good friend, Senator BYRD.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for yielding, and let me thank Senator HAGEL and Senator BYRD for bringing this resolution to the floor in a timely manner. I know several of my colleagues wish they could have spent a longer period of time this morning debating the issue, and I can't blame them. Let me suggest to them that this is only the beginning of a long and very important debate for our country to become involved in. It also was very important, though, that the Senate of the United States, the ratifying body of our Government and our country, speak out clearly and boldly before the ad hoc climate change negotiating group convenes next Wednesday in Bonn, and carries their meetings through August 8. The reason it is important that the Senate speak out is because we do not believe the sky is falling. We are not sure if the sky is cracked, and if it is, maybe we need to build a superstructure to hold it up. But this country cannot commit itself to this kind of binding agreement unless the science is clearer and the understanding of the American people is fairly reached when it comes to this issue.

Let me speak for a few moments about my frustration that our President has decided to use his bully pulpit, in my opinion, to terrorize the American people into supporting the administration's quest for commitments for energy use reduction that are legally binding on the United States. The President has been quite frank about building a propaganda campaign about calamities of future global warming, beginning with yesterday's White House meeting on climate change. The President has indicated his propaganda drive will culminate in a White House conference on global warming in October. The conference is not likely to be a thoughtful roundtable. It may now be more thoughtful, because I think the administration has finally recognized that the Senate in fact will become engaged and must become engaged.

Why did I use the words I just used? Here is the reason. Here is the plan that our administration is now supporting: That they would cause us to enter into a binding agreement that the United States would be responsible for 48 percent of the world's obligation to reduce energy use. We said a long time ago that any climate change agreement that affects the United States should not be binding, but voluntary on the world. Is the administration's plan a dramatic departure from where we were? Here is where it is. It is dramatic because when we arrive at the year 2010, to achieve our 1990 levels, the United States will be contributing about 20 percent of the world's emissions, while the rest of the world will be contributing 80 percent. Yet China and India and other Asian nations and developing countries, by this administration's negotiations, would be exempt. That is why it is time we come to the floor to speak about this.

Senate Resolution 98, under the authorship of Senator BYRD and Senator HAGEL, says just that, that we cannot become involved unless we are all involved and that we should not become involved unless the science is sure, or so sure that we will commit this country and the rest of the world into a course that could bind us and reshape our economies and clearly design a different destiny for the American people than one that we might otherwise choose.

The President and the Vice President stand next to flooded homes in the Dakotas and suggest that this unfortunate event is a product of global warming. That is not fair, because the science doesn't prove it. So when I use the word "terrorize," or I use the word "propaganda," it is not by chance that I use those words. The science simply doesn't support the claims being made by this administration. It is important to understand that. Last year, in the Leipzig Declaration, 100 scientists from around the world, climate scientists—not politicians, but scientists—expressed their doubts about the validity of computer-driven warming forecasts. Why? You heard the Senator from Oklahoma just now say the reason is the science isn't bearing it up. People who watch our satellites say that our satellites tell us we are getting cooler. Yet people who watch our ground temperatures suggest we might be getting warmer. Instead of sponsoring a fair debate, the administration is only using part of the available science, while denegrating the other side.

What is so important for this country to understand, what is more important for the parliamentarians of the world to understand, is that the President does not necessarily speak for this Senate. But what is critically important is that this Senate will speak for itself. And it is, without question, the responsibility of the Senate of the United States to approve treaties. What we do not want to happen is the lifting of the level of expectation projected by the rhetoric and the selective science by an administration that would bring us into negotiations to produce a treaty in Kyoto in December that simply would not speak to the realities or the responsibilities that we ought to be engaged in.

The administration must realize that a strong American economy is essential to our Nation if we are going to spend upwards of $2 billion a year on climate change research, if we are going to adapt to changing climate, if needed, and if we are going to adjust our economy and our economic base for those purposes.

So, I am pleased to endorse, and I hope Senators will join with me in a strong endorsement of Senate Resolution 98. It is important that we speak now. I view, as others do, that this is a preliminary statement in what will be a long and complex debate for all of us to become involved in, because I don't know where our science will lead us. But if it, in fact, can show us the way and clearly demonstrate that there is a climate change responsibility for this Nation, then all the rest of the nations in the world must participate. We cannot shoulder 48 percent of the burden for the rest of the world.

Mr. President, let me close with this last chart. If you were to turn the United States into a forest with no emissions whatsoever, by the year 2100 here is the problem with the rest of the world. The problem is that we want to be at 1990 levels by 2010. If you take the United States out of the equation, the total concentration of greenhouse gases hardly changes. Yet this administration, at least by their rhetoric of the last several months, would take China out of it, the other developing world nations out, and leave us to bear the burden. That is why S. Res. 98 is so critical for us today, for the world tomorrow, as we march toward Kyoto in December.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. Who seeks time?

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I yield myself a couple of minutes before yielding to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, we have heard a couple of Senators refer to the fact that the science somehow, because of satellite observations, does not indicate the kind of warming that others are arguing is taking effect. This is an example of how an individual scientific fact is used to distort the record here for one purpose or another. We will have time later to discuss all of those purposes. But the argument is made that, although thermometers located at the Earth's surface show an increase in temperature today higher than it has been for 130 years, people say the satellite measurements, which are thousands of feet above the surface, show a cooling since 1979.

That is true. That is the only part of this that is true. There is nothing in that fact that discredits the theory, the thesis, which has been accepted by scientists, with respect to the warming. Let me point out why. Thermometers in satellites and thermometers on the ground obviously measure temperatures at two very different places in the atmosphere, and it is not surprising, according to most scientists who interpret this, that there is a difference. At higher altitudes, temperatures fluctuate far more than they do at the surface due to natural climate influences like sunlight reflecting particles from volcanoes and other variabilities. What scientists called variability, or noise in the satellite record, obscures the warming trend due to the buildup of greenhouse gases that is apparent in the global surface temperature.

Furthermore, the depletion of the ozone layer, which has occurred mostly since 1979, has had a cooling effect on the atmosphere which is more marked at higher levels than it is at surface levels. The Earth's surface has warmed over the northern and the southern hemispheres, which totally negates the notion of any kind of heat effect from urban centers or otherwise.

There will be later times to discuss the science. But it is important to note that on June 22, 1997, the New York Times in an editorial said that the reason we had voluntary agreements out of Rio was science was somewhat murky. But in 1995, the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, consisting of 2,500 scientists, concluded that there was a serious impact they could discern, and the science became certain.

So I think as time goes on Americans will come to understand that.

I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I commend particularly Senator BYRD and Senator KERRY for their leadership in this area and say I come to the floor as a U.S. Senator from a State that is the first State in the country to put mandatory limits on carbon dioxide, the primary manmade source of global warming. We have shown in our home State that it is possible to have a thriving, prosperous economy and take steps to limit these environmental problems that our colleagues have talked about.

The fact is, our country can help play a leadership role in controlling global warming without causing an economic meltdown. There are, really, three approaches that the State of Oregon has used, as the first State in the country to have mandatory controls on carbon dioxide emissions.

First, as Senators BYRD and KERRY have talked about, we give great emphasis on market mechanisms. We are not talking about a big government approach. We are talking about using the market.

Second, we have taken steps to build these new approaches into new powerplant design. It is prospective, so that all those who are constructing our new powerplants understand the rules.

Third, we have given special rewards, credits, for innovative approaches such as proper management of our forests.

I conclude by saying that properly managed forests can be very effective in helping to capture greenhouse gases, carbon dioxide, and removing them from the air. Our Northwest forests are some of the very best carbon sinks in the world. The older forests are estimated to be two to three times as effective in capturing carbon dioxide emissions as new growth.

I have heard several of my colleagues talk about some of the alternatives. Carbon taxes——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. WYDEN. I ask unanimous consent for 30 additional seconds?

Mr. KERRY. How much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remain 7 minutes 35 seconds.

Mr. KERRY. I yield the Senator an additional minute.

Mr. WYDEN. My last point is we know, for example, that properly managed forests are a cost-effective alternative to end-of-pipe emission controls or carbon taxes. There are alternatives out there. My home State has shown they can work, and I thank Senator KERRY for the extra time.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I would like to just read that New York Times editorial and ask unanimous consent it be printed in the RECORD, and I yield myself such time as I use.

With respect to the science it says:

> One reason why the industrial nations opted for voluntary targets in Rio was that mainstream scientists simply couldn't agree whether manmade emissions have contributed to the small rise in global temperatures that began in the late 19th century. In 1995, however, the U.N. intergovernmental panel on climate change consisting of about 2,500 scientists concluded that they had. The language was cautious, their forecasts were gloomy. Unless the current rates of combustion of carbon-based fuels, coal, gas, oil, could be reduced, they warned, temperatures would rise between 1.8 and 6.3 degrees Fahrenheit over the next century. Temperature changes in the middle level of that scale could cause a 20-inch rise in sea levels that would flood coastal lowlands and tropical islands, an increase in weather extremes and global damage to forests and croplands. Despite challenges from businesses which have been attacking the science in tobacco industry fashion, the U.N. panel has not retreated from its basic findings.

So, Mr. President, we are going to have a good debate in this country in the next months on the science, and that is appropriate; we ought to have it. We ought to put to the test all of the theories. We should demand the most exacting models. We should press for the most certitude that we can gain. But there is no issue today scientifically about the fact that there is global warming taking place, about the fact that there is sea-level rise occurring, and that, if it continues at the current trend levels, the damages could be devastating.

We can quarrel about how much happens at what point in time, about what model is better at predicting the impact. I will acknowledge there are inherent uncertainties in that process. Clearly there are. But we know we are living in the midst of the most significant increase that we have seen in 130 years, and the evidence of the prognosis of our best scientists is that it is going to continue at a rate that is greater than anything we have known since humankind, since civilization has existed, civilization within the last 8,000 to 10,000 years on this planet. We owe it to ourselves and to common sense to try to make the best judgments about that.

This resolution today, I want to emphasize, is not about the science. This resolution is about how our team goes to Kyoto and how we negotiate in the next months.

I want to emphasize with respect to my comments about the Berlin mandate that there is nothing in this resolution today that I deem to be inconsistent with the mandate; nothing inconsistent. I do believe that this begins to alter appropriately how we begin to approach some of the negotiations in Kyoto, and I accept what the Senator from Nebraska has said, I accept what the Senator from West Virginia has said, and others. It is a matter of fairness and common sense that the United States should not be placed at a disadvantage and make a set of choices that don't bring others into the process of solving this.

So, Mr. President, thanking the Senator from West Virginia for the colloquy, clearly I am not calling my amendment up.

Mr. President, I have extra time. I will yield 2 minutes of my time to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair observes that the Senator has 1 minute 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. KERRY. I yield 1 minute 45 seconds to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 30 seconds over and above the time referred to.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it was John Stuart Mill who said that "On all great subjects, much remains to be said." I think we will all be saying a good bit more than has been said here as the days come and go. We are not yet debating the treaty itself. But my distinguished friend, Mr. KERRY, has just said, in his judgment, there is nothing in this resolution that is inconsistent with the Berlin mandate.

Mr. President, that is not my view at all. I think we only have to read the resolution itself—it speaks for itself—and we will find that it is inconsistent with the Berlin Mandate, and I intended to say that.

Mr. President, I will try to elaborate on my view with a two-part observation. First, with respect to significant emitters, such as China, it makes no sense for the international community to begin this effort by agreeing to unchecked emissions growth from newly constructed, but inefficient, power-generating and industrial facilities. It is neither cost-effective nor environmentally beneficial to go back and retrofit dirty smokestacks.

We all know that China in particular has near-term plans to increase its power-generating capacity exponentially. We must anticipate the prospect of significant new industrial development in China and other places by providing incentives for deployment of new, cleaner technologies. In short, we must bring back from Kyoto some commitments that China and other large emitters will grow in a smart way.

I want to make it clear that the current approach of the State Department is not acceptable to this Senator under the terms of the resolution. Their approach will not work. A promise by the developing countries to only negotiate at a later date is simply unacceptable. Any agreement resulting from negotiations in Kyoto, or thereafter, that includes binding commitments for developed countries must also include serious, specific, and binding commitments by the developing world.

I thank all Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair observes that all time has expired.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 60 seconds to clarify the record and respond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I don't disagree with what Senator BYRD has just said. In a sense, I should correct my own comment when I talk about the Berlin mandate. Obviously, we are altering the way in which we are approaching the question of inclusiveness. When I say "nothing inconsistent," I am talking about in the fundamentals of how you might approach the issue of timetable or compliance. We have discussed that in the course of this debate, and that is what I intended to say.

I yield back any remaining time.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 205 Leg.]

YEAS—95

Abraham	Faircloth	Lugar
Akaka	Feingold	Mack
Allard	Ford	McCain
Ashcroft	Frist	McConnell
Baucus	Glenn	Mikulski
Bennett	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Graham	Moynihan
Bingaman	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grassley	Murray
Boxer	Gregg	Nickles
Breaux	Hagel	Reed
Brownback	Hatch	Robb
Bumpers	Helms	Roberts
Burns	Hollings	Rockefeller
Byrd	Hutchinson	Roth
Campbell	Hutchison	Santorum
Chafee	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Cleland	Inouye	Sessions
Coats	Jeffords	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Collins	Kempthorne	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kennedy	Snowe
Coverdell	Kerrey	Specter
Craig	Kerry	Stevens
D'Amato	Kohl	Thomas
Daschle	Kyl	Thompson
DeWine	Landrieu	Thurmond
Dodd	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Domenici	Leahy	Warner
Dorgan	Levin	Wellstone
Durbin	Lieberman	Wyden
Enzi	Lott	

NOT VOTING—5

Bryan	Grams	Reid
Feinstein	Harkin	

The resolution (S. Res. 98) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. RES. 98

Whereas the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (in this resolution referred to as the "Convention"), adopted in May 1992, entered into force in 1994 and is not yet fully implemented;

Whereas the Convention, intended to address climate change on a global basis, identifies the former Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe and the Organization For Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), including the United States, as "Annex I Parties", and the remaining countries, including China, Mexico, Brazil, and South Korea, as "Developing Country Parties";

Whereas in April 1995, the Convention "Conference of the Parties" adopted the s called "Berlin Mandate";

Whereas the "Berlin Mandate" calls f the adoption, as soon as December 1997, Kyoto, Japan, of a protocol or another leg instrument that strengthens commitmen to limit greenhouse gas emissions by Ann I Parties for the post-2000 period and esta lishes a negotiation process called the "A Hoc Group on the Berlin Mandate";

Whereas the "Berlin Mandate" specifical exempts all Developing Country Parti from any new commitments in such negoti tion process for the post-2000 period;

Whereas although the Convention, a proved by the United States Senate, calle on all signatory parties to adopt policies an programs aimed at limiting their greenhous gas (GHG) emissions, in July 1996 the Unde Secretary of State for Global Affairs calle for the first time for "legally binding" emi sion limitation targets and timetables fo Annex I Parties, a position reiterated by th Secretary of State in testimony before th Committee on Foreign Relations of the Sen ate on January 8, 1997;

Whereas greenhouse gas emissions of De veloping Country Parties are rapidly increas ing and are expected to surpass emissions o the United States and other OECD countries as early as 2015;

Whereas the Department of State has de clared that it is critical for the Parties t the Convention to include Developing Coun try Parties in the next steps for global ac tion and, therefore, has proposed that con sideration of additional steps to include lim itations on Developing Country Parties greenhouse gas emissions would not begin until after a protocol or other legal instrument is adopted in Kyoto, Japan in December 1997;

Whereas the exemption for Developing Country Parties is inconsistent with the need for global action on climate change and is environmentally flawed;

Whereas the Senate strongly believes that the proposals under negotiation, because of the disparity of treatment between Annex I Parties and Developing Countries and the level of required emission reductions, could result in serious harm to the United States economy, including significant job loss, trade disadvantages, increased energy and consumer costs, or any combination thereof; and

Whereas it is desirable that a bipartisan group of Senators be appointed by the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate for the purpose of monitoring the status of negotiations on Global Climate Change and reporting periodically to the Senate on those negotiations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States should not be a signatory to any protocol to, or other agreement regarding, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change of 1992, at negotiations in Kyoto in December 1997, or thereafter, which would—

(A) mandate new commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions for the Annex I Parties, unless the protocol or other agreement also mandates new specific scheduled commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions for Developing Country Parties within the same compliance period, or

(B) would result in serious harm to the economy of the United States; and

(2) any such protocol or other agreement which would require the advice and consent

Clinton Presidential Records
Digital Records Marker

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

This marker identifies the place of a tabbed divider. Given our digitization capabilities, we are sometimes unable to adequately scan such dividers. The title from the original document is indicated below.

Divider Title: **Letters**

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

WASHINGTON

May 22, 1997

The Honorable Richard G. Lugar
Chairman
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510-6000

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for the letter from you and other members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry regarding the climate change negotiations and the potential impacts of climate change on U.S. agricultural production and competitiveness.

The issue of global climate change is an important one for agriculture. Over the next 50 years, U.S. food and fiber producers face major challenges in keeping pace with the ever increasing demands of a growing world population. Climate changes, environmental degradation, and increasing competition for land and freshwater supplies will make these challenges even greater. Based on current trends the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change projects significant impacts to ecological systems and the economy, including food security, water resources, coastal zones, and human health.

Information on the potential impacts of climate change on agriculture and net greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture and forestry activities is currently available. The White House Climate Change Task Force can arrange a briefing on this at your earliest convenience.

In light of the potential environmental consequences of climate change, this Administration has called on developed countries to agree to realistic and achievable binding targets for greenhouse gas emissions in the current climate negotiations. We believe that each nation needs the flexibility to determine its own cost-effective means of reducing emissions. And finally, everyone -- all nations (including developing countries) and all economic sectors -- must contribute to the solution because climate change is a global problem. We must begin now to lead the way to a sustainable future.

Further commitments under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change must ensure that the U.S. economy remains strong and internationally competitive. To help find the best solution, the Administration is engaged in an assessment of the economic impacts of various emissions targets (coordinated by Dr. Everett Ehrlich: Undersecretary for

Printed on Recycled Paper

Economic Policy at the Department of Commerce.] This assessment includes a variety of aggregate national economic impacts, as well as sectoral and international economic impacts. This analysis is currently underway. As it progresses, it will be subject to a peer review process. Once this process is completed, we fully expect to brief Congress.

As part of this assessment, the Department of Agriculture will analyze the impact of any new agreement on America's food sector and our farmers, ranchers and consumers. Evaluation of the agricultural sector impacts of emissions reductions scenarios is contingent in some cases on national macroeconomic results. As a result, an agricultural sector analysis will follow Dr. Ehrlich's modeling results.

I appreciate your concerns and look forward to working with you on this important environmental issue.

Sincerely,

Al Gore

AG/pgu

MAR 14 1997

RICHARD G. LUGAR, INDIANA, CHAIRMAN
JESSE HELMS, NORTH CAROLINA
THAD COCHRAN, MISSISSIPPI
MITCH MCCONNELL, KENTUCKY
PAUL COVERDELL, GEORGIA
RICK SANTORUM, PENNSYLVANIA
PAT ROBERTS, KANSAS
CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, IOWA
PHIL GRAMM, TEXAS
LARRY E. CRAIG, IDAHO
TOM HARKIN, IOWA
PATRICK J. LEAHY, VERMONT
KENT CONRAD, NORTH DAKOTA
THOMAS A. DASCHLE, SOUTH DAKOTA
MAX BAUCUS, MONTANA
J. ROBERT KERREY, NEBRASKA
TIM JOHNSON, SOUTH DAKOTA
MARY LANDRIEU, LOUISIANA

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON
AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6000
202-224-2035

March 14, 1997

The Honorable Al Gore
Vice President
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Vice President:

Farm state members of Congress have become increasingly concerned with the lack of adequate attention given to agricultural concerns as the Administration works on the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCC). As you know, this treaty, if ratified, could affect U.S. agricultural production and competitiveness.

American agricultural interests must be adequately represented during the upcoming negotiations. This representation will ensure the continued success of farmers and ranchers and allow them to maintain their productivity, which ultimately benefits consumers. We believe we can address the global greenhouse gas issue and protect the environment while carefully considering the interests of America's farmers, ranchers and consumers. However, before the United States is committed to a final international agreement to limit greenhouse gases, it is essential that we know more about the treaty's impact on our nation's largest employer and the world's most efficient producers of food and fiber.

We will be closely monitoring the negotiations as work continues on the final agreement before its submission to the Senate for ratification. We request an analysis and briefing by the Administration on the following issues as soon as possible:

1) The potential effects of climate change on U.S. agriculture and livestock production.

2) The estimated greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the production of crops and livestock in the U.S.

3) The net contribution of U.S. forests and crops in the sequestration of greenhouse gases.

4) Actions or controls necessary to reduce agricultural greenhouse gas emissions to comply with obligations that may arise under the treaty and an economic analysis of their impact on U.S. farmers and ranchers.

5) Whether and to what extent greenhouse gas emission controls would disadvantage agricultural producers in this country compared to producers in other countries with less stringent emission controls or no controls at all.

We understand that serious discussions in preparation for the Kyoto meeting may commence during July and August of this year. We firmly believe this information, as well as the Administration's formal economic analysis, should be submitted to Congress well before then so that the various options for U.S. policy may be understood and their impact on American agriculture and the American economy may be carefully assessed.

We look forward to working with you on this important issue.

Sincerely,

cc: The Honorable Madeleine Albright
The Honorable Dan Glickman

FRANK R. LAUTENBERG
NEW JERSEY

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-3002

APPROPRIATIONS
BUDGET
ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS
SMALL BUSINESS
HELSINKI COMMISSION

April 10, 1997

President Clinton
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

We understand the Administration will be submitting legislation concerning the deregulation of electricity. We urge you to ensure that any such proposal is consistent with fair competition and moving toward the goals of the Clean Air Act.

Deregulation of electrical power distribution can produce many benefits to consumers, including more efficient use of resources and lower costs. However, many Eastern states are concerned that deregulation will cause a significant increase in the transport of air pollution from Midwestern power facilities. Many Midwestern facilities produce cheaper power than eastern utilities because they have less stringent or no pollution controls. Deregulation could easily lead to increases in their power generation because they can undercut the price of other utilities that have made much larger investments in pollution control.

Although unlikely, the Midwestern utilities argue that competition may lead to lower usage of high polluting fuels and a switch to less polluting and less costly natural gas. They argue that air pollution levels will decrease because of the switch to lower polluting natural gas. Eastern states fear the opposite result, namely that cheaper energy will spur consumption and that high sulfur coal will be used to fuel this increased demand.

A recent study has shown that if energy deregulation legislation were enacted without any environmental safeguards, annual increases of 349,000 tons of nitrogen oxide and 113.5 million tons of carbon dioxide emissions would result by the year 2000. This cannot be permitted. Many states have taken extraordinary measures to clean up their air, sometimes at significant cost. Similarly, many utilities have invested in expensive pollution mitigation technology. These state and private investments, and the environmental and health benefits they provide, would be undermined if increased emissions from other states were allowed.

One of the major impediments to meeting our Clean Air Act goals is the unequal

REPLY TO:

☐ 506 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510-3002
(202) 224-4744

☐ One Newark Center 14th Floor
Newark, NJ 07102-5297
(201) 645-3030

☐ Burlington Cloverleaf
[illegible]
Suite 16-19
Bordentown, NJ 08505-1312
(609) 387-8653

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

treatment for plants constructed before 1977. Grandfathered facilities, that were thought would be taken off the market in a short time, are continuing to operate with emissions levels which are typically four to ten times higher than standards met by post-1977 plants. This exemption, combined with regional disparities in emissions control requirements, frustrates the creation of a fair and competitive marketplace by tilting the market against new, cleaner facilities.

In a speech given a little over a year ago, the Vice President assured state utility regulators that the Administration wanted electricity restructuring to be "a force to improve environmental quality, not move backwards." We urge that your Administration's legislative proposal for electric deregulation be a vehicle to improve our nation's air quality.

Sincerely,

Frank R. Lautenberg

Jim Jeffords

Patrick Leahy

Daniel P. Moynihan

William Roth, Jr.

John Chafee

Joseph Biden

Edward M. Kennedy

Robert Torricelli

Jack Reed

Christopher Dodd

Olympia Snowe

Joseph Lieberman

John Kerry

Weather Event

Climate Science Briefing: Congressional Invitations

Senate:

1. John Kerry (D-MA, Foreign Relations)
2. Richard Lugar (R-IN, Chair, Agriculture + Foreign Relations)
3. John Chafee (R-RI, Chair, Environment & Public Works)
4. Joe Lieberman (D-CT, Environment)
5. Ron Wyden (D-OR, Environment + Energy & Natural Resources)
6. Jeff Bingaman (D-NM, Energy & Natural Resources + Joint Economic Comm.)
7. Jim Jeffords (active on renewables, efficiency)
8. Barbara Boxer (D-CA, Environment & Public Works)
9. Harry Reid (D-NV, Environment & Public Works)
10. Dale Bumpers (D-AR, Energy & Natural Resources)

House of Representatives:

1. Ben Gilman (R-NY, Chair, House Int'l Relations)
2. Wayne Gilchrest (R-MD, Resources + Transportation & Infrastructure)
3. Dan Schafer (R-CO, Chair, Energy & Power Subcomm.)
4. Karen McCarthy (D-MO, Energy & Power)
5. Ed Markey (D-MA, Energy & Power)
6. Tom Sawyer (D-OH, Commerce)
7. John Dingell (D-MI, Ranking Member, Commerce)
8. George Brown (D-CA, Ranking Member, Science)
9. Elizabeth Furse (D-OR, Energy & Power)
10. Sherry Boehlert (R-NY, Science)

Clinton Presidential Records
Digital Records Marker

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

This marker identifies the place of a tabbed divider. Given our digitization capabilities, we are sometimes unable to adequately scan such dividers. The title from the original document is indicated below.

Divider Title: **Invites**

EVENT: Climate Change Conference
DATE: Monday, October 6, 1997
TIME: 10:00am-4:30pm
LOCATION: Georgetown University--Gaston Hall

Senator Lott
Senator Daschle
Senator Abraham
Senator Baucus
Senator Biden
Senator Bingaman
Senator Boxer
Senator Bumpers
Senator Robert Byrd
Senator Chafee
Senator Feingold
Senator Hagel
Senator Harkin
Senator Helms
Senator Hollings
Senator Kerrey
Senator Kerry
Senator Jeffords
Senator Lautenberg
Senator Leahy
Senator Levin
Senator Lieberman
Senator Lugar
Senator McCain
Senator Murkowski
Senator Robb
Senator Roberts
Senator Rockefeller
Senator Sarbanes
Senator Stevens
Senator Warner
Senator Wyden

Rep. Gingrich
Rep. Gephardt
Rep. Bliley

Clinton Presidential Records
Digital Records Marker

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

This marker identifies the place of a tabbed divider. Given our digitization capabilities, we are sometimes unable to adequately scan such dividers. The title from the original document is indicated below. Divider

Title: **Briefing**

White House Climate Change Task Force

734 Jackson Place, NW • Washington, DC 20503

Meeting Notice

This Friday we will provide base-case climate science and economics briefings, and announce next steps for peer review and public release of modeling results.

Times and locations:

- **Congressional Brief:** 10 - 12 AM Friday, April 25 In S 116 (Open To House And Senate Climate Staff)

- **Public Brief:** 2 - 4 PM, Friday, April 25 In The Department Of Commerce Auditorium

Presenters and agenda:

- **Dirk Forrister**, chair of the White House Climate Change Task Force, will provide an overview and introduce the presenters.

- **Dr. Rosina Bierbaum**, White House Office Of Science And Technology Policy, will provide a base-level analysis of past, present and future greenhouse gas emission levels and atmospheric concentrations.

- **Tom Karl**, NOAA National Center For Climatic Data Research, will provide analysis of past climate changes in the US in the context of increasing concentrations of greenhouse gasses, and discuss potential future climate changes. Much of Tom's work is published in the most recent issue of Scientific American.

- **Dr. Ev Ehrlich**, Under Secretary Of Commerce will present economic baselines for the US and its major energy-using sectors and key assumptions for the base case. He will also announce plans for peer review of action-based scenario results, and public release.

Contact: Tom Peterson (202) 343-1060

September 10, 1997

State Department Climate Change Briefing

Name	Member's Name	Phone #	FAX #
BOBBIE REED	BOB KERREY	46551	47645
Julie Eckert	Bob Kerrey	41537	4-7645
CARL HOLGUIN	SEN. BOXER	4-3553	4-1881
Sharon Taylor	Sen Murkowski	4-7875	8-0302
Ben Thinnes	Sen Kyl	4-4521	4-2207
Steve Eule	Cttee on Science	5-7504	
KENT BONHAM	HASEL	4-4224	4-5213
Kristy Simms	Lott	46253	42862
Susan Fletcher	C.R.S - Envir Div	7-7231	73342
Wayne Morrissey	CRS - Science Policy	7-7072	7-7000
JOHN JUSTUS	CRS - Science Policy	7-7078	7-7000
Alys Campaigne	Govt Reform Oversight - Minority	55420	6-3348
Barbara Roberts	SEPW - Baucus	42469	41273
John Hamphill	SE&PW - Baucus	4-7069	228-0574
Bob Palmer	Hovse Science	56375	5-3895
Julie [illegible]	W+L/A	456-6620	62664
Ginny Worrest	Olympia Snowe	4-8612	4-1946
Melanie Leyton	Nickles	4-5754	4-6005
MARTIN McBROOM	Sen Robert Byrd	4-5303	

II/Trading Briefing

9/29/96

- D. Ketterisk - WHCCTF
- Dale Haaddoff - DEP
- Joe Goffman - EOP

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

NAME	OFFICE	PHONE	FAX
Erik Rasmussen	DOE/Cong. Aff.	586-2762	-0143
Kurt Zwally	DOE/USIJI	586-3423	-3485/86
Duane Lakich	DOE/USIJI	586 3268	-3485/86
Tom Peterson	WHCCTF	343-1053	343-1060
[illegible]	WHLA	456-6620	634-[illegible]
[illegible]	EPA/Cong.	260.5764	260.2408
Jenn Tichey	Sen J. Kerry	224-4531	
Jim Jepsen	Sen. Durbin	4-2152	228-0405
Brian Stanke	WHCCTF	343-1060	343-1163
Tatiana S. Muessel	Sen. Jeffords	4-5141	228-1407
[illegible] LAWRENCE	SEN. BREAUX	4-4623	8-2577
David Corbin	Sen Byrd	[redacted] 4-7713	45476
Marla Marvin	Sen. Murray	42621	40238
DAN DELICH	SEPW-Chafee	4-5762	4-2322
CARL HOLGUIN	SEN. BOXER	4-3553	4-1883
Joyce Rechtschaffen	Sen Lieberman	4-1124	4-9750
Shannon Watson	Sen. Glenn	4-0390	4-7983
Andrea Nygren	Sen. Dorgan	4-1923	4-1193
Jeff Moore	Sen. Bob Smith	4-2841	4-1353
SARAH [illegible]	ENR-Bumpers	4-5360	
Richard Fong	Sen. Hollings	4-4451	8-5406
MELISSA CARLY	"	"	"
DREW FIELDS	SEN. ROCKEFELLER	4-9843	4-7665
Jennifer Chun	Sen Robb	48529	48689
MARTY McSORLEY	Sen Byrd	45303	84467

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

NAME	OFFICE	PHONE	FAX
John Hemphill	Env. & Public Works	224-7069	228-0574
CHRIS MILLER	SEN. LEVIN	224-9110	224-1388
Tom Dower	Sen. Specter	224-6210	228-1229
DIRK FORRISTER	WH Climate Change TF	343-1060	343-1162
Abe Haspel	Dept of Energy	586-5316	586-3047
Robert Dixon	US CSP/IJI	586-3003	586-3485
JIM Greene	Sen. Biden	224 5042	224 0562
DICK D'Amato	Sen Byrd	224, 3085	228-0280
JOE GOFFMAN	ENVIRO. DEF. FUND	387-3500	234-6049
Annie Petsonk	EDF	387.3500	234.6049
Dale Heydlauff	AEP	614/223-1280	x 1682
Dionne Thompson	Sen. Landrieu	224-5824	224-9735
Jeff Bialos	Sen Lugar		

10/16/97 Weberman Office briefing Todal

Joyce Rechtschaffen	Lieberman	224-1225
Diane Hill	Bob Kerrey	224-5588
Eric Washburn	Daschle	224-2321
DAN DELICH	Sen EPW - Chafee	224-5762
Justin LeBlanc	Murray	4-7160.
MARY FRANCES REPKO	FEINGOLD	4-8648
Julia Hathaway	Graham	4.1546
Tamara Nameroff	Lieberman	49849
Brian Kristjansson	Murray	8-3799
Peter Pugano	Torricelli	4-3224
JIM GREENE	Biden	45042
Sarah Bittleman	Sen ENR - Bumpers	4-5360
MELISSA CAREY	SEN. MOYNIHAN	4-4451
DIRK FORRISTER	WH Task Force	343-1060
MARTY McBROOM	Sen Byrd	4-5303
Joshua Steinkman	Wyden	44563
Kate English	Sen John Kerry	42747
Bob Simon	Bingaman	41802
Linda Delgado	Boxer	43553

Todd

SENATE BRIEFING
October 16, 1997
706 Hart

Lieberman	Joyce Rechtschaffen
Bumpers	Richard Glick
Bingaman	Bob Simon
Baucus	Barbara Roberts
Kerry	Kate English
Bryan	Brent Heberlee
Wellstone	Brian Symmes
Wyden	Hope Whitney
Feinstein	Kathy Lacey
Boxer	Linda Delgado
Feingold	Mary Frances Repko
Biden	Jim Green
Torricelli	Peter Pagano
Jeffords	Ken Connolly
Leahy	Suzanne Fleek
Chafee	Dan Delich
Byrd	Marty McBroom
Harkin	Andy Fish
Daschle	Eric Washburn
B. Kerrey	Diane Hill
B. Graham	Julia Hathaway
Kennedy	Mimi Brody
Moynihan	Peg McGlinch
Murray	Justin LeBlanc
Dodd	Sheila Duffy
Lautenberg	Amy Maron

10/23/97 Ag/EPW/Energy brief by Todd

~~JEFF~~ BURNAM	LUGAR	44814
DAVID FRENCH	SANTORUM	224-6324
Walt Lukken	Lugar	4-7444
Mike Carlson	Santorum	4-6324
Page Faulk	Santorum	4-6324
Sarah Lister	Senate Agr. ~~Democratic~~	4-5929
Eric Washburn	Daschle	4-2321
Ginny Worrest	Sen. Snowe	4-8672
Ben Thinnes	Sen. Kyl	4-4521
Stephanie Mercer	Sen. Ag. (Harkin)	4-0014
Keith Kehle	Sen. Roberts	44774
Julia Hathaway	Sen Graham	4.1546
Angela Marshal	Sen. Baucus	4-2651
Kira Finkler	Sen. Energy Dems.	4-8164
Gerry Hilligan	Sen. Sessions	4-4124
Wayne Hammon	Craig	4-2752
Ethan Brady	Grady	4-4242
PAUL BURGESS	ENZI	4-3424
DEBBIE REED	BOB KERREY	43518
Karl Glosener	Ag. Cmte	4-5932 6250
JOHN RODRIGUEZ	~~ROBERTS~~ LOTT	4-~~3725~~
Dave White	Ag Cmte	4-2468
Richard Pouyat	Moynihan	4-4451
Melissa Grey	Moynihan	4-4451
Linda Delgado	Boxer	4-3553
Sally Kane	Lieberman	4-7203
John Hemphill	Env. & Public Works Minority	4-7069

V = Senate staff briefed on 10/16 and 10/23 re POTUS announcement of policy.

Senate staff by 10/23

☐	Adam	Lawrence	Sen. Breaux	(202) 228-2577
☐	Amy	Maron	Sen. Lautenberg	(202) 224-9707
☐	Andrew	Meyer	Sen. Jeffords	(202) 228-1967
☐	Andrew	Fields	Sen. Rockefeller	(202) 224-7665
☑	Angela	Marshal	Sen Baucus	
☐	Angela	Logomasini	Sen. Brownback	(202) 228-1265
☐	Ann	Klee	Sen. Kempthorne	(202) 224-5893
☐	Ann	Loomis	Sen. Warner	(202) 224-6295
☐	Anne	Ruhle	Sen. Moseley-Braun	(202) 228-1318
☐	Annette	Price	Sen. Gordon Smith	(202) 228-3997
☐	Ashley	Miller	Sen. Roth	(202) 228-0354
☑	Barbara	Roberts	Senate EPW, Minority	(202) 224-1273
☐	Becky	Shipp	Sen. Hatch	(202) 224-6331
☑	Ben	Thinnes	Sen Kyl	
☐	Bill	Testerman	Sen. Frist	(202) 228-1264
☐	Bob	Stokes	Sen. Stevens	(202) 224-2354
☑	Bob	Simon	Sen. Bingaman	(202) 224-2852
☐	Bobby	Peede	Sen. Cochran	(202) 224-9450
☐	Brent	Heberlee	Sen. Bryan	(202) 224-1867
☑	Brian	Kristjansson	Sen Murray	(202) 224-0238
☐	Brian	Kuehl	Sen. Baucus	(202) 228-3687
☐	Brian	Sweatland	Sen. Roberts	(202) 224-3514
☐	Brian	Symmes	Sen. Wellstone	(202) 224-8438
☐	Bridget	Lanouett	Sen McCain	(202) 228-2862
☐	Brooke	Roberts	Sen. Craig	(202) 228-1067
☐	C.K.	Lee	Sen. Mack	(202) 224-1907
☐	Chad	Bradley	Sen. Inhofe	(202) 228-0380
☐	Charlie	Stek	Sen. Sarbanes	(202) 224-1651
☐	Chris	Miller	Sen. Levin	(202) 224-1388
☐	Christine	Russell	Sen. Robert Smith	(202) 224-1353
☐	Chuck	Berwick	Sen. Gorton	(202) 224-9393
☐	Clark	LeBlanc	Sen. Snowe	(202) 224-1946
☐	Colleen	Deegan	Sen. Kyl	(202) 224-2207
☐	Conrad	Lass	Sen. Thomas	(202) 224-1724
☐	Dale	Tigg	Sen. Ashcroft	(202) 228-0998
☑	Dan	Delich	Senate EPW	(202) 224-2322
☑	Dave	White	Sen Ag Cte	
☐	Dave	Garman	Senate Energy	(202) 228-0302

David	French	Sen Santorum	
Debbie	Reed	Sen. Kerrey	(202) 224-7645
Diana	Olbaum	Senate Foreign Relations - ...	(202) 224-5011
Diane	Hill	Sen Kerrey	(202) 224-7645
Dianne	Thompson	Sen. Landrieu	(202) 224-9735
Don	Green	Sen. Collins	(202) 224-2693
Doug	Benevento	Sen. Allard	(202) 224-6471
Drew	Willison	Sen. Reid	(202) 224-7327
Eddy	Moore	Sen. Hollings	(202) 224-4293
Eric	Washburn	Sen Daschle	(202) 224-2047
Esten	Perez	Sen. Reed	(202) 224-4680
Esther	Kiaaina	Sen. Akaka	(202) 224-2126
Ethan	Brady	Sen Leahy	
Gerry	Gilligan	Sen Sessions	
Ginny	Worrest	Sen Snowe	
Hope	Whitney	Sen. Wyden	(202) 228-2717
J.J.	Brown	Sen. Hatch	(202) 224-6331
Jeff	Bingham	Sen. Lugar	(202) 228-0360
Jeffrey	Weiner	Sen. Landrieu	(202) 224-9735
Jennifer	Chartrand	Sen. Burns	(202) 224-8594
Jennifer	Chun	Sen. Robb	(202) 224-8689
Jim	Jepsen	Sen. Durbin	(202) 228-0400
Jim	Greene	Sen Biden	(202) 224-0139
Joe	Keeley	Sen. Murkowski	(202) 224-5301
John	Hemphill	Sen EPW Min.	
John	Rodriguez	Sen Lott	
Joshua	Schenkman	Sen. Wyden	(202) 228-2717
Joyce	Rechtschaffen	Sen. Lieberman	(202) 224-9750
Julia	Hathaway	Sen. Graham	(202) 224-2237
Julie	Manes	Sen. Grassley	(202) 224-6020
Justin	LeBlanc	Sen. Murray	(202) 224-0238
Karl	Glasener	Sen Ag Cte	
Karl	Limvere	Sen. Dorgan	(202) 224-1193
Karl	Holguim	Sen. Boxer	(202) 228-1338
Kate	English	Sen. Kerry	(202) 224-8525
Kathy	Lacey	Sen. Feinstein	(202) 228-3954
Keith	Yehle	Sen. Roberts	(202) 224-3514
Ken	Connelly	Sen. Jeffords	(202) 228-0338
Kenneth	Peel	Sen. Hagel	(202) 224-5213
Kent	Bonham	Sen. Hagel	(202) 224-5213
Kevin	Kolevar	Sen. Abraham	(202) 228-1244

Kiel	WEaver	Sen. Grams	(202) 228-0956
Kimberly	Stein	Sen. Shelby	(202) 224-3416
Kira	Finkler	Sen Bumpers	
Kirk	Johnson	Sen. Conrad	(202) 224-7776
Kristy	Simms	Sen. Lott	(202) 224-2262
Linda	Delgado	Sen. Boxer	(202) 228-1338
Lisa	Jeager	Sen. Hutchinson	(202) 224-0776
Marc	Sumerlin	Sen. Domenici	(202) 224-4835
Margaret	Cummisky	Sen. Inouye	(202) 224-6747
Mark	Whittington	Republican Policy Committee	(202) 224-1235
Marla	Marvin	Sen. Murray	(202) 224-0238
Martin	McBroom	Sen. Byrd	(202) 228-0002
Mary	Stallings	Sen. Bumpers	(202) 224-6435
Mary Frances	Repko	Sen. Feingold	(202) 224-2725
Matt	Shimkus	Sen. Gramm	(202) 228-2856
McLane	Layton	Sen. Nickles	(202) 224-6008
Melissa	Carey	Sen Moynihan	(202) 228-0406
Mike	Carlson	Sen. Santorum	(202) 228-0604
Mimi	Brody	Sen. Kennedy	(202) 224-2417
Missy	Copher	Sen. Coats	(202) 228-4745
Page	Faulk	Sen Santorum	
Patti	McNerney	Senate Foreign Relations	(202) 224-0836
Paul	Carliner	Sen. Mikulski	(202) 224-8858
Paul	Burgess	Sen. Enzi	(202) 228-5693
Peg	McGlinch	Sen. Moynihan	(202) 228-0406
Peter	Phipps	Sen. D'Amato	(202) 224-5871
Peter	Pagano	Sen. Torricelli	(202) 224-8567
Rachael	Farnham	Sen. Thompson	(202) 228-3679
Reid	Cavnar	Sen. Shelby	(202) 224-5744
Rhea	Suh	Sen. Campbell	(202) 224-1933
Rich	Glick	Sen. Bumpers	(202) 224-6435
Richard	Gupton	Senator Coverdell	(202) 228-3783
Richard	Pouyat	Sen. Moynihan	(202) 228-0406
Rick	Murphy	Sen. Gregg	(202) 224-4952
Rob	Pinkerton	Sen. Thurmond	(202) 224-1300
Robert	Mangas	Sen. Ford	(202) 224-0046
Sally	Kane	Sen Lieberman	(202) 224-9750
Sarah	Bittelman	Sen Energy - Minority	(202) 228-0391
Sarah	Massing	Sen. Sessions	(202) 224-3149
Sarah	Lister	Sen Ag Cte	
Sarah B.	Heman	Sen. ENR-Bumpers	

#4-###

Scott	Brady	Sen. Cleland	(202) 224-0072
Scott	O'Malia	Sen. McConnell	(202) 224-2499
Sean	Callinicos	Sen. Faircloth	(202) 224-7406
Shannon	Watson	Sen. Glenn	(202) 224-7983
Sharon	Miner	Sen. Bingaman	(202) 224-2852
Shaun	Parkin	Sen. Bennett	(202) 224-4908
Sheila	Duffy	Sen. Dodd	(202) 224-1083
Stan	Harris	Sen. Domenici	(202) 224-7371
Stephanie	Mercer	Senate Ag (Minority)	
Stephanie	Helfrich	Sen. Johnson	(202) 228-0368
Steve	Etka	Sen. Kohl	(202) 224-9787
Suzanne	Fleek	Sen. Leahy	(202) 224-3595
Tamara	Nameroff	Sen. Lieberman	(202) 224-9750
Tom	Wood	Sen. Frist	(202) 228-1264
Tom	Dower	Sen. Specter	(202) 228-1229
Tracy	Henke	Sen. Bond	(202) 224-8149
Walt	Luken	Sen Lugar	
Wayne	Hammon	Sen Craig	
Wayne	Boyles	Sen. Helms	(202) 228-1339

(4)

Clinton Presidential Records
Digital Records Marker

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

This marker identifies the place of a tabbed divider. Given our digitization capabilities, we are sometimes unable to adequately scan such dividers. The title from the original document is indicated below.

Divider Title: **Briefings**

To: Stern, Sperling, McGinty,Hilley
From: Wyman

SENATE VISITS
October 10, 1997

Department Secretary	Agency Contact	Member	Response/Date
?????		Lott	
Babbitt	Amy Holley 208-7693 ok	Bumpers B. Kerrey Inouye B. Graham	strg support 10/9 need grassroots 10/9 not engaged 10/9 offer treaty to Senate early b/f '98 campaigns 10/9
Pena	Gary Faut 586-5450 ok 10/10 lm	Bingaman Baucus Breaux Rockefeller	
Glickman	Dave Carlin 720-7095	Lugar Dorgan Daschle	go slowly, little support 10/9 large lignite $ on scrubbers/must bring China & India "fairness" 10/9
Browner	Diane Hicks ok	Chafee	meeting 10/10
Cohen (Kris Balderston) (Calls next week)		McCain Jeffords	

Daley	Craig Lee 482-3281	Stevens

(traveling, I have asked that call be made from road)

Shalala	Kevin Burk 690-7627 ok	Kohl (call placed 10/9) Moseley-Braun (call placed 10/9)
Summers	Rick Sinkfield 622-1900 lm	Moynihan D'Amato Roth
Slater	Cresence Massey 366-9714 366-3675 fax ok	Snowe (call placed) Frist (call placed)
Goldin	Mary Kerwin 358-1948 ok	Glenn Mikulski
McGinty Stern		Lieberman office meeting 10/9 Harkin Conrad

Not assigned: Hollings, Robb, Cleland, Leahy

CLIMATE SENATE NOTIFICATION
October 22, 1997

I. Floor Statement or Statement in Record

John Kerry	Kate English: working on statement : working w/grp press
Joe Lieberman	Joyce Rechtscheften: working on statement, Senator out Thursday & Fri., would have to be Wed.
Dale Bumpers	Sarah Bittleman: need details, could do statement thur or fri
John Chafee	Dan Delich: preparing rept for Chafee to take to conference luncheon on Tuesday, I'll get rept back. Pls note**Chafee will have a hard time supporting President if decision includes cost caps.
Max Baucus	Barbara Roberts: need more info
Joe Biden	Jim Green: wants to help, needs to see details
Jim Jeffords	Tatiana Muessel/ Ken Connolly: will support and will do statement or go to floor
Ron Wyden	Joshua Schenkman: if incl forest management domestically
Jeff Bingaman	Bob Simon: want to be supportive
Paul Wellstone	Brian Symmes : yes will be statement but may be left of us
Barbara Boxer	Linda Delgado: yes if CA spin
Russ Feingold	Mary Frances Repko
Robert Torricelli	Peter Pagano: probably, need details
Patrick Leahy	Suzanne Flee: left message
Robert Byrd	Dick D'Amato / Marty McBroom: if contains dev countries and no escape hatch.
John Rockefeller	Drew Fields: will submit statement
Tom Harkin	
Carl Levin	

II. Notification and Briefing
Wed. 4:45 pm, S127

(Observer Group)	*Briefing Todd, Gene, Katie, Dan*
Byrd	
Hagel	
Baucus	
Bingaman	
Kerry	
Levin	
Lieberman	
Abraham	
Chafee	
Murkowski	

Roberts
Craig

III. *Leadership Erskine Bowles, John Hilley or Susan Brophy*
Daschle
Lott

IV. *Committees of Jurisdiction - Cabinet*

Agriculture	Glickman
Lugar	
Harkin	
Armed Services	Cohen
Thurmond	
Levin	
Commerce	Daley
McCain	
Hollings	
Energy	Pena
Murkowski	
Bumpers	
Environment	Babbitt
Chafee	
Baucus	
Foreign Relations	Albright
Helms	
Biden	
Labor	Hermann
Jeffords	
Kennedy	
Finance	Summers (not jurisdictional but important)
Roth	
Moynihan	
D'Amato	

Other (these offices should be notified -if not invited to event, can be called from Legislative Affairs)

Durbin	Jim Jepsen
Breaux	Adam Lawrence
Murray	Justin LeBlanc
Glenn	Shannon Watson
Dorgan	Andrea Nygren
Robb	Jennifer Chun

Specter
Lugar
Lautenberg
Dodd
Kennedy
B. Graham
B. Kerrey
Feinstein
Wyden
Inouye
Cleland
Kohl
Moseley-Braun
Snowe
Frist
Mikulski
Conrad

Tom Dower
Jeff Birham
Amy Maron
Sheila Duffy
Mimi Brody
Julia Hathaway
Diane Hill
Kathy Lacey
Hope Whitney

GLOBAL WARMING (Senate - October 21, 1997)

[Page: S10871]

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, this week, representatives from over 160 nations are meeting in Bonn, Germany, for the final negotiating session prior to the climate change conference scheduled in Kyoto in December. It is a critical meeting, the culmination of several years of international cooperation on this extraordinarily important global issue.

Over the past several months I have had an opportunity to discuss global warming with scientists and representatives from the United States and abroad and, indeed, we have had one brief discussion on the Senate floor in the context of the Byrd-Hagel amendment.

Last week, I met in London with a number of officials of the Government of Great Britain, but most importantly on this subject with Foreign Minister Robin Cook, to discuss our mutual concerns about the climate change problem and how best to address this issue from a global perspective. As our U.S. negotiators continue their work in Bonn and the President finalizes the U.S. position for the Kyoto conference, I wanted to share with my colleagues some views on the science of global warming, on the international process, the U.S. role, and the next steps that the United States and others should undertake to address this issue in a responsible manner.

Last July, I joined with Senator Byrd and others in the Chamber to discuss global warming and to debate Senate Resolution 98 which addressed some of the Senate position on the Kyoto treaty. The Byrd-Hagel resolution called for the United States to support binding commitments to reduce greenhouse gases only if: One, all nations, developed and developing, participate in addressing this global problem; and two, if the commitment did not adversely impact the U.S. economy. In addition, the resolution created a bipartisan Senate observer group of which I am pleased to be a member. Our task is to continue to monitor this process.

I supported the Byrd-Hagel resolution, Mr. President, which passed the Senate 95-0 after we worked out in colloquy some of the interpretations of definitions contained therein. I supported it because I believe that there has to be a universal effort to tackle this ever-growing problem, and that the United States, while taking a lead role, need not jeopardize its economic viability in order to meet our international obligations.

The resolution language, in my judgment, provides enough flexibility to address the concerns of growing economies of the developing world even as we encourage them to join in this global effort.

The resolution was silent, however, as to the science of global warming. It addressed only the U.S. role in the Kyoto negotiations. During the debate over the resolution, there was some discussion by a few Senators over their interpretation individually of the science. But there was no broad debate about the science, and there was certainly in the resolution no judgment by the U.S. Senate whatsoever as to the foundations of science which might or might not be applied to the negotiations in Kyoto. From the statements in the Record by the resolution's chief sponsor, Senator Byrd, it is clear that he agrees, as I and others do, that the prospect of human-induced global warming as an accepted thesis is beyond debate, and that there are many adverse impacts that can be anticipated as a consequence of those theories in fact being found to be true. We are joined by many of our colleagues in thinking that there is sufficient scientific consensus that human activities are exacerbating

climate changes.

The vast majority of scientists and policymakers who have examined this issue carefully have concluded that the science is sound and that it is time to take additional steps through the established international theory to address this issue in a more systematic way. A small but extremely vociferous minority continue to assert that the science is not yet convincing. They advocate a wait-and-see approach. They believe that continued review and inaction is best for the U.S. economy and for Americans in general.

Given the money that the very vociferous minority has been expending in trying to promote their view, and given the fact that shortly we will be engaged in some discussions based on the factual foundations of this issue, I would like to address the issue of science for a few moments on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, the vast majority of the scientific community--the vast majority of those who have taken time to make a dispassionate, apolitical, nonideological determination based on lifetimes of work, and certainly on a lifetime-acquired discipline in their particular areas--the vast majority of consensus of those who have been so engaged is that the science regarding global warming is compelling and that to do nothing would be the most dangerous of all options.

In the late 1980's, a number of our Senate colleagues--among them Vice President Gore, State Department Counselor Tim Wirth, Senators John Heinz and Fritz Hollings--and I, and a few others became increasingly concerned about the potential threat of global warming. It was at that time that I joined as an original cosponsor of Senator Hollings' bill, the National Global Change Research Act, which attracted support from many Members still serving in this body, including Senators Stevens, McCain, Cochran, Inouye, and Gorton. After numerous hearings and roundtable discussions, this legislation to create the global change research program at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration became law in 1990.

As a Senator from a coastal State I take very seriously parochial implications of global warming. As a United States Senator and a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am also concerned about the crafting of a workable international response that treats all parties--including the United States --fairly.

I have stated that I would be happy to engage any of my colleagues in the debate on the science of climate change here on the Senate floor, or elsewhere. And I have sought on numerous occasions--as yet not successfully--to try to get an adequate airing of the science within the Senate observer group. And it is my hope that, before that group reports to the Senate, a broad-based review of the science will be undertaken in a bipartisan, nonpolitical way.

But, Mr. President, before we even proceed further with that

analysis, I want to take this opportunity to at least lay out some precursor truths with respect to the science as we know it.

Whether by nature or experience, we know that scientists are a fundamentally cautious group of people. That is why I find it particularly compelling that over 2,000 scientists who participated in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change--the most comprehensive and thoroughly reviewed assessment of any environmental problem ever undertaken--concluded that global climate change is currently under way. The 1995 IPCC report concludes that the Earth has already warmed about 1

degree Fahrenheit over the last century, and that `the balance of evidence suggests that there is a discernible human influence on global climate.' The IPCC estimates that the global surface air temperature will increase another 2 to 6.5 degrees Fahrenheit in the next century. Their `best guess' is that we will experience warming of about 3.5 degrees Fahrenheit by the year 2100. That would be a faster rate of climate change than any experienced during the last 10,000 years of the history of this planet. And we have to recognize that the human history as we have recorded it and, therefore, understand its impact on ourselves and current human endeavor is within a span of about 8,000 years.

The conclusion that the observed warming trend is not simply a natural fluctuation is affirmed by the research of several institutions. Basing their conclusions on climate model calculations, scientists at the Max Planck Institute for Meteorology in Hamburg, Germany, concluded that the warming of the Earth over the past 30 years goes far beyond natural variations. Indeed, there is a judgment that there is only a 1-in-40 chance of that variation being natural. So we are dealing with a 1-in-40 prospect in terms of odds.

The United States and other governments have been collecting at ground-based and ocean-based sites global surface temperature measurements since the year 1880. Remarkably the 11 warmest years this century have all occurred since 1980, with 1995 the warmest on record.

Some will argue that there are discrepancies between our long-term surface record and recent satellite observations. But that fact--by again nonideological dispassionate and nonpolitical scientists--has been determined to be not surprising at all because the two techniques--measurement at the surface and measurement by satellite--are entirely different. They measure temperature at different parts of the Earth's system--the surface and various layers of the atmosphere. In addition, other factors, such as the presence of airborne materials from the 1991 eruption of Mt. Pinatubo volcano, affect each record in a very different way.

The natural `greenhouse effect' has made life on Earth possible. Without it, our planet would be about 60 degrees colder. Water vapor, carbon dioxide, and other trace gases, such as methane and nitrous oxide, trap the solar heat, and they slow the loss of that solar heat by the reradiation back into space. That is a natural process.

But with industrialization and with population growth, greenhouse gas emissions from human activities have consistently increased. Anthropogenic climate changes, most importantly the burning of fossil fuels--coal, oil, and natural gas--and deforestation, have tipped the very delicate balance of nature. We all know that the forests of the planet play a critical role in the recycling of carbon dioxide. The forests in the Amazon, all through Central and Latin America, and all through Asia have been disappearing in entirely measurable and discernible ways. As we have seen by satellite photography over the last 15 or 20 years, all of the areas of the Earth's green are beginning to shrink in those satellite photographs; we understand that we are diminishing our capacity to do the recycling of the CO2.

Therefore, more gas is trapped. More gases have the impact of diminishing the amount of reradiation that takes place. This natural climate variability alone, including the effect of volcanic

eruptions and solar variability--that is, sunspot activity--would not have changed carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere. However, the manmade addition, presently about 3 percent of annual natural emissions, is sufficient to exceed what is known to be the balancing effects of `carbon sinks.' As a result, carbon dioxide is gradually accumulated in the atmosphere, until, at present, its

concentration is 30 percent above preindustrial levels. Existing data of other greenhouse gases show increasing concentrations of methane, nitrous oxide, and chlorofluorocarbons over recent decades. While ice core data show that concentrations of methane and nitrous oxide have increased in the past few centuries, after having been relatively constant for thousands of years, chlorofluorocarbons are absent from deep-ice cores because they have no natural sources and were not manufactured before 1930.

So I want to emphasize for those who try to doubt the science, for those who come and say there is no indicator of this change and that we have only been recording the temperature since 1880, the fact is that both in the Arctic and the Antarctic we have accumulations of thousands of years--tens of thousands of years--of ice. And we have to be able to bore down into that ice. In the bores that we bring out--just as we have tested and found geological formations which have allowed us to drill for gas--we have been able to come up with ice cores. And as the scientists look at those ice cores, they have been able to measure the degree of carbon dioxide that was trapped in those ice cores. By measuring that, and, indeed, by measuring the absence of chlorofluorocarbons, we have been able to trace thousands of years of climatic activity and change that we otherwise would not have knowledge of.

That is what has given us this capacity to make a determination about the rapidity with which changes are taking place today relative to what we knew or can discern was taking place thousands of years ago.

While we have no control over sun spots or volcanoes, we, obviously, can control human activities.

Then the question will be, 'Well, why should we do that? What is the showing that somehow this really represents a danger sufficient to require a response from Government?' Well, the essential issue here, Mr. President, is one of compounding emissions over time. We know that the emissions we put into the atmosphere today have a life that goes on and on and on. It is like nuclear material that has a half-life. So does this material have a half-life. And the fact is that, even if we were to stop our activity today, what is already in the atmosphere will continue to do the damage that it does. And the models have to measure the rate at which we might be able to reduce today in order to guarantee that you have turned off the spigot sufficiently to be able to control what will happen in the future. But anyone who follows the stock market or even your back account, obviously, understands the miracle of compounded interest. It means that a small amount set aside becomes a big amount over time.

That is what is happening to the Earth's accumulation of greenhouse gases. Many of these gases reside in the atmosphere for years to come--hundreds to thousands of years. Even constant emissions of the gases can cause atmospheric concentrations to build up rapidly.

So, unlike the stock market, when it comes to emissions, the small amounts don't necessarily bring a miracle. But they could bring enormous calamities.

So why would we care if the Earth warms a few degrees? I have actually heard people say it really doesn't matter that much if all of a sudden North Dakota or South Dakota became a little more attractive, and they don't have as long a winter, or somehow you have a longer hiking season in a particular State. Well, Mr. President, it isn't that simple. It just isn't reduced to that kind of simplistic judgment about the overall impacts.

The IPCC scientific assessment of climate change estimated that the average surface temperature

will increase by 1 to 3.5 degrees with an associated rise in sea level of 6 to 37 inches. These changes are projected to lead to a number of potentially serious consequences with incidence of heat waves, floods, droughts, hurricanes, and other extreme events affecting human health and natural ecosystems.

Americans will experience more health problems and there will be an increase in health-induced deaths from future warming. Heat waves of the type in the 1995 Chicago heat wave which killed 465 people will occur more frequently, and increased warming will exacerbate existing air quality problems such as smog that aggravate asthma and allergic disorders, especially in children and the elderly. Warmer climates breed diseases such as malaria, dengue and yellow fevers, encephalitis, and cholera due to the expansive range of mosquitoes as a consequence of increased warmer climates and other disease-carrying organisms.

One key aspect of climate change that is important to remember is the slow capacity of any corrective action to have an impact. Harvard professor and member of the President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology, Dr. John Holdren, shared his analogy at the White House Round Table on Climate Change. He said:

[Page: S10873]

The world's energy-economic system is a lot like a supertanker, very hard to steer and with very bad brakes * * * and we know from the science that the supertanker is heading for a reef * * * it's a bad idea to keep on a course of full speed ahead.

The oceans are going to continue to expand for several centuries even after the temperatures stabilize. We are currently dealing with rising sea levels that are already eroding beaches and wetlands, inundating low-lying areas and increasing the vulnerability of coastal areas to flooding from storm surges and intense rainfall.

We know how costly droughts, flood control, and erosion mitigation efforts can be to the taxpayers. We constantly, every year, are facing requests from one community or another to do a beach-erosion project or to undertake some kind of erosion mitigation, and we spend literally millions of dollars in insurance as a consequence of those anticipated problems already.

Damages from the southern plains drought of 1996 were estimated at $4 billion; the 1993 Mississippi River flood damages were $10 billion to $20 billion; the Pacific Northwest floods of the winter of 1996-97 were $3 billion; the 1997 Ohio River flood was nearly $1 billion; and the 1997 river flood in the Northern Plains was another $2 billion. And this is just the impact of the changes perceived in the United States in the last few years.

Scientists have not definitively said that any one of these events I just listed is absolutely tied to global warming. And I am not going to suggest that that is in fact true if they are not willing to suggest that that there is that linkage. But the scientists have issued a warning. The scientists have issued a warning--not the politicians, the scientists. And their warning is that these disasters collectively show precisely what we are likely to see if we do not reverse the current trend lines of global warming. And we will see them with greater frequency, with more destruction under global warming.

The areas of greatest vulnerability are those where quality and quantity of water are already problems such as the arid and semiarid regions in the United States and the world. If warming trends were to continue, then water scarcity in the Middle East and Africa will become even more

pronounced, exacerbating tensions among countries that depend on water supplies that originate outside of their borders.

Another key area of concern will be the dramatic alteration of geographic distributions of vegetation. The composition of one-third of the Earth's forests would undergo major changes as a result of a doubling of preindustrial carbon dioxide levels. Over the next 100 years, the range of some North American forest

species will shift by as much as 300 miles to the north, far faster than the forests can migrate naturally. For example, in my region of the country, New England, we could lose the most economically important species, the sugar maple.

Other areas of the country would be hit economically as well. The tourism industry, for instance, surrounding the Glacier National Park could literally evaporate along with glaciers which we already know have receded steadily for decades. Since the park's founding, over 70 percent of the glaciers have already melted. Model projections indicate that all of the park's glaciers will disappear by the year 2030 unless temperatures begin to cool. One-third to one-half of the world's mountain glacier mass could disappear by the year 2100, thus eliminating a natural reservoir of water for many areas.

Let me give an example. In Lima, Peru, the entire water supply for 10 million people depends on the annual summer melt from a glacier that is now in rapid retreat. These are just some of the predictions, predictions made by scientists, predictions made by various models where they have taken the data which scientists have agreed on--not speculated about, but agreed on.

The facts about global warming are beyond reasonable scientific doubt, and they ought to be beyond reasonable policymaking doubt.

Mr. John Browne, CEO of British Petroleum, in a recent speech at Stanford University said:

The time to consider the policy dimensions of climate change is not when the link between greenhouse gases and climate change is conclusively proven but when the possibility cannot be discounted and is taken seriously by the society of which we are part. We in BP have reached that point.

That is the CEO of British Petroleum saying that they have reached the point of concluding that linkage exists.

Efforts to rein in and reduce manmade contributions of such emissions are now warranted. Worst case scenarios under current business-as-usual practices are catastrophic.

So let me turn for a moment to the international efforts and the role of the United States at this point.

In 1992, it was precisely because of those scientific conclusions that I have just enumerated that President Bush at the Earth Summit in Rio signed a climate-change agreement, and it was ratified later that year by the Senate. That agreement pledged that nations would reduce their gas emissions to their 1990 levels by the year 2000. Regrettably, the vast majority of nations, including the United States, have failed to achieve this goal. Today, the United States has increased emissions about 8 percent above 1990 levels. Much of that increase has been tied to our economic expansion.

However, it should also be noted that industry during this remarkable growth period was also

engaged in a voluntary program to reduce emissions. While not achieving its objective completely, the voluntary effort did meet 70 percent of the original targets at a time when the American economy grew and wherein the American jobs machine was rolling along at as high a rate as we have seen in recent years. The relative success of voluntary industry effort ought to encourage confidence that more comprehensive efforts under a global regime can result in greater progress at far less cost than Cassandras allowed for.

However, the question is now for all countries, developed and developing, to step forward to support binding commitments to reach an acceptable level of human-induced emissions. That is why the United States is engaged in negotiating a legally binding climate-change agreement to be finalized in Kyoto this December.

Our challenge is to shape an agreement which sets tough, realistic global emission standards and goals while harnessing the market forces to lower costs, foster technological development, and ensure economic growth.

The climate change problem is global. It requires a solution, obviously, that includes a global response--participation from

all nations, industrialized countries and those countries in the developing world. The best approach is to establish a global economic incentive program in which the free market and not Government intervention is driving the reductions.

The goal of universal participation via an international treaty with binding commitments ought to be undertaken now, not with delay, not with an effort to try to have subterfuge diminish what we can accomplish in Kyoto. The United States, with 22 percent of global emissions, is the world's largest emitter of greenhouse gases. And today the industrial world comprises nearly three-quarters of all of the global emissions. But that does not mean that we are the only ones who should deal with this problem. The reason for that is clear. China is currently the world's second largest emitter, and it is expected to displace the United States as the largest emitter by the year 2015. Over the next few decades, 90 percent of the world's population growth will take place in the developing world. Given the projected economic and population growth statistics of China and other quickly developing countries such as India, Mexico and Brazil, the developing world will exceed the industrialized world in emissions by the year 2035.

Universal participation, therefore, does not mean we have to all begin at the same time. It does not mean you have to embrace the exact same commitment at the exact same implementation moment. Clearly, if one country is doing more than another, there is room for us to be able to negotiate an agreement where we all meet at the appropriate point. But it does mean that it is quite reasonable for the industrialized nations, those nations that have put most of the greenhouse pollution into the atmosphere, initially to take the lead, as long as in so doing they do not simply fall into a trap of disadvantaging themselves economically. A scenario where the industrialized world acts alone will not be enough to prevent the costly implications of global warming in the future.

I want to emphasize that. The developing nations cannot go to Kyoto and suggest that it is up to the developed world simply to bear the burden of reductions, because even if we reduce to the greatest degree possible, we cannot alone avert the problems that will come from global warming. It is absolutely essential that China, India, Brazil, Mexico, and other countries join in the effort with an understanding that we are moving down this road together.

Currently, many of these developing nations are not inclined to join in an international treaty. Some believe it is not in their immediate economic interests to do so. Others believe that as long as the biggest contributors to the problem, the industrialized nations, are not taking sufficient effective steps to cut back on greenhouse pollution, it is not in the interest of their nations to do so either. One could well understand how they would make that kind of determination. Some of them cite the language of the 1995 `Berlin Mandate,' calling on the Annex I countries, the developed countries, to be the ones to complete a treaty with binding commitments by December 1997 but to leave excluded the developing world from an established binding reduction target.

Let me say that in my reading of the `Berlin Mandate,' I do not believe that we are precluded from proceeding to Kyoto in an effort to come up with a two-stage arrangement which would have the developed countries enter into an agreement while simultaneously bringing the developed countries along.

I don't believe it is in any nation's interest to thwart international efforts to reduce greenhouse gases in as expeditious and as economically feasible a manner as possible. The remaining option is the option of doing nothing, and nothing would, in most people's judgment, be ultimate mutual devastation.

The only viable solution is a global treaty which provides economic incentives for all nations. I believe such a treaty can be crafted, one that would include all nations but permit flexibility in the targets and flexibility in the timing of compliance for developing nations, while at the same time requiring all countries to agree to make legally binding commitments by a date certain. If the United States signs such a treaty, it would be reasonable for the President to refrain from transmitting that treaty to the Senate until the developing world signs its binding commitments. In that way we can make Kyoto a success, coming up with the binding agreements necessary but still maintain and keep good faith with the approach we have thus far deemed to be the roadmap to the achievement of this treaty.

In this Chamber I previously shared my concerns with a component of the European proposal as it currently stands. The Europeans continue to argue for a treaty that would enable the European Union to secure an exclusive bubble emissions policy. This is tantamount to a regional emissions trading program. They want Europe to be contained under one bubble, whereby they can trade their emissions within the European bubble, a license, in effect, to increase emissions in some European countries by relying on the trendline decreases that are already in place in others. Such a posture is helpful only to the European Union. It fails to address the essential need to engage those rapidly growing economies of the developing world, and it excludes other industrialized countries which could be left to meet target reductions in a more costly manner.

The European proposal would provide the Europeans with a competitive advantage over the United States by creating this collective emissions cap as opposed to country-by-country reduction targets. Some European countries could actually increase their emissions by up to 40 percent. This approach, coupled with their opposition to joint implementation with developing nations, seems to be aimed almost exclusively at beating the United States out of economically sensible emissions reduction activities in Eastern Europe, Russia, the Far East, and elsewhere. I think they should know that is not acceptable under most people's definition of fairness.

Therefore, it is my feeling that we should approach Kyoto in the following way. I believe President Clinton and his advisers have been developing a U.S. position for these negotiations that moves mostly in the right direction. I have shared views with the administration over the course of these last

months and in recent weeks, and there are a number of different options that are currently rumored to be under consideration by the President. It is my hope the President will announce a U.S. position that is aggressive in curbing the projected business-as-usual trendline.

I believe the President ought to press for a proposal that will seek at least a target of 2010, rather than the outyear options of 2020 or 2030 that we have heard discussed. The Europeans, given the protection of their European bubble proposal, have proposed a 15 percent reduction below the 1990 levels by the year 2010. Perhaps without the bubble this level may prove to be too ambitious to achieve without significant harm to their economies. However, I believe it is realistic for the United States and other nations to stabilize their emissions at 1990 levels by the year 2010, remembering, of course, that our original goal was to do so by the year 2000. With additional economic incentives such as early credits for reductions and joint implementation and a market-oriented emissions trading system, perhaps additional reductions could be undertaken.

I believe also that the centerpiece of the U.S. negotiating position should be a worldwide emissions trading

program. Emissions trading is an important market mechanism that will benefit all countries including the United States. But it is not only advantageous to U.S. businesses. It will provide developing countries with incentives to sign up to binding legal commitments that are absolutely essential to a workable treaty.

The market-based approach of emissions trading is a sensible one that helps businesses lower costs by promoting emissions reductions and by giving the industry flexibility to decide how they will go about reducing pollution. We know an emissions trading system could reduce the cost of emissions controls dramatically, afford American industry great opportunities to do what we do best, which is to innovate, to develop cheaper, better ways of getting the job done. And, if the system includes joint implementation with developing countries, providing jobs here at home in the well-paying technology export sectors that serve the booming demands in rapidly industrializing nations, we would be well served.

Experiences in States such as Massachusetts or California or Texas or Florida, States which have invested in technology and which have built on their combined technology bases and education bases--those experiences have proven where we invest in technology in order to solve some of these problems, we inevitably not only create jobs for Americans but we wind up creating an export capacity, because we are the leading, cutting edge of technology and we wind up greatly reducing the costs that the original estimates are based on.

If you look at the SO2 reduction programs in this country, I remember the automobile and other industries arguing it was going to be upward of $1,000 per ton to reduce. In fact, because of the technology advances, the costs have come in around $90. Therefore, the opportunity, by virtue of pushing our technology and advancing our capacity to transfer that technology to the developing countries, can assist all of us in the effort to create jobs and to provide for the gains necessary to be able to meet these targets. The United States should contain in this effort, along with the rest of the industrialized countries, a significant technology transfer component in order to assist in achieving this treaty and its goals.

Economically, the best time to establish an international trading program is now. Many developing countries are currently investing in long-term energy programs. By excluding any discussion of joint implementation with developing countries and early credits for reductions prior to implementation of

such a system, important incentives to encourage developing countries to begin shifting their development trajectory to a cleaner path would be lost. U.S. industry and U.S. competitiveness are the winners of an international trading system, wholly apart from any environmental gains.

Environmentally, we need to get the trading program going as soon as possible, and world events are escalating the seriousness of the problem. The terrible fires in Indonesia and the havoc that that conflagration continues to wreak on the people of South Asia are additional testaments to an urgent need for a global framework that provides powerful market incentives for environmentally friendlier behavior. Emissions from these fires are pumping greenhouse gases into the atmosphere and destroying forests that could be protected and harvested in a much more sustainable manner. A Kyoto protocol that provides credits for protecting forests that sequester carbon dioxide, and an income stream that would potentially be available to those who husband the forest, would be an important step for the nations and the peoples of the worlds.

A model for such a regime is the SO2 trading program contained in the 1990 Clean Air Act. That program, as I mentioned a moment ago, really contradicted what had been predicted by the industry. According to the Wall Street Journal, some initial industry estimates for those SO2 reductions were $1,500 per ton but which actually came in at $90 per ton, which was 6 percent of the original doom forecast of the industry.

I would like to emphasize one point about the sulfur program that is key to its success. In the sulfur trading program, the Government has resisted the temptation to intervene in the market and provide price props or cushions, or to print new allowances and sell them at a set price. I understand that one option before the President is exactly such an approach. I believe other Senators would join me and strongly urge him to resist such intervention here. When the Government intervenes in market trading it inevitably drives those prices up.

My recommendation to the President would be that any proposal that would make companies pay the Government for additional carbon permits is likely to be regarded--in this institution, anyway--as a thinly veiled tax, and would, frankly, not receive favorable reception. I urge the President to let the market for greenhouse emissions reductions do what the markets do best, which is to spur companies to develop better products at a lower cost. I am very optimistic that the President will ultimately make a judgment that would be opposed to that alternative, significant intervention in the marketplace.

A second goal should be a framework that brings all countries into this effort at the beginning while allowing for the developing countries to initiate their reduction efforts at a different rate than the industrialized world. I think this is an essential component of any realistic approach to this effort. Even without a universal emission reductions program, the Montreal Protocol, signed by President Reagan during his second term, called for the phaseout of chlorofluorocarbons. As with the SO2 estimates, the CFC reduction costs were grossly exaggerated by certain industry sectors. Market-type mechanisms in the Montreal Protocol and the U.S. domestic implementation program drove prices down, with the result that companies were spurred to bring online CFC substitutes that proved cheaper and cleaner. A more inclusive treaty, covering all greenhouse gas emissions, sources and sinks would produce even more economic and environmental progress.

A final goal is to recognize the opportunity presented by technology to help in this effort. The United States is now a world leader in the high tech industries of pollution prevention, abatement and control. With a global emissions reduction treaty, the faster we invest in new pollution prevention and energy conservation technologies, the faster we will achieve emissions reductions and the quicker we

will gain market share in the international arena. This means more jobs for U.S. workers and more revenues for U.S. companies. If we don't, then someone else will.

I would simply cite the example of what took place in the two decades ago. At the end of the 1970's, President Carter had made a commitment to alternative and renewable fuel research. Regrettably, when the Reagan administration arrived in 1980, support for the institute in Colorado was withdrawn. So it was that over a 10-year period of time the great lead that the United States had built up in photovoltaics and in alternatives and renewables was lost.

Today, as the former Soviet bloc countries of Eastern Europe come online in their effort to try to reduce the grotesque pollution that is one of the longest legacies of the Communist rule, they are turning to the Japanese and to the Germans for the technology where we once were the leader. But since we withdrew our own investment, we ceased to be that leader.

So I believe there is, in this effort, an enormous economic opportunity for the United States for the future. At home, we need to consider ways to leverage our technological leadership through domestic tax provisions, such as a zero capital gains tax rate, or a specifically targeted investment tax credit for companies that invest in pollution prevention and energy conservation, or quicker depreciation of investment in such technologies. I repeat, a zero capital gains tax rate or faster depreciation for those companies that invest in energy saving, energy conservation and pollution prevention.

I anticipate, Mr. President, that following the announcement the President makes regarding a U.S. proposal, regardless of what that proposal entails, there will be a number of colleagues on the floor of the Senate denouncing it, arguing that the science is not yet there or that the economic assumptions are unreliable. Some will argue it is unnecessary and too costly for the United States to participate in an international treaty.

On the contrary. I believe the evidence from scientists is overwhelming, that it is far too costly to sit on the sidelines and do nothing. Mr. President, 2,500 leading economists, including 8 Nobel laureates tell us:

For the United States in particular, sound economic analysis shows that there are policy options that would slow climate change without harming American living standards, and these measures may, in fact, improve U.S. production in the long term.

I believe that if we heed the warnings, if we plan for the future now, if we avoid allowing this to become the political football that it might, if we seek the involvement of all nations, we can secure a healthy planet for ourselves and for our children and for future generations, and we can exercise our responsibility as U.S. Senators in the way that we ought to. I yield the floor.

[Page: S10875]

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kempthorne). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his thoughtful comments about global warming. It is a subject in which I am deeply interested.

I was very interested and pleased with his references and comparisons with what took place with the Montreal protocol and our efforts that were successful in controlling chlorofluorocarbons, so-called CFC's. There is an example where the first scientific body of opinion suggested that, indeed, the CFC's were destroying the ozone layer. There was great skepticism, not only in this body, but throughout the Nation. But gradually, through testimony and through powerful speeches and articles by those who were involved, this country came to recognize that, indeed, CFC's were destroying the ozone layer, were causing skin cancer to our population and the population of the world.

As a result of that, we moved forward and various meetings were held, which many of us remember, and capping it all off was the Montreal protocol, which called for substantial reduction of the production of CFC's in our country and the world.

At the time, it looked as though it would be very difficult to achieve, but as the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out, the United States' scientific and mechanical ingenuity rose to the surface and, lo and behold, we not only met those reductions but we exceeded them.

The results are now showing that the amount of chlorofluorocarbons in the atmosphere has been reduced, at least the increases have been reduced, and gradually we will see a reduction in the total body of CFC's, as it were, in the atmosphere, because all of this takes a long time to achieve.

I also say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I think it is important to stress not only the costs of complying with a global warming treaty--that is always what is portrayed, it is going to cost our farmers, it is going to cost our manufacturers, it is going to cost our automobile industry, the coal miners, and on and on it goes. The costs of complying. But rarely does anybody ask, what are the costs if we don't have the treaty?

The scientific evidence, as the Senator from Massachusetts was pointing out, is increasingly coming to be recognized that, indeed, the world is becoming warmer, just as the Senator pointed out what is happening to the ice accumulations, the glaciers. In every single place in the world, the glaciers are retreating. Why is that coming about? It is coming about because of the increased temperature, infinitesimal though it might seem, that is occurring throughout the world.

So more and more I believe we have to say to ourselves, what does it cost if we don't do anything? Just take Florida. I don't know what the height of Florida is above sea level, but it must be tiny. If they get an increase in the level of the oceans of the world, and particularly those in the Caribbean, for example, the effects to Florida can't help but be devastating. Indeed, in my State, likewise; Massachusetts, likewise. In all our States, we are doing what we can to increase seawalls. What is happening? We are not sure. All we know is, once upon a time, our beaches were steeper and now they have been cut away. Now we have to have breakwaters and barriers and groins, as they call them, and so forth, to try and prevent the erosion of the soil.

The Senator from Massachusetts pointed out what one of the presidents of one of the oil-producing countries of the world had to say. I would like to also point out a statement by the chairman of the Ford Motor Co. finance committee, none other than William Clay Ford, Jr. This is what he had to say on October 11, just 10 days ago, as quoted in the Washington Post:

[Page: S10876]

Ford Motor executive William Clay Ford, Jr., called global warming a genuine threat to the environment and said automakers who oppose a proposed treaty to address the problem risk being

`marginalized' in the court of public opinion.

This is what someone, whose family owns 40 percent of the voting stock of Ford Motor Co., had to say.

The remarks by Ford, a leading contender to become chairman of the No. 2 automaker, distances himself from several Detroit executives who, in recent months, have criticized the proposed global warming treaty saying the phenomenon might not exist or its causes are uncertain.

So that's what the leader of the second largest automobile manufacturing company in our country had to say.

All I am saying to my colleagues, and substantiating what the Senator from Massachusetts said, is let's examine this thing carefully. Let's look at what the scientists have to say. We can say we don't agree with them. I don't know how many Nobel laureates there are in that group--are there 10 Nobel laureates in that most recent group? It is something like that--plus a total of 2,500 scientists.

I believe this thing is serious, and I think we ought to approach it with that attitude and not say, `No, we're not going to have anything to do with it because if we have anything to do with it and try and solve the problem it will be very expensive.' Well, that is no way to approach things.

I commend the Senator from Massachusetts for the remarks he made, and I hope that all our colleagues were listening. This thing is serious; let's take it seriously. We may not agree. We may have different scientific evidence, but let's not just trash it because it is going to be expensive to comply with.

Mr. KERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his generous comments and also for his substantive comments. He has been dealing with this issue for a long period of time. As chairman of the committee of jurisdiction with respect to the environment, as well as a Senator from a coastal State, a neighbor of ours, he is very knowledgeable about these impacts. He serves also on the observer group. So I appreciate his comments particularly and his leadership on it.

I will just say to my friend from Rhode Island, when I was in this discussion with the British minister just last week, he was quite dumbstruck, in fact, that Senators here are still questioning the science or that some people want to make an issue out of the science. There is almost a universal European acceptance among those in Government of the science. They really have stepped beyond that debate.

The debate now is not over the science. The debate is how do you really deal with this the best. The Senator from Rhode Island pointed out Ford Motor Co. Let me just share with my colleague the environmental commitment statement by the insurance industry. The insurance industry in America is increasingly concerned about this. Here is what they said:

Based on the current status of climate research and on their experience as insurers and reinsurers, the member companies of the UNEP-Insurance Industry Initiative conclude that . . . Man-made climate change will lead to shifts in atmospheric and ocean circulation patterns. This will probably

increase the likelihood of extreme weather events in certain areas. Such effects carry the risk of dramatically increased property damage, with serious implications for property insurers and reinsurers . . . We are convinced that in dealing with climate change risks, it is important to recognize the precautionary principle, in that it is not possible to quantify anticipated economic and social impacts of climate change fully before taking action. Research is needed to reduce uncertainty but cannot eliminate it entirely . . . We insist that in accordance with the precautionary principle, the negotiations for the Framework Convention on Climate Change must achieve early, substantial reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.

So I think that increasingly businesses are aware of the fact that the costs of not doing something are the real measurement here.

I thank the distinguished chairman for bringing that to the Senate's attention. I yield the floor.

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

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

A GLOBAL WARMING CHALLENGE (Senate - October 22, 1997)

[Page: S10920]

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I would like to comment on what is a challenge unique in human history that we face as a nation, and I am talking about global warming. It is unique because we have to make important decisions without a visible crisis staring us in the face.

In the 1970's, we had the long gas lines, we had two oil price shocks, the taking of hostages by a revolutionary mob in Iran, and that spurred our Nation to reduce its reliance on oil. And in the 1960's and the 1970's we had the dark clouds of particulates and the smog that smothered urban areas which moved us to clean up the air. Today, we are faced with a potentially greater threat, but it is not a visible threat. We are talking about something that is going to happen, something that is going to affect our children and their children, and the question is what are we going to do? It is a challenge for my State of Minnesota. It is a challenge for our country. It is a challenge for the whole human race. It is also a challenge about leadership. I am talking about the problem of global warming, the problem of climate change.

In 1992, for the Earth summit, President Bush made a commitment to return greenhouse gases to 1990 levels by the year 2000, and we have not lived up to that commitment. We have not honored that commitment. I believe the President, in 1993, made a similar commitment that we would reduce our greenhouse gases to the 1990 level by the year 2000.

I believe that the President's announcement today will fall far short of meeting this challenge--but I certainly want to say to the President and to the White House that I appreciate their efforts to try to move this process forward as we move toward a very important international gathering in Kyoto.

For more than a decade, the scientific community has investigated the issue. Initially, its reports called for more research, better modeling techniques, more data. But in December 1995, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, composed of more than 2,000 scientists from more than 100 countries, concluded that there was a discernible human impact on global climate. In

June, more than 2,000 U.S. scientists, including Nobel laureates, signed the Scientists' Statement on Global Disruption, which reads in part that the accumulation of greenhouse gases commits the Earth irreversibly to further global climate change and consequent ecological, economic and social disruption.

Mr. President, I believe as a Senator from Minnesota that we have reached a point where unduly delaying action on reducing greenhouse gas emissions is foolhardy and it is tantamount to betrayal of our future generations. We know what this is going to do. The consequences can be catastrophic for our country and for the world, and I believe that the President and the United States of America have to do better in addressing this challenge.

What has saddened me about this debate is that I believe we should be below 1990 levels certainly before the year 2010. I believe our country should make a commitment to meeting these kind of targets. I think the evidence shows that as opposed to being on the defensive, we should be proactive, and the very bridge the President talks about building to the next century is going to be a bridge that combines a sustainable environment with sustainable energy with a sustainable economy. I think the country that is the most clean country is going to be the country with an economy

powered by clean technologies, industries and businesses. It is going to be a country run with an emphasis on energy efficiency and with a renewable energy policy. It is going to be a country which will generate far more jobs in the renewable energy and clean technology sectors, which are labor intensive, small business intensive and community building sectors.

We have an opportunity as we move into the next millennium to really create a new marriage between our environment and our economy. We are all but strangers and guests on this land, as the Catholic bishops have said. We have to take action now. What the President is calling for is not likely to be enough to address this challenge and the task before us. We can do better as a nation. We can be more respectful of our environment while still growing our economy.

In the Red River Valley, the people of North Dakota and people of Minnesota went through a living hell this past winter and spring. We don't want the floods in the Red River Valley to be 5-year occurrences. And there will be other catastrophic consequences from global warming. For my State it could be agricultural devastation; for my State it could be deforestation and lower lake levels in the Boundary Waters, an area that we love, a crown jewel wilderness area in northern Minnesota.

The more important point, however, is that not only for ourselves but for our children and grandchildren we need to take much stronger action. We have to stand up to some of the powerful forces that are saying no to a meaningful treaty. We have to lay out a proactive, positive agenda which makes it crystal clear that energy efficiency and renewable energy and clean technologies will create many more small businesses and many more jobs for our country. This marriage between our economy and our environment would respect the environment, respect the economy, and would give us an energy policy that is much more productive and positive, while helping us to build and sustain our communities and our country.

I am disappointed in the position the President seems to have taken on targets and timetables for climate change action. I hope as we move forward toward an international treaty, our country will take a stronger negotiating position. We need to be the leaders of the world in meeting what I think is perhaps the most profound environmental challenge which we have ever faced.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

[Page: S10921]

Mr. BAUCUS. 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. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask consent to speak as in morning business.

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

GLOBAL WARMING (Senate - October 23, 1997)

[Page: S11004]

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, today we will be having some conversation on the floor concerning the global warming treaty. I will make a few comments concerning that in that I am the chairman of the Clean Air Committee of the Environment and Public Works Committee. We have had extensive hearings on this. I will review just very briefly what we have learned from the hearing that we held in our subcommittee in the Environment and Public Works Committee insofar as global warming is concerned.

In July, the Environmental Committee had a hearing on the global climate change treaty and we heard from five top scientists.

The conclusions I found were very interesting, particularly since last night when I watched Administrator Carol Browner talk about the scientific evidence that is conclusive concerning global climate change. That is not at all what we found in our hearing. We had five of the top scientists around. While there is a large body of scientific research, there is much controversy and disagreement in scientific facts being misrepresented by the administration and the press.

Four things that we came to a conclusion on were, No. 1, we don't know how much human activity has influenced the climate. One scientist before our committee said it could be as much as 6 percent.

Second, if you look at satellite data, we are not sure if there has been any global warming. We had a very interesting session that lasted more than an hour with viewing the satellites and what conclusions could come, and there was no conclusive evidence that there has actually been any global warming.

Three, even if we eliminate all manmade emissions, it may not have a noticeable impact on the environment, and the treaty may only eliminate emissions here in the United States and not in the entire world.

Four, when asked, all five scientists stated that we would not have the uncertainties understood by this December, when the administration plans on making a decision regarding the treaty.

Now, we found out yesterday that the President came and made his announcement. It is kind of interesting, Mr. President, because we passed a resolution on the floor of the Senate, by 95 to 0, that said we would reject any type of a treaty that came from Kyoto that didn't treat the developing nations the same as the developed nations. So the President came out with something where he is calling for a binding 30 percent reduction in emission levels by the year 2012. He calls this an important first step, with more reductions to follow.

As chairman of the Armed Services Readiness Subcommittee, I can tell you that this is going to have a profound negative affect on our ability to defend America, as the President stated yesterday that the military accounts for 43 percent of the Federal energy use. The Federal Government cannot reduce by 30 percent or more without significant cuts in the military. I think this equates to something like a 3 to 7 times greater cut than the Btu tax of 1993.

One of the things that bothered me more than anything else is the moving target that we are dealing

with. In March of 1995 in a House Commerce Committee hearing, Congressmen Dingell and Schaefer raised concerns that the new targets may not apply to all countries equally, and on behalf of the administration, Mr. Rafe Pomerance, a Deputy Assistant Secretary of the State Department said, `Our goal, Mr. Chairman, is that all parties participate in this next round of negotiations. We want to see that all governments participate and help define the post-2000 regime.'

One month later, the administration signed on to the Berlin Mandate to review the commitments made to reduce the greenhouse gases and adopt targets for further reductions. The conference differentiated between developed and developing nations. They signed on to this, totally at odds and contradicting the commitment made to the Congressmen.

n June 1996, Mr. Pomerance stated, `Are we going to agree to legally binding instrument in Geneva? No way.' One month later, Under Secretary Wirth announced that the United States supported a legally binding emissions target.

I want to also say that this has not changed since September 1996. It is before the same Commerce Committee. Assistant Secretary of State Eileen Claussen told Congressman Dingell and the committee that the United States would not be bound before we have completed the economic analysis and assessments. We have just learned that the administration's efforts to analyze the economic effects has failed. The models they used did not work, and we will not understand the effect on our nations's economy certainly before December.

The reason I am concerned about this is, there is a very interesting parallel between what they are trying to do in the absence of any scientific evidence in global climate change, which has a dramatic deteriorating effect on our ability to be competitive on a global basis and on the ambient air changes promulgated by this administration. We all know that, just about a year ago, Carol Browner came out and unilaterally suggested--and now has promulgated--the rule change to lower the ambient air standards in both particulate matter and in ozone. We find that during the various hearings that we have had that Mary Nichols, who is immediately under Carol Browner, said that the cost would be $9 billion to put these standards in--the cost to the American people. At the same time, the President's Economic Advisory Committee said it was $60 billion a year. The Reason Foundation estimated the costs between $90 billion and $150 billion. This would cost the average family of four some $1,700 a year.

They talk about the deaths, and Carol Browner reused this yesterday. There would be 60,000 premature deaths. Those deaths were lowered by the EPA last November to 40,000; then in December to 20,000, and in April to 15,000. Then the scientist who discovered the mathematic mistake now says it's less than 1,000. In our committee, Mary Nichols admitted these regulations would not save any lives over the next 5 years.

I have watched how Carol Browner goes around and makes promises. She says to the mayors of America, `This isn't going to affect you.' She says to the farmers, `This isn't going to affect you.' She says to small businesses, `This won't affect you.' To some of the parishes in Louisiana that were found to be out of attainment, she said, `This isn't going to make you do anything because the problem is for the neighboring State of Texas to the west; they are going to have to do this.'

So, Mr. President, I only ask the question, why is this obsession taking place in the administration if there is no scientific justification on either global warming or ambient air standards? Why are they trying to do this in eroding our personal freedoms? I think probably the best way to answer that is to read an article in Forbes magazine, called `Watch Out For This Woman; The EPA's Carol Browner

is exploiting health and the environment to build a power base.'

If you read this article, Mr. President, it says:

[Page: S11005]

If science isn't Browner's strong point, political tactics are. Her enemies can only envy the way the EPA uses the courts.

. . . For her part, Browner often dismisses as simple male chauvinism any criticism of her hardball tactics.

. . . She learned politics working on Gore's Senate staff, where she rose to be his legislative director before heading back to Florida to head the State environmental commission.

. . . She is an environmentalist zealot.

Mr. President, I know my time has expired. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

From Forbes magazine, Oct. 20, 1997

[FROM FORBES MAGAZINE, OCT. 20, 1997]

Carol Browner, Master of Mission Creep

(BY PRANAY GUPTE AND BONNER R. COHEN)

As the center of that enormous rent-seeking organization known as the federal government, Washington, D.C. has evolved its own vocabulary. There is, in bureaucratese, an innocent-sounding but insidious phrase: mission creep. Mark it well: Mission creep explains a lot about how big government grows and grows and grows.

Mission creep is to a taxpayer-supported organization what new markets are to a business organization. It involves a gradual, sometimes authorized, sometimes not, broadening of a bureaucracy's original mission. It is a way to accrete money and power beyond what Congress originally approved when it funded an agency.

Playing mission creep is an old game in Washington. But no one has ever played the game with more skill than Carol M. Browner, Bill Clinton's choice to head the Environmental Protection Agency.

From a modest beginning a quarter-century ago, the agency has grown to employ nearly 20,000 people and control an annual budget of $7 billion. But these numbers are a poor measure of the agency's power: Because its regulations have the force of law, the agency can jail people, close factories and override the judgments of local authorities.

In its quest for power and money, the agency has imposed many unnecessary costs on American

industry, and ultimately on the American people--costs that do more to satisfy bureaucratic zeal than to clean the air or the water.

The EPA was established in 1970 by an executive order issued by President Richard M. Nixon. Rachel Carson, a patron saint of the environmental movement, had made a huge impact with her emotional tract, Silent Spring, a few years earlier.

The public was right to be alarmed. Industrialization has imposed hidden costs in the form of polluted air, despoiled streams, unsightly dumps and a general degradation of the landscape. Concerns about pollution could, of course, have been dealt with by existing agencies, but that is not the nature of American politics. Politicians must be seen to be doing something dramatic. Creating new agencies makes favorable waves in the media.

Nixon created a new agency. Pulled together from a hodgepodge of existing federal programs, the EPA never had a congressional charter that would have defined its regulatory activities. It was simply given the task of carrying
out the provisions of what, over time, became 13 environmental statutes, each with its own peculiarities and constituencies.

Without perhaps fully comprehending the issues, Nixon made the new EPA the instrument for a tremendous power grab by the federal government. Most environmental problems--chemical spills, groundwater contamination, abandoned dump sites--are purely local in nature. But suddenly they were federal matters. In the name of a greener, cleaner Earth, Washington mightily increased its power to intervene in the daily lives of its citizens. It was a goal so worthy that few people saw the dangers inherent in to. Mission creep had begun.

In 1978 then-EPA administrator Douglas Costle cleverly shifted the focus of the agency. Henceforth the EPA would protect not just the environment but your health. `Costle became determined to convince the public that [the] EPA was first and foremost a public health agency, not a guardian of bugs and bunnies,' wrote Mark K. Landry, Marc J. Roberts and Stephen R. Thomas in their book, The Environmental Protection Agency: Asking the Wrong Questions from Nixon to Clinton.

People do care about forests and wildlife, but they care much more about themselves and their families. There is a strong strain of hypochondria in the American people, and nothing grabs our attention faster than an alleged threat to our health. If the alleged threat involves cancer, it is almost guaranteed to make the six o'clock news. Costle shrewdly exploited cancerphobia to expand his agency's reach and to wring money from Congress. He launched the EPA on a cancer hunt, looking for carcinogens in foods and air and water, even in the showers we take.

Carcinogens, of course, abound in nature, ordinary sunlight being one of the most prevalent. So it is with many man-made substances. The exposure to background levels of these carcinogens is so minimal in most cases as to pose no serious threat in the over whelming majority of cases. Never mind: EPA scientists, following the agency's cancer-risk guidelines, were soon ignoring the age-old admonition that the `dose makes the poison.' If it was man-made and carried carcinogens, the EPA would root it out. As one EPA scientist explained it to Forbes: `At EPA, we're not paid not to find risks.'

Under the mantra of `one fiber can kill,' the EPA in the 1980s mounted a costly and probably self-defeating nationwide effort to rip asbestos out of schools. Simply sealing the substance would have kept the fibers away from kids at a fraction of the cost. But it would not have yielded the same

harvest in headlines.

Even more than her predecessors--and possessing much greater resources--Carol Browner presents herself as the great family physician. `There isn't a decision I make on any given day that's not related to the health of the American people.' she tells Forbes. Browner, it's worth noting, is a lawyer with no medical training.

After all, she reminds us, she's the mom of a young boy. Attendees of Capitol Hill hearings snicker at her constant references to her son, Zachary, when she testifies on environmental issues. But she never misses a chance to repeat the message. `If we can focus on protecting the children . . . we will be protecting the population at large, which is obviously our job,' she tells Forbes.

Who said that was her job? Nobody, but that's what mission creep is all about.

Last September Browner announced the release of a new EPA report setting forth a broad national agenda to protect children from environmental risks. She followed up the report with the creation earlier this year of the Office of Children's Health Protection at EPA.

There was no congressional mandate, but Congress meekly went along by failing to challenge the agency's justification of the program. Who would want to face reelection accused of being callous toward children? Especially when the EPA's kept researchers stand by ready to produce scare studies on EPA money (see box, p. 172).

Where most agency chiefs tremble at criticism from Congress, Browner has a platform from which she can counterattack. An EPA-funded newsletter was recently distributed by the National Parents Teachers Association. At the time an internal EPA memo noted: `The PTA could become a major ally for the Agency in preventing Congress from slashing our budget.' Thus does Browner's EPA use taxpayer money to fight efforts to trim the federal budget.

On Mar. 15, 1995 David Lewis, an EPA scientist attached to the agency's laboratory in Athens, Ga., was told by his supervisor that EPA employees with connections to members of Congress should use their influence to sway lawmakers against a bill proposed by Representative Clifford Stearns (R-Fla.)--if it could be done `without getting into trouble.' Stearns' bill would have reduced funding for EPA. The scientist later said in a deposition: `We were being asked to do this during government business hours, and the purpose was to protect EPA funding levels.' This request on the part of high-level EPA officials to lobby Congress on government time is under investigation by the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee.

Had this been a Republican administration and had the department involved been other than the EPA, one can imagine the outcry in the media.

Asked about the growing criticism of her tactics, Browner blatantly ducks the question with: `This isn't about me. It never has been about me. It's about the air being cleaner. Is the water going to be safer? It's about business going to be able to find a better solution to our environmental problems.'

It's really about politics. When supportive lawmakers ask to borrow EPA experts for their staffs, the EPA hastens to comply. Requests from liberal Democrats almost always are filled, those from Republicans rarely. A request by Representative Richard Pombo (R-Calif.) for an EPA detailee was rejected on Jan. 2, 1997 on the grounds that `new procedures' were being written. Less than four weeks later (Jan. 28), a similar request from liberal Democrat Representative Charles Rangel of

New York was approved, without reference to any `new procedures.'

Since 1995 her office has approved all requests for employee details to four Democratic lawmakers--Senator Frank Lautenberg (D-N.J.), Senator John Kerry (D-Mass.), Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-N.Y.) and Rangel. Of the four GOP requests, three were rejected.

Browner was at her politically impressive best in this summer's debate over the EPA's tougher clean air standards. Because air quality levels have improved markedly since passage of the Clean Air Act amendments of 1990, it was widely hoped--especially in areas that badly need new jobs--that the standards would not be further tightened. The EPA's own data showed that levels of the particulates have dropped dramatically over the past decade. Many local governments, anxious for jobs and economic development, were looking forward to being removed from the list of so-called nonattainment areas for ozone and particulate matter, or PM.

In July the EPA finalized new tighter standards for ozone and PM. For communities that had made expensive efforts to comply with the current law, the higher standards were like a baseball player, having rounded third base and heading toward home, being told he had to circle the bases again to score.

A good many congresspeople were outraged. Browner's insistence on imposing the new standards in the face of nothing more than scanty scientific evidence unleashed howls of protest from elected officials in the affected communities.

Legally, Browner was probably in the right. In its haste to seem to be attending to the environment, Congress failed to exert control over EPA standards and regulations.

There was nonetheless quite a donnybrook, with veteran Democrat John Dingell of Michigan leading the charge against Browner. A lot of jobs were at stake in Michigan, still headquarters of the U.S. auto industry. Congress, he insisted, should be consulted. Dingell was not alone.

With lots of support from Vice President Al Gore's office, Browner went to work putting down the congressional revolt. Her testimony before Congress was, by general agreement, brilliant, though her facts were often shaky.

Until then, Bill Clinton had remained on the sidelines. But Browner maneuvered the President into a corner, where he faced the politically embarrassing choice of supporting her controversial initiatives or disavowing his outspoken EPA administrator. Clinton then got to the head of the parade by declaring his support for Browner. The game was over. Browner 1, Congress 0.

If EPA's new standards survive congressional and legal challenges, state and local governments will have to devise elaborate State Implementation Plans, or SIPs, detailing their strategies for complying with the agency's latest regulatory diktat. And in accordance with the Clean Air Act, it will be up to the EPA to approve or disapprove the SIPs. The estimated cost of compliance with the new standards for the Chicago area alone is projected to be between $3 billion and $7 billion.

`I wish we never had that fight with Congress,' she tells Forbes. `I wish it could have been avoided. I think it came at great expense to the country. I think it was very unfortunate.' Note the implication: The way it could have been avoided was for Congress to avoid challenging her.

You can admire Browner's skill and still be appalled by what she is doing. `This is by far the most

politicized EPA I've seen in my three decades of working in state governments,' says Russell J. Harding, director of Michigan's
Depatment of Environmental Quality. `It is an agency driven more by sound bites than by sound science.'
Says Barry McBee, chairman of the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission: `EPA continues to embody an outdated attitude that Washington knows best, that only Washington has the capability to protect our environment. States are closer to the people they protect and closer to the resources and can do a better job today.'

As a weapon to humble the state regulatory bodies, Carol Browner's EPA has embraced the politically correct concept of `environmental justice.' This broadens EPA's mandates even beyond protection of everyone's health.

In early 1993 Browner set up the Office of Environmental Justice within EPA which, among other things, passes out taxpayer-funded grants for studying the effects of industrial pollutants on poorer, mostly black, communities. In 1994 the White House supported this initiative by ordering federal agencies to consider the health and environmental effects of their decisions on minority and low-income communities.

That's the rhetoric. The reality is that the federal agencies have a new weapon for overruling state agencies. Browner's EPA recently delayed the approval of a $700 million polyvinyl chloride plant to be built by Japanese-owned Shintech in the predominantly black southern Louisiana town of Convent. Louisiana's Department of Environmental Quality had already given the go-ahead; the plant would have created good-paying jobs and opportunities in an area suffering from 60% unemployment and low incomes. But the EPA argued that blacks would suffer disproportionately from potentially cancer-causing emissions of the plant in an area already lined with chemical factories of all descriptions.

Louisiana Economic Development Director Kevin Reilly was enraged. `It is demeaning and despicable for these people to play the race card,' he says, pointing out that poor people and blacks would have gained economically and were at little health risk. The scientific evidence bears Reilly out: A recent article in the Journal of the Louisiana Medical Society found that cancer incidence in the area is in most cases no higher than nationally.

But never mind the facts: This kind of decision has less to do with science than with power politics. It delivers the message: Don't mess with the EPA. `Carol Browner is the best hardball player in the Clinton Administration,' says Steven J. Milloy, executive director of The Advancement of Sound Science Coalition in Washington, a longtime critic of EPA who acknowledges receiving funding from industry. `She has the 105th Congress completely intimated by her debating skills and her sheer grasp of facts, however questionable. She eats their lunch.'

Like many Clintonites, Browner takes her own good time about responding to congressional requests for EPA documents. When word got out that EPA was developing a series of proposals for reducing U.S. emissions of man-made greenhouse gases, the House Commerce Committee asked for a copy. The EPA ignored the request for two years.

When the proposals were leaked to the committee late last week, it was immediately clear why EPA had stiffed Congress. The document was loaded with proposals for raising taxes to pay for new EPA initiatives. Produced in the agency's Office of Policy, Planning & Evaluation and dated May 31, 1994, EPA's `Climate Change Action' recommends a new 50-cent-per-gallon gasoline tax, with an

estimated cost to motorists of $47 billion in the
year 2000 alone. Seven other tax increases were recommended: a `greenhouse gas tax,' a `carbon tax,' a `btu tax,' an `at-the-source ad-volorem tax' on the value of the fuel at the source of extraction, an `end-use ad valorem tax' on the value of the fuel at the point of sale, a `motor fuels tax' on the retail price of gasoline and diesel, an `oil import fee.' Also recommended: A new federal fee on vehicle emissions tests of $40 per person to `shift the cost of vehicle inspection from the state to the vehicle owner.'

How could they hope to get so many new taxes through a tax-shy Congress? The `Climate Change Action Plan' contains repeated references to how each of the above taxes and fees can be imposed under existing laws. Talk about taxation without representation.
It's not entirely surprising that Browner and her crew think in terms of government-by-edict. Browner's extraordinary power is in many ways a consequences of Congress' delegation of its lawmaking power to the EPA. It has let the agency micromanage environmental activities throughout the nation with little regard for either local wishes or the cost. This negligence has permitted the agency to ignore scientific data that conflict with agency orthodoxy. The EPA is in many ways becoming a state within the state.

`This is Washington at its worst--out-of-touch bureaucrats churning out red tape with reckless abandon. The EPA hasn't taken into account an ounce of reality,' says Representative Fred Upton (R-Mich.), a frequent critic, referring to the new clean air rules.

If science isn't Browner's strong point, political tactics are. Her enemies can only envy the way the EPA uses the courts. An organization such as the Natural Resources Defense Council will go into federal court and sue to force the EPA to do something. The EPA will wink and, after the courts expand its mandate, see to it that big legal fees go to the NRDC.

Mission creep, in short, takes many forms and its practitioners have many ways to plunder the public purse.

For her part, Browner often dismisses as simple male chauvinism any criticism of her hardball tactics. `I think sometimes that it's an issue of men and women,' she says, coyly.

Such cute demagoguery aside, there is no doubting Browner's sincerity. She is an environmentalist zealot. She was clearly behind the decision to tighten the clean air standards to what many people regard as unreasonable levels. If not a tree-hugger she is philosophically close to Al Gore and his quasi-religious environmentalism.

After graduating from University of Florida law school, Browner (both of whose parents were college teachers) went to work for a Ralph Nader-affiliated consumer advocate group. There she met her husband, Michael Podhorzer, who still works there.

She learned politics working on Gore's Senate staff, where she rose to be his legislative director before heading back to Florida to head the state environmental commission.

After the EPA, what's next for this tough and aggressive politician? If Al Gore's presidential hopes aren't dashed by the fund-raising scandals, there's vice presidential slot on the Democratic ticket up for grabs in 2000. A female environmentalist and mother of a young boy would do a lot to bolster Gore's otherwise soggy appeal.

In a statement to Forbes, Gore went so far as to try to claim for Browner some of the credit for the current economic prosperity. `She has helped prove,' he declares, `that a healthy environmental and a strong economy are inextricably linked.'

If not a vice presidential run, what? Could Browner be nominated by the Clinton Administration to be the next head of the United Nations' environment program? Or would the Administration nominate her as the new U.N. Deputy Secretary General? Either position would give Browner instant international visibility, which couldn't hurt her political prospects in Washington.

One way or another, you are going to be hearing a lot more about Carol M. Browner; whenever you do, it's unlikely to be good news for business--and it may not even be good news for the environmental.

[Page: S11007]

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I believe that we have 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 30 minutes under the control of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Faircloth] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Ford].

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina is here. So with your permission, we will proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. FORD. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. Ford and Mr. Faircloth pertaining to the introduction of S. 1310 are located in today's Record under `Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.')

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brownback). The Senator from Nebraska is recognized. There will now be 35 minutes under control of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Craig] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hagel].

THE GLOBAL CLIMATE TREATY (Senate - October 23, 1997)

[Page: S11007]

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, yesterday the President of the United States announced the United States negotiating position on the U.N. global climate treaty. Some have called the President's position a compromise. I would say that is the case only if you define compromise as an action that would have devastating consequences for the United States without any meaningful progress toward the overall goal.

This is how an editorial in Investors Business Daily defined the President's proposal yesterday morning. This doesn't make any sense. `Signing a treaty that hobbles U.S. growth getting no environmental payoff in return.' Now, here is what does make sense. `Listening to science rather than overheated rhetoric and acting on the basis of real events, not computer models.'

The President's announcement follows along the same lines of what this administration has been pushing in international circles for years. No matter how he wraps his package, the President is still talking about making the United States, our businesses, our people, subject to legally binding international mandates while letting more than 130 nations off the hook. Most important for this body, the U.S. Senate, is how does the administration's position stack up against the Byrd-Hagel resolution which passed this body in July by a vote of 95 to zero? The Clinton administration's position announced yesterday falls woefully short on all counts.

The President obviously realizes this since he stated yesterday that America cannot wait for the U.S. Senate on this issue. The President said:

I want to emphasize that we cannot wait until the treaty is negotiated and ratified to act.

This flies in the face of the Constitution and the powers it gives to the U.S. Senate to give approval for the ratification of treaties. Why does the President's proposal fall short? Regarding participation by the developing nations, the Byrd-Hagel resolution states very clearly that no treaty will get the support of the U.S. Senate unless, and I read from the Byrd-Hagel resolution, `* * * unless the protocol or agreement also mandates new specific scheduled commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions for developing country parties within the same compliance period.'

That is very clear. I noted some of my colleagues yesterday, and others, have said what the President proposed yesterday is in full compliance with Byrd-Hagel. I strongly recommend to those colleagues who actually believe that, that they go back and read the Byrd-Hagel resolution. It is only five pages long. It is not legal. It is very clearly understood by everyone.

What this means also is that support of the U.S. Senate is contingent upon China, Mexico, India, Brazil and the other 130 developing nations committing to specific limitations on greenhouse gas emissions within the same time period as the United States and the other industrialized nations. Anything less, anything less than this, what is clearly defined in the Byrd-Hagel resolution put forward by the U.S. Senate, is not in compliance and it is the U.S. Senate that will have the final say on any treaty signed by the administration in Kyoto, Japan, in December.

At the same time President Clinton was calling for `meaningful participation'--those were his

words--meaningful participation by the developing countries, at the same time he was saying that, this is what his negotiator in Bonn, Germany, Ambassador Mark Hambley, was saying in a prepared release. `In our view,' said Ambassador Hambley, the President's negotiator in Bonn Germany this week--`In our view, this proposal is fully consistent with the Berlin mandate--it imposes no new substantive commitments on developing countries now. Instead, it calls for such obligations

to be developed following the third conference of the parties' in Kyoto in December.

I think that is rather clear, what Ambassador Hambley said: That the Third World, the developing nations, would not be called upon for any commitments, any obligations in this treaty. It is obvious that this administration has no intention of ensuring that the developing countries have to meet the same obligations as the United States.

What about the second condition of the Byrd-Hagel resolution, which stated the Senate would not ratify a treaty that would cause serious economic harm to the United States? Most of the economic impact studies are based exactly on what the President proposed yesterday, in terms of timetables, targets, reducing emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2010, and excluding the developing nations from any binding limitations of greenhouse gases. The President's own analysis shows that this will require a 30-percent cut in projected energy use by the year 2010.

So, we are going to cut our energy use, between now and the year 2010, by 30 percent; at the same time the administration says we don't have an economic analysis to really understand what economic impact this might have on our economy, on jobs. After a year and a half of the administration promising to me and others in both the House and the Senate that they would come forward with an economic model and economic analysis showing that there would be no harm to our economy, they have now said: Well, economic models don't mean anything. But we are going to surge forward and sign that treaty having no understanding whatsoever of what it might do to our economy, to jobs.

I have seen studies, I have seen economic models and analyses done by the AFL-CIO, done by independent economists, done by business, done by industry, done by the agriculture industry, farmers, ranchers. The results are not good. Here is what these studies have shown: Job losses in the millions for this country, lower economic growth in this country meaning a lower standard of living and less opportunities for all Americans, energy rationing. What the Clinton administration is talking about is the rationing of energy use in the United States.

Remember the gas lines the last time this country rationed energy use in the 1970's? I remember them very well. Energy taxes--I know the administration has said we don't think this is going to require any taxes. We are not sure, but we will kind of get going, sign that treaty and bind the United States to these commitments, and allow an international body to enforce and police and administer it. Maybe we will need more taxes, who knows, they say.

In an October 4 article in the Washington Times an unnamed Clinton administration official said that the President's proposal would raise energy taxes up to five times greater than the Btu tax the Clinton administration proposed back in 1993. That is devastating. That is devastating. Much of the State that I represent, Nebraska, is agricultural. Agriculture is an energy-intensive industry. When you start talking about raising taxes on energy five times greater than what President Clinton proposed in 1993, that will put literally thousands of farmers and ranchers and agricultural interests out of business. What I find incredible about this is at the same time the President is asking for fast-track legislation because we are trying to do something about our deficit of payments, deficit in the balance of payments to China, to Japan, all the other areas of trade we are trying to pursue, what this would do is go the other way, make our products less competitive because they would cost

more. Higher prices for all goods because of higher energy costs mean American goods cost more worldwide, making American products and services less competitive in the world market. And when you are allowing China and Mexico and Brazil and India, South Korea, and 130 other nations not to legally bind themselves to this, what do you think happens in the world marketplace? Our products cost more, our services cost more, and these other nations' economies will thrive as their

products cost less. Does that put us in a stronger competitive position worldwide? I don't think so.

The real question is, for what? Why are we doing this? Why are we doing this? The nations that would be excluded, the over 130 nations that would be excluded from this treaty are the nations that will be responsible for 60 percent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions within the next 20 years. Not the United States, the nations that we are not asking to bind themselves to this treaty.

China, which has said very forcefully that it will never agree to legally binding emission limits, will be the largest emitter of greenhouse gases by the year 2015. By 2025, China will surpass the United States, Japan and Canada combined, as the greatest emitter of greenhouse gases in the world. Yet we are not asking them to sign up to any legally binding mandate to do something about their greenhouse gas emissions. So how can any treaty that exempts these 134 nations be at all effective in reducing global greenhouse gas emissions? It will not. This is folly. This is feel-good folly. It makes great press, but it is insane that we would bind our Nation to this kind of folly and allow these other nations to go untouched.

What President Clinton proposed yesterday is for the American people to bear the cost and suffer the pain of a treaty that will not work. That is the legacy, or more appropriately the lunacy he would leave to the children of America. I have always said that this debate is not about who is for or against the environment. That is not the debate. We are all concerned about the environment. We are concerned about the environment we leave to our children and our grandchildren, our future generations. But let's use some common sense here. Let's use some American common sense.

Mr. President, in its present form, this treaty will not win Senate approval. We can do better. We must do better. Our future generations are counting on us to do better. Let's bring some balance, some perspective and some common sense to this issue and do it right.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

[Page: S11008]

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I join with my colleague, the Senator from Nebraska, this morning to speak out against the proposal that our President yesterday announced to the Nation and to the world as it relates to this country's concept of how the world ought to be when it comes to the issue of global warming.

But first let me thank the Senator from Nebraska for the leadership role he is taking on behalf of a very large bipartisan coalition of Senators in bringing clarity to this issue and demonstrating what is a clear opposing point of view, an opposing point of view based on science, an opposing point of view based on economics and an opposing point of view based on one of the largest coalition-building

efforts I have witnessed, at least in my public life, between labor and business and public officials in this country.

The Senator spoke out very clearly this morning on the discrepancy as it relates to what our President announced yesterday compared to what the Hagel-Byrd resolution that was adopted by the Senate some months ago spoke to. That was, if we are to enter an agreement, that agreement must be, by its definition, a world agreement, that all parties involved, that is, all nations of the world, must come together in recognition of what may or may not be an environmental problem.

I am disappointed that the President of the United States, clearly recognizing the constitutional obligation of this body, chose largely, yesterday, in his proposal, to ignore us. While he gave us lip service and while his spokespeople have given us lip service over the last several months since the almost unanimous adoption of the Hagel-Byrd resolution, I must tell you that what our President laid down for his negotiators in Bonn yesterday is not reflective of what he has been saying or what his people have been saying.

To the parliamentarians of the world, it is important that you understand that we are not a parliament and the President is not a prime minister. He does not speak for the majority of the U.S. Congress. He speaks for himself and for what I believe to be a narrow interest of people whose agendas take them well beyond just the concept of a better environment, but to a desire to do some industrial or economic planning nationwide, if not universally, all without any reliance whatsoever on the good judgment of the American consumer and/or the free market that this country has relied on since its very beginning.

`Serious harm,' those are important words. Those are words that the Hagel-Byrd resolution spoke to, `serious harm to the U.S. economy.' Important words, simple words, easy to understand, a relatively small measurement and threshold to be understood by anyone negotiating a treaty that, in the long term, might bind this country in an international obligation.

We will not, nor should we, seriously harm our citizens, the economy in which they live, and the opportunities for which they strive. And yet, the President, we believe, ignored that and talked about the need for catastrophic emissions reductions by the year 2012. Mr. President, 2012. A long time off? No, not really; clearly within my lifetime, clearly within everybody's reasonable imagination, and something that if you are to accomplish a 30-percent reduction of fossil fuel emissions off from the current path, then you must start now in significant ways to change that and alter it. It is something that you do not wait until you get out to 2008 and then you say, `Oh, my goodness.' Because if we are to be responsible in relation to a negotiated treaty, a `binding' relationship by that point would draw us into a situation

that we could not meet, or, if we chose to meet it, we would truly handicap the economy of this country.

This Senator will not vote to make our country and its citizens second class to the rest of the world. I cannot nor will I do that nor do I believe any Senator in this body will knowingly vote in that way. Yet, the President is proposing that we allow 130 economies, 130 nations of the world, be exempt, to be able to do anything they choose while we would choose to restrict and control ourselves.

Mr. President, we are a nation today that is proud of its environmental legacy. We have moved faster and more directly in the last two decades to improve the environment in which our citizens live than any other nation of the world, and we have paid a big price for it. But we have been willing to

pay it. We have been willing to pay it and able to pay it because we are a rich nation. Rich nations move to do things to clean up their environment. Poor nations simply cannot afford to. They are too busy trying to feed themselves, clothe themselves and put shelters over the heads of their citizens. All of those items in this country are secondary considerations because we take them for granted, because we are rich, and we are rich because of a free-market system unfettered by Government rule and regulation and, in my opinion, by the silly politics that this administration perpetrates today on faulty science or certainly a lack of science or a knowledge of what all of this means.

I have to say, in all fairness, the President gave some reasonable suggestions for conservation, and there is no question we ought to create the kind of incentives within our economy that move our citizens, and the economy that drives us, toward conservation. That is fair and that is reasonable, and we could assume a better world with all of that in mind.

But the thing that frustrates me most is that there is emerging out of all of the current negotiations a reminder that the developing world is saying something to us that is most significant, and I am not sure that our President is listening at this moment. They are, in essence, saying, and when they laid down their position on the table in Bonn on October 22, that developing countries are demanding reductions of 35 percent below 1990 levels of emissions and that fines be assessed against the United States and the other developed nations if those targets are missed. They want global warming gas reductions, but guess who is supposed to pay for it? Not the consumers of the developing world, but us rich Americans. Rich Americans are supposed to pay for any economic inconvenience the developing world would encounter because we are foolish enough to agree to impose these kinds of reduction targets on ourselves.

I am sorry, Mr. President, I don't buy that, the American consumer is not about to buy it, nor do I believe the U.S. Senate will.

So in 10 to 14 years, at about the time that the baby boomers are retiring and our Social Security system is challenged, at about the time when we are once again going to have to make tough decisions in this country about our social character and the economics that drive our social well-being, the President yesterday said we are going to lay yet a bigger burden on the economy; we are going to say that you are going to have to be at a certain level of emissions reductions and, if not, we are going to take drastic measures to drive up the cost of energy, to drive down the amount of consumption, and that's what we are prepared to do based on faulty science and interesting politics.

I suggest, Mr. President, that what you have proposed to the world and to the Nation and to this Congress is unacceptable. It certainly appears to be unacceptable at this moment to the U.S. Senate and to all who have spent any time studying the critical issue of global warming.

While this Nation will continue to strive for a cleaner world--and it should--and a cleaner nation and will be reasonable and responsible players, we expect the rest of the world to do the

same. But we can also understand that where a nation tries to feed itself and clothe itself and cause its citizens, by the economy in which they live, to rise to a higher standard of living, we understand that we have had that privilege and opportunity over the years and we should not restrict nor should we cause them to achieve anything less.

Our technology can assist, and we need to be there to help. But I suggest, Mr. President, that binding obligations, no matter how far out you push them to allegedly conform with what our country believes ought to be done, simply do not work. This proposal won't work. I agree with my colleague

from Nebraska, this Senate, in my opinion, will not concur in this, will not agree to the kind of treaty that our President and his associates are attempting to cause the rest of the world to agree to.

So, Mr. President, I hope that you understand and I hope the world understands that this Senate, the Senate responsible for the ratification of these kinds of agreements, will, at this time, not ratify what you are proposing.

[Page: S11009]

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I join my colleagues for just a few moments with respect to the question that we are addressing this morning, that question of global warming, but more particularly the specifics with respect to it.

I am sure you already heard, but let me say again, there was a measure adopted by this Senate 95-0 that expressed two main points: One, the United States should not be signatory to any treaty that would `result in serious harm to the U.S. economy.' And, No. 2, that mandates developing countries to have specific scheduled commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions within the same compliance period.

So we have been working at this for some time. We have had several hearings in our Committee on the Environment and Public Works and also in Energy. We have had representatives of the administration there. This goes clear back to Rio, I think, in 1992. It goes back more specifically now to Geneva about a year ago, in which promises were apparently made at that meeting with respect to what the United States would do. We called the Assistant Secretary to our committee to talk about that. He indicated, no, that wasn't true, there were no commitments made. In fact, I think there were.

Now we move on to the meeting in Bonn, which will go on almost immediately, and then the Kyoto meeting to take place something over a month from now.

So this is the result of a good long time in planning and a good long time in difficulty in trying to bring together the issues as they relate to developed countries, as they relate to developing countries.

The President has finally made somewhat of an understandable statement.

We have not had that before.

Just 2 weeks ago we had another hearing in our committee, brought the Assistant Secretary on Global Affairs to talk to us, asked specific questions about what they had in mind without any specific answers. There was no response from the administration's witness.

So now the President has come forth with statements. That is good. We should have had them some time before, statements which he indicates--and I quote--`Would be painless and even economically beneficial.' Of course that is what he would say. Many people disagree with that, including myself. I cannot imagine that whatever we do that is meaningful is going to `be painless and economically beneficial.' But specifically, of course we have not had time to analyze the full thing.

It talks about reaching 1990 levels by the year 2010, emission levels that occurred in 1990, reaching back to those by 2010, with some cap by 2008. And then to move below the 1990 levels by 2020. He calls that a fairly modest proposal.

Interesting how often these things are set out. I think if you go back, you find that the air quality statutes were given a great deal of time before implementation, so the argument was, `Don't worry, don't worry about some regulation. Don't worry about the cost because it's way out in the future.' I do not think that is a good recommendation.

We should worry about what the impacts are on the economy, what the impacts are on costs, what the impacts are on our ability to compete in the world and worry about them regardless of the fact that they are out there.

China, on the other hand, and some of the other countries that are developing countries, ask for a 15 percent reduction from the 1990 levels by 2010, a 7.5 percent reduction by 2025, 7.5 below 1990. Remember, the President said we will not reach 1990 until 2010. The Chinese and their group also want a 35 percent reduction from 1990 levels by the year 2020.

The problem, of course, is, as we go into this negotiation--and those who are involved say, `Well, they've set the parameters, somehow the results will be between these two.' That is kind of scary. The President is saying, this is where we are. They are saying, we want to be way up here. And probably they will end up somewhere in between.

I go back to the action of the Senate which 95 to nothing said we will not accept a treaty that does the kinds of things that we have already talked about.

So, Mr. President, I know this is a difficult problem. But I agree with my friend, the Senator from Idaho. We have done a good job of emissions.

I have been to China several times, and I can tell you, if you want to look forward to where the emissions problems are going to be, it is going to be there in those developing countries.

I think we need to make the changes that we want to have happen in our country, encourage others. But I am very concerned about us going to this meeting in Kyoto and coming out seeking to agree to the kinds of things that have been set forth by the developing countries who wish not to have any containment put on theirs.

So we are looking for a fair agreement. We are looking for some kind of an arrangement that will allow us to continue to do what we have done and we are proud of doing.

I think, Mr. President, that you need to be more specific than you have been with this idea that we want you to do some things, and then we will decide later what the reimbursement is going to be, we will decide later what the incentives are going to be, which I understand is what the President said yesterday.

So I think we need to continue. And I want to say to my friend from Nebraska that he has done an excellent job of holding hearings, taking positions, following this issue, which is one of the most important issues to the future of the country. And I commend him for that and join with him.

I yield the floor.

[Page: S11010]

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, the old adage says everybody likes to talk about the weather, but nobody can do anything about it. A particularly strong El Nino has meteorologists predicting strange weather this year, so expect lots of people to be talking about the weather in the months ahead. But in a new twist, many will claim that there is something we can do about the weather as well.

I'm talking about efforts to curb global warming. And if you'll pardon the pun, this is one of the hottest debates we are likely to see over the next year.

Is human activity the cause of this particularly strong El Nino, or the warming that some say is underway? Or is this just natural climate variation? Scientists are divided. The prestigious journal Science, in its issue of May 16, says that climate experts are a long way from proclaiming that human activities are heating up the earth. Indeed, the search for the human fingerprint in observed warming is far from over with many scientists saying that a clear resolution is at least a decade away. We continue to spend over $2 billion each year on the U.S. Global Climate Change Research Program for the simple reason that the science is not settled.

One thing that scientists can agree on is that the Earth's climate has always changed--the ice core and fossil records bear that out. Hippos once grazed in European rivers. Sea levels were low enough during periodic ice ages to allow humans to walk from Asia to North America. The climate changes. It always has. And it will continue to change regardless of what we do or don't do.

Yesterday, the President revealed his negotiating position on a new climate treaty. He has proposed reducing our carbon emissions to 1990 levels between 2008 and 2012. The Department of Energy estimates that we will have to engage in a crash course of research and development, plus impose a $50 per ton carbon permit price--or tax--to achieve this target.

Talks are underway at this moment in Bonn, and everyone is preparing for December negotiations in Kyoto, Japan. It is almost certain that legally binding targets and timetables will be a central feature of the new climate treaty expected to emerge in Kyoto--and that these targets and timetables will not apply to developing nations. Even if you are a proponent of strong action to address increasing concentrations of atmospheric carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases thought to warm the Earth's climate, there are plenty of good reasons to oppose selectively applied, legally binding targets and timetables for greenhouse gas reductions as the President has proposed.

First, these are really just emissions controls targeted at just a few of the 168 nations that are parties to this treaty. Aside from being just plain unfair, these new emissions controls will be devastating to large sectors of our economy. They will raise energy prices in the United States, Canada, Australia, and Europe--while China, South Korea, and Mexico are specifically exempted from them.

As a consequence, energy-intensive industrial production, capital, jobs, and emissions will shift from the U.S. to developing nations not subjected to the new controls. What will result from that? According to a study by the Department of Energy: 20 to 30 percent of the U.S. chemical industry could move to developing countries over 15 to 30 years, with 200,000 jobs lost; U.S. steel production could fall 30 percent with accompanying job losses of 100,000; All primary aluminum plants in the United States could close by 2010; many petroleum refiners in the Northeast and gulf coast could close, and imports would displace more domestic production.

Needless to say, China, South Korea, Mexico, and some of our other most competitive trading partners salivate at the prospect of this monumental shift in capital, production, and jobs.

Putting economic and competitive aspects aside for a moment, it's important to ask the questions: Will these emissions controls applied only to a few nations work? Can they decrease emissions and stabilize atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations?

The answer is no. Actual global emissions won't decrease--only their point of origin will change. In fact, because our industrial processes are more energy efficient than those found in most developing nations, global carbon emissions per unit of production would actually increase under the administration's approach.

In other words, the United States and a few leading industrial nations would suffer domestic economic pain, without realizing any global environmental gain.

The U.S. Senate has passed a resolution by a vote of 95 to 0 urging that the new climate treaty avoid legally binding targets and timetables on developed nations unless there are `new, specific scheduled commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions for Developing Country Parties within the same compliance period.'

Thus, we have the makings of a train wreck: The developing nations will not participate in a climate treaty that contains legally binding targets and timetables that apply to them. Yet, the U.S. Senate is unwilling to ratify a treaty that does not contain new commitments for developing countries.

There are other practical problems as well. Legally binding targets and timetables would be impossible to verify and enforce. For example, how does one measure the methane being produced by a rice paddy or landfill? How do you calculate the carbon dioxide being sequestered by a forest? While good scientific estimates can be offered, the legally binding nature of the controls might require greater precision. What kind of new strict and intrusive international regulatory regime would be needed for enforcement?

These are all questions that have not been answered in the rush toward Kyoto. Practically speaking, legally binding targets and timetables won't reduce global emissions. In addition, they present potentially insurmountable implementation problems, and would even kill the treaty. Thus, they endanger well meaning efforts to address the global climate issue.

If we want to keep the new treaty from becoming an international embarrassment as an environmental initiative, we should reconsider the rush to Kyoto and hammer out solutions that can really work.

So, you may ask--what can really work? How does one generate large amounts of carbon-free electricity for a growing economy here at home and a developing world abroad? There are two ways in the short term--hydropower and nuclear.

So what is our official U.S. policy toward hydropower? Domestically, we are studying tearing down a few dams out west. Environmental interests want to tear down, for example, the Glen Canyon Dam on the Colorado River in Northern Arizona in hopes of `restoring the natural wonder of the once wild Glen Canyon.' In so doing, we would: Drain Lake Powell--a 252 square mile lake which guarantees water supplies for Los Angeles, Phoenix, and Las Vegas; Eliminate the source of carbon-free electricity for four million consumers in the Southwest; Scuttle a $500 million tourist

industry and the water recreation area frequented by 2.5 million visitors each year.

On the international front, we have refused to participate in efforts such as China's `Three Gorges Dam,' a project that will produce electricity equivalent to thirty-six 500 megawatt coal plants.

Of course, all this makes no sense if you claim that carbon emissions are your preeminent environmental concern.

Let's turn to nuclear, which produces 22% of our electricity and about 17% of global electricity. The President says he will veto our nuclear waste bill, and that could cause some of our nuclear plants to close prematurely as they run out of space for spent fuel. And we can't sell nuclear technology to China, something we hope to change in the very near future.

Well, you can't be anti-nuclear, anti-hydropower, and anti-carbon. Let's do the math: Coal produces 55% of our electricity, and our coal use is likely to decrease in the face of: A new climate treaty; the EPA's new air quality standards on ozone and particulate matter; the EPA's tightened air quality standards on oxides of sulphur and nitrogen; the EPA's proposed regional haze rule; and the possibility of a new EPA mercury emissions rule.

So if you knock coal out of the picture, what's next? Nuclear is in second place with 22% of our electrical generation. But as I mentioned, the President has threatened to veto our nuclear waste bill, and we haven't ordered a new nuclear plant since 1975. Moreover, if we can't recover `stranded costs' of nuclear power plants in the electricity restructuring effort, you can say goodbye to nuclear.

What's next? Hydropower produces 10%. But all of our large hydropower potential outside Alaska has been tapped, and as I mentioned earlier, the administration is entertaining notions of tearing down some dams.

What's next? Natural Gas produces 10% of electricity generation. Gas also emits carbon, although not as much as coal. So expect gas generation to increase, demand to rise, prices to increase and shortages to result from time to time. Does that sound like a solid strategy on which to gamble our economy?

No coal, no nukes, no hydro; that leaves us with 13% of our generation capacity. What's left? Wind power? I like wind and solar, but you can't count on them all the time. And recently, the Sierra Club came out against wind farms in California, calling them `cuisinarts for birds.'

So the choices are tough, and a dose of realism is badly needed down at EPA and the White House. To sum things up, we are negotiating a treaty in Kyoto that is unrealistic, can't be verified, and can't achieve the advertised results. If this were an arms control treaty, we'd be guilty of unilateral disarmament if we were to agree to it.

We should reconsider this rush to Kyoto and a new treaty. There is no reason to join the lemmings in their rush over the cliff. The carbon problem didn't appear overnight. It won't be addressed overnight. We have time to devise and consider balanced approaches that can work. Time will allow new energy and efficiency technologies to mature. Time will provide for global solutions that include the developing nations. Time will allow us to sharpen our science and better understand the true threat of climate change, if it is indeed a dangerous threat.

Mr. TORRICELLI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hagel). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CLIMATE CHANGE TREATY (Senate - October 23, 1997)

[Page: S11019]

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, the United States is currently engaged in negotiating a climate change treaty. This is a negotiation that we have literally only just really engaged in, in the sense that we have only now made clear to the world what our negotiating position will be, the critical elements from which we will proceed. I was somewhat troubled this morning to hear a number of our colleagues come to the floor of the Senate and, frankly, either considerably misstate or considerably misrepresent the very straightforward words of the President yesterday with respect to this subject. The following is the position that the President articulated yesterday.

No. 1, it is the goal of the United States to find a binding treaty which includes not just developed nations but developing nations as well.

No. 2, the U.S. goal is a binding treaty that seeks to bring greenhouse gases to 1990 levels between 2008 and 2012, so as to minimize economic costs to the United States.

And, finally, No. 3, the United States now will undertake policies to fully leverage market mechanisms, innovation, technology, and American ingenuity to make achieving emissions reductions less costly.

I remind my colleagues that all of these positions are completely within the framework of the resolution that the Senate passed, the Byrd-Hagel resolution. That resolution specifically said it must `mandate new commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions for the annex I parties, unless the protocol or other agreement'--and I want to emphasize here, `other agreement.' The President in his proposal has made allowance for the very `other agreement' potential that was contemplated in the resolution we passed. It specifically requires that other agreement, or the principal agreement, mandate new, and specific scheduled reductions for the developing countries within the same compliance period.

The second requirement that the Senate passed was that whatever agreement we reached would not result in serious harm to the economy of the United States. Let me emphasize, the term is `serious harm to the economy of the United States.' Any fair reading of the President's remarks outlining our position would find that the President is completely within the framework of the Senate resolution. And yet, today, we really heard Senators completely misrepresenting that position and asserting that it is somehow outside of the Byrd-Hagel resolution.

I ask unanimous consent the full text of the President's comments be printed in the Record so people can judge for themselves the degree with which we are in compliance.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by the President on Global Climate Change
Before the National Geographic Society

The President. Thank you very much. Mr. Murphy, Mr. Vice President, to all of you who are here. I thank especially the members of Congress who are here, the leaders of labor and business who are here, all the members of the administration, and especially the White House staff members that the

Vice President mentioned and the Secretary of Energy, the Administrator of the EPA, and the others who have helped us to come to this moment.

On the way in here we were met by the leaders of the National Geographic, and I complimented them on their recent two-part series on the Roman Empire. It's a fascinating story of how the Empire rose, how it sustained itself for hundreds of years, why it fell, and speculations on what, if any, relevance it might have to the United States and, indeed, the West.

And one of the gentlemen said, well, you know, we got a lot of interesting comments on that, including a letter referencing a statue we had of the bust of Emperor Vespasian. And one of our readers said, why in the world did you put a statue of Gene Hackman in a piece on the Roman Empire? (Laughter.) And I say that basically to say, in some senses, the more things change, the more they remain the same. (Laughter.)

For what sustains any civilization, and now what will sustain all of our civilizations, is the constant effort at renewal, the ability to avoid denial and to proceed into the future in a way that is realistic and humane, but resolute. Six years ago tomorrow, not long after I started running for President, I went back to my alma mater at Georgetown and began a series of three speeches outlining my vision for America in the 21st century--how we could keep the American Dream alive for all of our people, how we could maintain America's leadership for peace and freedom and prosperity, and how we could come together across the lines that divide us as one America.

And together, we've made a lot of progress in the last nearly five years now that the Vice President and I have been privileged to work at this task. At the threshold of a new century, our economy is thriving, our social fabric is mending, we've helped to lead the world toward greater peace and cooperation.

I think this has happened, in no small measure, in part because we had a different philosophy about the role of government. Today, it is smaller and more focused and more oriented toward giving people the tools and the conditions they need to solve their own problems and toward working in partnership with our citizens. More important, I believe it's happened because we made tough choices but not false choices.

On the economy, we made the choice to balance the budget and to invest in our people and our future. On crime, we made the choice to be tough and smart about prevention and changing the conditions in which crime occurs. On welfare, we made the choice to require work, but also to support the children of people who have been on welfare. On families, we made the choice to help parents find more and better jobs and to have the necessary time and resources for their children. And on the environment, we made the choice to clean our air, water, and land, to improve our food supply, and to grow the economy.

This kind of commonsense approach, rooted in our most basic values and our enduring optimism about the capacity of free people to meet the challenges of every age must be brought to bear on the work that remains to pave the way for our people and for the world toward a new century and a new millenium.

Today we have a clear responsibility and a golden opportunity to conquer one of the most important challenges of the 21st century--the challenge of climate change--with an environmentally sound and economically strong strategy, to achieve meaningful reductions in greenhouse gases in the United States and throughout the industralized and the developing world. It is a strategy that, if properly

implemented, will create a wealth of new opportunities for entrepreneurs at home, uphold our leadership abroad, and harness the power of free markets to free our planet from an unacceptable risk; a strategy as consistent with our commitment to reject false choices.

America can stand up for our national interest and stand up for the common interest of the international community. America can build on prosperity today and ensure a healthy planet for our children tomorrow.

In so many ways the problem of climate change reflects the new realities of the new century. Many previous threats could be met within our own borders, but global warming requires an international solution. Many previous threats came from single enemies, but global warming derives from millions of sources. Many previous threats posed clear and present danger; global warming is far more subtle, warning us not with roaring tanks or burning rivers but with invisible gases, slow changes in our surroundings, increasingly severe climatic disruptions that, thank God, have not yet hit home for most Americans. But make no mistake, the problem is real. And if we do not change our course now, the consequences sooner or later will be destructive for America and for the world.

The vast majority of the world's climate scientists have concluded that if the countries of the world do not work together to cut the emission of greenhouse gases, then temperatures will rise and will disrupt the climate. In fact, most scientists say the process has already begun. Disruptive weather events are increasing. Disease-bearing insects are moving to areas that used to be too cold for them. Average temperatures are rising. Glacial formations are receding.

Scientists don't yet know what the precise consequences will be. But we do know enough now to know that the Industrial Age has dramatically increased greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, where they take a century or more to dissipate; and that the process must be slowed, then stopped, then reduced if we want to continue our economic progress and preserve the quality of life in the United States and throughout our planet. We know what we have to do.

Greenhouse gas emissions are caused mostly by the inefficient burning of coal or oil for energy. Roughly a third of these emissions come from industry, a third from transportation, a third from residential and commercial buildings. In each case, the conversion of fuel to energy use is extremely inefficient and could be made much cleaner with existing technologies or those already on the horizon, in ways that will not weaken the economy but in fact will add to our strength in new businesses and new jobs. If we do this properly, we will not jeopardize our prosperity--we will increase it.

With that principle in mind, I'm announcing the instruction I'm giving to our negotiators as they pursue a realistic and effective international climate change treaty. And I'm announcing a far-reaching proposal that provides flexible market-based and cost-effective ways to achieve meaningful reductions here in America. I want to emphasize that we cannot wait until the treaty is negotiated and ratified to act. The United States has less than 5 percent of the world's people, enjoys 22 percent of the world's wealth, but emits more than 25 percent of the world's greenhouse gases. We must begin now to take out our insurance policy on the future.

In the international climate negotiations, the United States will pursue a comprehensive framework that includes three elements, which, taken together, will enable us to build a strong and robust global agreement. First, the United States proposes at Kyoto that we commit to the binding and realistic target of returning to emissions of 1990 levels between 2008 and 2012. And we should not stop there. We should commit to reduce emissions below 1990 levels in the five-year period thereafter,

and we must work toward further reductions in the years ahead.

The industrialized nations tried to reduce emissions to 1990 levels once before with a voluntary approach, but regrettably, most of us--including especially the United States--fell short. We must find new resolve to achieve these reductions, and to do that we simply must commit to binding limits.

Second, we will embrace flexible mechanisms for meeting these limits. We propose an innovative, joint implementation system that allows a firm in one country to invest in a project that reduces emissions in another country and receive credit for those reductions at home. And we propose an international system of emissions trading. These innovations will cut worldwide pollution, keep costs low, and help developing countries protect their environment, too, without sacrificing their economic growth.

Third, both industrialized and developing countries must participate in meeting the challenge of climate change. The industrialized world must lead, but developing countries also must be engaged. The United States will not assume binding obligations unless key developing nations meaningfully participate in this effort.

As President Carlos Menem stated forcefully last week when I visited him in Argentina, a global problem such as climate change requires a global answer. If the entire industrialized world reduces emissions over the next several decades, but emissions from the developing world continue to grow at their current pace, concentrations of greenhouse gasses in the atmosphere will continue to climb. Developing countries have an opportunity to chart a different energy future consistent with their growth potential and their legitimate economic aspirations.

What Argentina, with dramatic projected economic growth, recognizes is true for other countries as well: We can and we must work together on this problem in a way that benefits us all. Here at home, we must move forward by unleashing the full power of free markets an technological innovations to meet the challenge of climate change. I propose a sweeping plan to provide incentives and lift road blocks to help our companies and our citizens find new and creative ways of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

First, we must enact tax cuts and make research and development investments worth up to $5 billion over the next five years--targeted incentives to encourage energy efficiency and the use of cleaner energy sources.

Second, we must urge companies to take early actions to reduce emissions by ensuring that they receive appropriate credit for showing the way.

Third, we must create a market system for reducing emissions wherever they can be achieved most inexpensively, here or abroad; a system that will draw on our successful experience with acid rain permit trading.

Fourth, we must reinvent how the federal government, the nation's largest energy consumer, buys and uses energy. Through new technology, renewable energy resources, innovative partnerships with private firms and assessments of greenhouse gas emissions from major federal projects, the federal government will play an important role in helping our nation to meet its goal. Today, as a down payment on our mission solar roof initiative, I commit the federal government to have 20,000 systems on federal buildings by 2010.

Fifth, we must unleash competition in the electricity industry, to remove outdated regulations and save Americans billions of dollars. We must do it in a way that leads to even greater progress in cleaning our air and delivers a significant down payment in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Today, two-thirds of the energy used to provide electricity is squandered in waste heat. We can do much, much better.

Sixth, we must continue to encourage key industry sectors to prepare their own greenhouse gas reduction plans, and we must, along with state and local government, remove the barriers to the most energy efficient usage possible. There are ways the federal government can help industry to achieve meaningful reductions voluntarily, and we will redouble our efforts to do so.

This plan is sensible and sound. Since it's a long-term problem requiring a long-term solution, it will be phased in over time. But we want to get moving now. We will start with our package of strong market incentives, tax cuts, and cooperative efforts with industry. We want to stimulate early action and encourage leadership. And as we reduce our emissions over the next decade with these efforts, we will perform regular reviews to see what works best for the environment, the economy, and our national security.

After we have accumulated a decade of experience, a decade of data, a decade of technological innovation, we will launch a broad emissions trading initiative to ensure that we hit our binding targets. At that time, if there are dislocations caused by the changing patterns of energy use in America, we have a moral obligation to respond to those to help the workers and the enterprises affected--no less than we do today by any change in our economy which affects people through no fault of their own.

This plan plays to our strengths--innovation, creativity, entrepreneurship. Our companies already are showing the way by developing tremendous environmental technologies and implementing commonsense conservation solutions.

Just yesterday, Secretary Pena announced a dramatic breakthrough in fuel cell technology, funded by the Department of Energy research--a breakthrough that will clear the way toward developing cars that are twice as efficient as today's models and reduce pollution by 90 percent. The breakthrough was made possible by our path-breaking partnership with the auto industry to create a new generation of vehicles. A different design, producing similar results, has been developed by a project funded by the Defense Advanced Research Products Agency and the Commerce Department's National Institute of Science and Technology.

The Energy Department discovery is amazing in what it does. Today, gasoline is used very inefficiently in internal combustion engines--about 80 percent of its energy capacity is lost. The DOE project announced yesterday by A.D. Little and Company uses 84 percent of the gasoline directly going into the fuel cell. That's increased efficiency of more than four times traditional engine usage.

And I might add, from the point of view of all the people that are involved in the present system, continuing to use gasoline means that you don't have to change any of the distribution systems that are out there. It's a very important, but by no means the only, discovery that's been made that points the way toward the future we have to embrace.

I also want to emphasize, however, that most of the technologies available for meeting this goal through market mechanisms are already out there--we simply have to take advantage of them. For example, in the town of West Branch, Iowa, a science teacher named Hector Ibarra challenged his

6th graders to apply their classroom experiments to making their school more energy efficient. The class got a $14,000 loan from a local bank and put in place easily available solutions. The students cut the energy use in their school by 70 percent. Their savings were so impressive that the bank decided to upgrade its own energy efficiency. (Laughter.)

Following the lead of these 6th graders--(laughter)--other major companies in America have shown similar results. You have only to look at the proven results achieved by companies like Southwire, Dow Chemical, Dupont, Kraft, Interface Carpetmakers, and any number of others in every sector of our economy to see what can be done.

Our industries have produced a large group of efficient new refrigerators, computers, washer/dryers, and other appliances that use far less energy, save money, and cut pollution. The revolution in lighting alone is truly amazing. One compact fluorescent lamp, used by one person over its lifetime, can save nearly a ton of carbon dioxide emissions from the atmosphere, and save the consumer money.

If over the next 15 years everyone were to buy only
those energy-efficient products marked in stores with EPA's distinctive `Energy Star' label, we could shrink our energy bills by a total of about $100 billion, over the next 15 years and dramatically cut greenhouse gas emissions.

Despite these win-win innovations and commitments that are emerging literally every day, I know full well that some will criticize our targets and timetables as too ambitious. And, of course, others will say we haven't gone far enough. But before the debate begins in earnest, let's remember that over the past generation, we've produced tremendous environmental progress, including in the area of energy efficiency, at far less expenses than anyone could have imagined. And in the process, whole new industries have been built.

In the past three decades, while our economy has grown, we have raised, not lowered, the standards for the water our children drink. While our factories have been expanding, we have required them to clean up their toxic waste. While we've had record numbers of new homes, our refrigerators save more energy and more money for our consumers.

In 1970, when smog was choking our cities, the federal government proposed new standards for tallpipe emissions. Many environmental leaders claim the standards would do little to head off catastrophe. Industry experts predicted the cost of compliance would devastate the industry. It turned out both sides were wrong. Both underestimated the ingenuity of the American people. Auto makers comply with today's much stricter emissions standards for far less than half the cost predicted, and new cars emit on average only 5 percent of the pollutants of the cars built in 1970.

We've seen this pattern over and over and over again. We saw it when we joined together in the '70s to restrict the use of the carcinogen, vinyl chloride. Some in the plastics industry predicted massive bankruptcies, but chemists discovered more cost-effective substitutes and the industries thrived. We saw this when we phased out lead and gasoline. And we see it in our acid rain trading program--now 40 percent ahead of schedule--at costs less than 50 percent of even the most optimistic cost projections. We see it as the chlorofluorocarbons are being taken out of the atmosphere at virtually no cost in ways that apparently are beginning finally to show some thickening of the ozone layer again.

The lesson here is simple: Environmental initiatives, if sensibly designed, flexibly implemented, cost less than expected and provide unforeseen economic opportunities. So while we recognize that the

challenge we take on today is larger than any environmental mission we have accepted in the past, climate change can bring us together around what America does best--we innovate, we compete, we find solutions to problems, and we do it in a way that promotes entrepreneurship and strengthens the American economy.

If we do it right, protecting the climate will yield not costs, but profits, not burdens, but benefits; not sacrifice, but a higher standard of living. There is a huge body of business evidence now showing that energy savings give better service at lower cost with higher profit. We have to tear down barriers to successful markets and we have to create incentives to enter them. I call on American business to lead the way, but I call upon government at every level--federal, state, and local--to give business the tools they need to get the job done, and also to set an example in all our operations.

And let us remember that the challenge we face today is not simply about targets and timetables. It's about our most fundamental values and our deepest obligations.

Later today, I'm going to have the honor of meeting with Ecumenical Patriarch Batholomew I, the spiritual leader of 300,000,000 Orthodox Christians--a man who has always stressed the deep obligations inherent in God's gift to the natural world. He reminds us that the first part of the word `ecology' derives from the Greek word for house. In his words, in order to change the behavior toward the house we all share, we must rediscover spiritual linkages that may have been lost and reassert human values. Of course, he is right. It is our solemn obligation to move forward with courage and foresight to pass our home on to our children and future generations.

I hope you believe with me that his is just another challenge in America's long history, one that we can meet in the way we have met all past challenges. I hope that you believe with me that the evidence is clear that we can do it in a way that grows the economy, not with denial, but with a firm and glad embrace of yet another challenge of renewal. We should be glad that we are alive today to embrace this challenge, and we should do it secure in the knowledge that our children and grandchildren will thank us for the endeavor.

Thank you very much.

[Page: S11021]

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I also point out it is true that yesterday the group of 77 and China proposed a 15 percent reduction in greenhouse gases by the year 2010 under a framework that would exempt developing nations. That is a proposal that would do serious harm to the U.S. economy. It does completely ignore the growing contributions of developing nations to the problem. It anticipates a command-and-control model that would undermine all of the opportunities for cost savings inherent in the market-based solutions that the President has proposed. I believe that is a proposal that U.S. Senators ought to oppose, and I am confident we would. But that is not what the President will agree to. That is not what the President has proposed. That is not, clearly, the negotiating framework within which the United States will attempt to approach this treaty.

I urge my colleagues to read the remarks of the President so they will understand how fully it is within the framework of the resolution that the Senate passed. I hope my colleagues will stand back and really make judgments based on a fair appraisal of our negotiating position and ultimately what we hope to achieve in Kyoto.

Mr. President, before I yield, I would just say it is my hope, obviously, we are about to be able to

talk about the framework in which we are going to proceed on campaign finance reform. I would like to thank all of those parties who have worked together to try to come to what I think is a reasonable agreement on that.

yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed as in morning business for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object--of course, I will not object--I wonder if I could get consent to be recognized after the majority leader and the minority leader, who are going be recognized a little later? Following their recognition, I would like to be recognized.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I would object to that. I only can assume that the Senator wants to speak first. The business before us will be the ISTEA legislation.

[Page: S11022]

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. CHAFEE. As manager, normally I would be the first, the one who would be recognized first, under that. I don't want to waive that.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that after Mr. Chafee is recognized, in that order, after the two leaders, then Mr. Chafee, if I could be recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request by the Senator from Alabama? Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for up to 20 minutes.

Is there objection to the unanimous consent request by the Senator from West Virginia, that he would follow the Senator from Rhode Island? If not, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama for his characteristic courtesy.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, at this point I yield 2 minutes of my time to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

GLOBAL WARMING (Senate - October 24, 1997)

[Page: S11189]

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I noted that the White House recently released a strategy for climate change talks. The President said the United States would not assume binding obligations until developing countries agree to participate meaningfully in the climate-change issue. White House officials said they expect requirements for developing countries would be fleshed out in negotiations.

This is what concerns me, Mr. President, `fleshed out in negotiations.' The senior Senator from West Virginia and the occupant of the chair, Senator Hagel, authored a resolution that has been supported in this body by an overwhelming vote of 95 to 0. The Byrd-Hagel resolution said developing nations must have targets and timetables in the same timeframe as the United States.

Mr. President, it is my contention that the President is glossing over the issue of developing-country participation.

The Berlin Mandate says `no new commitments for developing nations.' Has the President repudiated the Berlin Mandate? Otherwise, how in the world can President Clinton simply state that this is something that can be taken care of in negotiations when the Berlin Mandate clearly says no new commitments for developing nations? Our President only says `meaningful commitments for developing nations.' I wonder what meaningful really means.

At this time, we are somewhat at the mercy of our negotiators on this matter. We have seen comments in the Record from various members of the Senate praising the President's plan, stating that they are encouraged by the policy announcements and pleased with the White House plan. Another member said that the President's position should satisfy demands of the Byrd-Hagel resolution as expressed in this body.

Those demands are not met, Mr. President, because Byrd-Hagel says developing nations must have targets and timetables in the same timeframe as the United States. That is the test.

Another Senator indicates this is a green light that speaks to our Nation's commitment to reducing greenhouse gases. I am a bottom line person, a nuts and bolts kind of guy. How are we going to get there from here? How will we reach the goal the President expressed, which is to go back to emissions levels of 1990 by the years 2008 to 2012?

Let's do the math.

Fifty-five percent of our U.S. energy production is coal. What is happening to coal? If a new climate treaty is signed, there will be reductions in coal use. EPA's new air quality standards on ozone and particulate matter are likely to decrease coal use. EPA's tightened air quality standards on oxides of sulfur and nitrogen will put more emphasis on coal reduction. EPA's proposed regional haze rule will put more pressure on coal as will any new EPA mercury emission rules.

So there is going to be more pressure to reduce use of the resource supplying 55 percent of our electricity.

What about nuclear?

Well, the President threatens to veto our nuclear waste bill. There have been no new orders for new plants in the United States since 1975. There is the potential inability to recover stranded costs of nuclear plants in electric restructuring, so nuclear use is likely to fall.

Nuclear is the largest carbon-free generator of power. The President didn't even mention it in his plan.

Let us go to our next contributor--10 percent of our energy comes from hydroelectric. Yet, there are considerations in the administration to tear down dams. An example that has been discussed is the Glen Canyon Dam. If we tear down Glen Canyon, we would drain Lake Powell--252 square miles. That is a lake that provides the water for Los Angeles, Phoenix, and Las Vegas. It would eliminate sources of carbon-free electricity for 4 million consumers in the Southwest. We would scuttle a $500 million tourist industry.

What about gas that supplies 10 percent of our power? Gas also emits carbons, but not as much. Demand would increase, prices would increase, and shortages might result.

Some people say we will pick up the slack with wind and solar. I like wind and solar, but you can't always count on it. It is kind of interesting to see the Sierra's Club announcement the other day opposing wind farms. They refer to them as `Cuisinarts for birds.' So they are opposed to that.

So the point is, Mr. President, how do you get there from here if the administration does not consider nuclear or hydroelectric? In his speech, the President specifically excludes hydro from renewable energy.

What about the rest of the world? Let me tell you what one of our witnesses said at a hearing yesterday. Mr. Bill Martin, former Deputy Secretary of Energy, said the world is likely to increase its dependence on coal primarily due to energy demand in China. This dependence is likely to result in the doubling of sulfur dioxides in Asia and at least a 30-percent increase in global CO2, in 1990 levels, by the year 2000. To reach a sustainable energy with respect to carbon, the world will have to triple natural gas production, increase coal efficiencies through clean coal technology, triple renewables, triple nuclear power to a worldwide total of 1,000 gigawatts and increase energy efficiency by at least 25 percent.

Mr. President, these are the real terms and conditions in the world that we are living in. Nuclear energy, renewables and energy efficiency emerge as the only viable source to date that are emissions-free and offer some energy independence to nations which adopt them.

The point I want to make here, Mr. President, is that nuclear and hydro, a big part of the solution, are not addressed in the administration's proposal on how to reduce emissions to the 1990 level by the year 2008 to 2012.

The witnesses at the hearings we held yesterday said you cannot get there from here. You cannot physically do it unless you triple nuclear and the renewables, including hydro.

Let me conclude with one other thing. The President says we can do this without a carbon tax. The Department of Energy says you need a carbon permit price of $50/ton. There is no difference.

There are no free rides. Somebody has to pay it. If it is a carbon tax, it is $50 a ton, and it goes to the consumer. If we set up some kind of a market in emissions, somebody like the Board of Trade

starts trading permits, they are estimated to equate to $50 a ton. Somebody is going to have to pay for that, and that is the U.S. consumer.

Let me conclude with just one observation as we address China, as we address the question of whether we should sell nuclear reactors and technology to China.

China has the availability of nuclear power reactors from France. They have it from other nations. Canada is selling; Russia is selling. And certainly they are a nuclear power.

Do we want China to burn more coal? We already have a prohibition against assisting China in the development of the world's largest hydroelectric project. It is called the Three Gorges Dam. The Eximbank will not assist.

Let me tell you how big Three Gorges is. That plant would produce 18,000 megawatts, equal to 36 500-megawatt coal plants. So that is how China will address some of its energy demands from carbon-free hydropower. But we are prohibited from participating. And we are prohibited from participating in their nuclear power program.

So I think, Mr. President, we have to be realistic. As the administration comes down with its plan, again, I suggest to you that the President has glossed over the issue of the developing countries' participation.

I suggest and remind my colleagues of the Byrd-Hagel vote that was 95 to 0. It said developing nations must have targets and timetables in the same timeframe as the United States. And the Berlin Mandate says, no new commitments for developing nations.

So I conclude by saying the President only says `meaningful commitments for developing nations.' And I say `meaningful' means what?

Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

[Page: S11190]

THE IMPORTANCE OF RENEWABLE FUELS (Senate - October 24, 1997)

[Page: S11212]

[Begin insert]

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, just this week, we in the U.S. Senate have been confronted with two strong reminders of the importance of renewable fuels to this country. This emerging industry, potentially lucrative for American farmers and agribusiness, can help solve two key problems that we face: the impact of greenhouse gases on the global climate, and the growing dependency of the American economy on the import of foreign petroleum products.

On Wednesday, President Clinton, announced the U.S. position with respect to the climate change treaty to be negotiated in Kyoto in December. Under his instructions, American negotiators will seek to fashion an agreement that will commit, on an equitable basis, the nations of the world to reducing emissions of greenhouse gases over the next several decades. If implemented, our ability to meet such goals will depend greatly on the development and adoption of new technologies which are more energy efficient. The President's proposal to provide tax incentives for more energy efficient technology should be important in spurring such development efforts. Renewable fuel technologies, especially those derived from agricultural products, will be a crucial component of such activities. Many forms, such as the energy that will be produced from the switchgrass project underway in Centerville, IA, offer the added benefit of actually withdrawing carbon from the atmosphere. Expansion of production of renewable fuels also increases income for the farm sector, and creates new jobs. In keeping with a key theme voiced at the recent White House Conference on Climate Change, with renewable fuels we can do well by doing good, for American agriculture and the whole country.

If that were not enough, Mr. President, Tuesday's announcement by the Commerce Department that record oil imports caused our merchandise trade deficit to increase in August gives added urgency to the promotion of renewable fuels. It is clear that even if no treaty on climate change comes out of Kyoto, our dependence on oil imports still looms on the horizon. The share of imports in U.S. oil consumption has been climbing steadily over the last few years, and the Energy Information Administration of the Department of Energy projects that the share could reach 75 percent within the next 10-15 years. Increased production and use of renewable sources of energy could help to stem that tide, and reduce our need to rely on energy sourced in large part from a politically unstable region of the world.

During this session of Congress, we can begin to respond to these events in at least one concrete way, by passing into law the proposed extension of the ethanol tax credit to the year 2007. I urge my colleagues to seize this opportunity now to show our confidence in agriculture's ability to make a positive contribution in these areas by producing renewable energy for American consumers to use.

[End insert]

REGARDING MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL FORESTS TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GASES (House of Representatives - October 21, 1997)

[Page: H8857]

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 151) expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should manage its public domain national forests to maximize the reduction of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere among many other objectives and that the United States should serve as an example and as a world leader in actively managing its public domain national forests in a manner that substantially reduces the amount of carbon dioxide added to the atmosphere, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Con. Res. 151

Whereas carbon dioxide, a major greenhouse gas, can be removed from the atmosphere by trees through photosynthesis and stored in wood;

Whereas releases of carbon dioxide can be prevented by the use of wood products as substitutes for products whose manufacture consumes fossil fuels and releases substantial amounts of carbon dioxide; and

Whereas managing our forests by planting and growing our forest resources will remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States--

(1) should manage its forests to maximize the reduction of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere among many other objectives; and

(2) should serve as an example and as a world leader in managing its forest in a manner that substantially reduces the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Young] and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. Faleomavaega], each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Young].

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In December, representatives of 150 nations will gather in Kyoto, Japan, to sign a successor treaty to the United Nations 1992 framework convention on climate change. Today, as we anticipate this important event, we will debate a nonbinding measure putting the House on record as supporting proper management of our Nation's forests to maximize the reduction of greenhouse gases, among other important objectives. This resolution is similar to the Byrd-Hagel resolution passed by the Senate earlier this year that put them on record opposing any treaty that would cause serious economic harm to the

United States.

Everyone agrees that we must have clean environment, but we must do it in a way that does not impair or harm our economy. This resolution represents the fact we can have both a healthy environment and a vibrant economy.

By the Clinton-Gore administration's own economic model, the effect of mandatory reductions of greenhouse gases would be devastating to this economy of ours. The United States has an obligation to defend the rights of people who inhabit our planet. It seems that officials representing the United States in the climate change treaty negotiations have lost sight of that duty. Science has proven to us that carbon dioxide, the leading greenhouse gas, can be taken out of the atmosphere by properly managing our forests. Carbon dioxide is kept out of the atmosphere by harvesting the forest before it begins to decompose or burn, thus storing the carbon in wood products that are environmentally friendly, as well as providing an economic benefit to society.

The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which may commit the United States to mandatory greenhouse gas reductions, could lead to enormous burdens and costs on the American people, the economy, and our way of life. The key issue is whether the Clinton-Gore administration will commit the United States to mandatory reductions of carbon dioxide.

Mandatory reductions will cost taxpayers billions of dollars and will cost many Americans their jobs. There are alternatives to mandatory reductions of carbon emissions. The alternative we bring before the Congress today is to properly manage our forests in order to take from the atmosphere carbon dioxide.

This means using the controls on greenhouse gases that Mother Nature gives us rather than controls that Government mandates for us to follow. For that reason, we would move to agree on House Concurrent Resolution 151 and urge our colleagues to give it their full support.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 151, I am proud to rise today in strong support of this important measure introduced by our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Young]. The chairman's legislation sends a crucial message. Carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions constitute a serious problem of global dimension. We can begin, in part, to address and control gas emissions and the growing crisis of global warming by proper and prudent management of our national forests and Federal lands.

Madam Speaker, coming from the South Pacific, I am particularly sensitive to the related phenomena of global climate warming and rising sea levels. For many low-level Pacific island nations, especially those that rise only 6 feet at their highest point of elevation, increasing sea levels threaten to flood, engulf and destroy the very homelands of many Pacific peoples.

Global climate warming presents a real and terrifying danger in the region that cannot be dismissed.

I have introduced a companion-related resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 157, to address the need for the United States to work with the Pacific island leaders on these issues. I have attached a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 157 for the Record and urge our colleagues' support.

Madam Speaker, just last month, as a member of the House Committee on International Relations, I attended the South Pacific Forum meetings in Rarotonga in the Cook Islands as a representative of the U.S. Congress. As members know, the South Pacific Forum is the annual meeting of the Heads of State of 16 Pacific island nations, including Australia and New Zealand.

The Forum meetings revealed that the most urgent priority of the island leaders concerned global climate warming and the related phenomenon of rising sea levels.

House Concurrent Resolution 157 expresses the sense of the Congress regarding the effects of global warming-induced climate disruptions to Pacific nations that are longtime allies of the United States. The measure calls on the United States to work with the island nations to address this extremely serious problem.

As I foresee the process unfolding, the United States will play a leadership role to ensure that all nations and major economies in the world--including China, India and Mexico--fairly share the burden of reducing global greenhouse emissions. All members of the international community must bear the sacrifice for the greater good of the world. No nation should be exempt from doing its part.

As to the measure before us, House Concurrent Resolution 151, Madam Speaker, the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller], has contributed immensely to the amended legislation. Unfortunately, the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller], is at the White House and is unable to be here with us to urge adoption of this measure.

House Concurrent Resolution 151, as amended in committee with the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller], recognizes that our forests have an important role to play in removing carbon dioxide, a major greenhouse gas, from the atmosphere. In our view, however, the amended

resolution clearly does not endorse the original premise that it is desirable to increase old growth harvests of U.S. national forests in order to reduce global warming. That would be a horribly misguided message to send to the rest of the world, especially as we seek to encourage conservation of forest resources in other countries.

Instead, we believe that the old growth forest reserves of the United States should be protected. The temperate rain forests in the Pacific Northwest are among the most effective carbon sinks in the world. If the old growth is harvested it takes many decades to recover the vast amount of carbon released in the process.

We do recognize that carbon dioxide reduction can and should be improved by planting and growing more forest cover in the United States, especially on marginal crop and pasture lands. That is why the amended resolution applies not only to national forests, but to all U.S. forests including private lands.

Finally, Madam Speaker, we want to be very clear that forest-based carbon sequestration, while important, does not replace the need to reduce fossil fuel emissions.

Just yesterday, the Department of Energy reported U.S. emissions of carbon dioxide and other gases, which contribute to global warming, significantly increased in 1996. Contrary to our 1992 treaty obligations, such emissions have increased by 7.4 percent since 1990. This should give the administration a sense of urgency as they prepare to engage in global warming talks with the rest of the world in Kyoto, Japan, this December.

Madam Speaker, I would urge our colleagues to adopt House Concurrent Resolution 151, a worthy measure that symbolizes America's commitment to address the growing crisis of global climate warming.

REGARDING MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL FORESTS TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GASES (House of Representatives - October 21, 1997)

[Page: H8858]

H. Con. Res. 157

Whereas the world's leading climate experts who comprise the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (hereafter in this preamble referred to as the `IPCC') have reported that `the balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate';

Whereas the IPCC has concluded that the effects of global climatic disruption due to increased greenhouse gas emissions could result in (1) a global temperature increase of 1.8 to 6.3 degrees Fahrenheit by the year 2100; (2) a rise in sea level of 6 inches to 3 feet by the year 2100; (3) extreme weather events due to a more vigorous hydrological cycle, such as increased flooding in some areas and more severe droughts in others; (4) saltwater intrusion into freshwater supplies; and (5) the spread of infectious diseases, including malaria and dengue fever;

Whereas the IPCC estimates that today's carbon emissions will remain in our atmosphere for a century or more;

Whereas more than 2,600 scientists recently signed the Scientists' Statement on Global Climatic Disruption calling on the United States, and the world leader in greenhouse gas emissions, to provide leadership this December in Kyoto, Japan, where an international protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, to which the United States is party, is scheduled to be signed;

Whereas relations between the United States and Pacific island nations historically have been marked by a spirit of mutual understanding and cooperation on a wide range of issues;

Whereas Pacific island nations and the United States share a commitment to world peace, and the Pacific islands have traditionally been supportive of major United States initiatives, including United States positions at the United Nations;

Whereas at the Seventh Economic Summit of Smaller Island States (SIS), held September 17, 1997, in the Cook Islands, a statement was issued to reaffirm, recognize, and endorse the Second Assessment Report of the Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) of 1996;

Whereas the United States is a Forum Dialogue Partner in the South Pacific Forum and is a participant or contributor to other regional organizations, including the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme, the South Pacific Commission, the Forum Fisheries Agency, the El Nino research in conjunction with the United States National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the South Pacific Geoscience Commission (SOPAC), the Joint Commercial Commission (JCC), the U.S. Studies Country Program (USSCP), in connection with the Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) Program, the International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI), the South Pacific Nuclear-Free Zone (SPNFZ) Treaty, the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), the World Bank, and the Asian Development Bank;

Whereas the bonds of cooperation are established between the United States and Pacific island nations either through independent territorial, commonwealth, or free association relationships;

Whereas certain Pacific island nations, in alliance with the United States, have historically provided for an important U.S. regional strategic presence and have continued to provide such vital assistance in recent years;

Whereas the world is becoming more politically and socially volatile, with growing security threats in proximity to the Pacific region and in other potentially hostile global theaters;

Whereas Pacific island nations, with many inhabited atolls, lie only a few feet above sea level and are faced with the constant threat of flooding and the possible loss of their nations due to a rise in sea level induced by global warming;

Whereas Pacific island nations such as Nauru, Tuvalu, Kiribati, Niue, Tonga, the Cooks Islands, the Marshall Islands, and the Federated States of Micronesia are already experiencing the effects of an accelerated sea level rise, such as salinization of soil and water, erosion, and rising tides;

Whereas the National Academy of Sciences has determined that the efficiency of nearly every United States energy use can be improved and that the United States could reduce its greenhouse gas emissions significantly at low cost or potential savings; and

Whereas research and development into advanced energy saving technologies would position the United States as the leading exporter of these technologies, reduce the dependency of the United States on foreign oil, and help balance the trade deficit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that--

(1) the United States, with its advanced technologies and comprehensive studies on global climate conditions, should be committed to the proposition that global warming is a very serious international issue, and the United States take appropriate measures to consult closely with the nations of the world to address this serious problem; and

(2) the leaders and peoples of Pacific island nations should be commended for their efforts to enhance the consciousness and sensitivity of the world community by raising the issue of global warming and greenhouse gas emissions.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

REGARDING MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL FORESTS TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GASES (House of Representatives - October 21, 1997)

[Page: H8859]

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. Chenoweth], subcommittee chairman.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alaska for yielding me the time. This is a very interesting subject. I listened with great intrigue to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. Faleomavaega]. I can identify with his remarks and appreciate them.

Today, as the administration considers its position on global warming, though, the House will send a message to the White House that regardless of whether you believe that human-induced global climate change is occurring are not, our forests should play an integral part in reducing greenhouse gases.

At the 11th World Forestry Congress taking place in Antalya, Turkey, many professional forest managers in other countries have criticized the Clinton administration for its lack of management of our national forests. This is very interesting to me, Madam Speaker, because they feel that we have great resources here in America and we are not using them. Instead, we are demanding that the wood that we export now from other countries be harvested in other countries putting an undue pressure on those countries to produce the wood.

[redacted] not applying good silviculture treatments to our forests, we are creating [redacted]rdens for the rest of the world. The ramification is decertification and destruction of tropical forests because of the pressures of the world demand as well as increases in world levels of greenhouse gases that are leading to some of the problems we are talking about today.

Science has proven to us that carbon dioxide, the leading greenhouse gas, can be taken out of the atmosphere by allowing a young vibrant forest to absorb carbon through photosynthesis and storing it as wood. In 1 year, an acre of healthy forest can absorb approximately 3 tons of carbon dioxide by sequestering 1 ton of carbon in woody tissue and converting 2 tons into oxygen for our use. Tree planting, forest management and increasing forest productivity research can positively reduce greenhouse gas buildup.

Carbon dioxide can also be kept out of the atmosphere by harvesting the forest before it begins to decompose on the forest floor or burn, thus storing the carbon dioxide in wood products that are environmentally friendly as well as providing an environmental and economic benefit to society.

In December of this year, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which may commit the United States to mandatory greenhouse gas reductions, is expected to meet in Kyoto, Japan. The ramifications of this treaty could be enormous for the American people, for our environment, for our economy and our way of life.

The key issue, Madam Speaker, is whether the Clinton-Gore administration [redacted]ll commit the United States to mandatory reductions of carbon dioxide. [redacted]ndatory reductions will cost taxpayers billions of dollars and will cost

many Americans their jobs and that is very sad, Madam Speaker. This is based on the fact that we do not know how much greenhouse gas emissions, especially carbon dioxide, from the burning of fossil fuels contributes to the rise in temperatures.

There are alternatives to mandatory reductions of carbon emissions. To suggest that the United States now take radical steps to curb greenhouse gases such as imposing heavy taxes on carbon dioxide emissions, such as 50 cents per gallon of gasoline, to all of the people who drive cars, is a horrible burden for the United States of America. Rather than head down this road void of scientific information that will lead to devastating economic, environmental consequences, we should begin to manage our public forests through sound silviculture methods. This means using the controls on greenhouse gases that mother nature gives to us rather than controls that Government mandates us to follow.

We must send a message that the Federal Government itself should take the lead by reducing the levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, but not by mandating unrealistic, costly, ambient air quality standards, but by doing that which comes natural. That is, that we as good stewards of this Earth should help manage our forests to reestablish themselves as healthy forests.

By managing our national forests to minimize additions of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere, we will improve our air quality, the health of our Nation's forests, and set an example for other nations as the world prepares for the negotiations in Kyoto, Japan.

REGARDING MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL FORESTS TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GASES (House of Representatives - October 21, 1997)

[TIME: 1400]

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Certainly I would commend and thank the gentlewoman from Idaho for her eloquent statement and her thoughts and reasoning, which are well taken.

With regard to the Global Climate Treaty to be negotiated in Kyoto, I do not think there is any question that the Administration is very mindful of the concerns of both private industry as well as the many hundreds of thousands of American workers. The impacts upon the U.S. business community and labor force from the Kyoto conference will be significant but positive. Aside from all of that, I think the jury is still out. We will see tomorrow what the Administration's decisions will be as far as greenhouse gas emissions and the United States' role, which I am sure will be very critical, in the upcoming conference this December in Kyoto.

Madam Speaker, I have no additional requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Hansen], the chairman of the subcommittee.

REGARDING MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL FORESTS TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GASES (House of Representatives - October 21, 1997)

Mr. HANSEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

This week in Bonn, Germany, representatives from around the world will meet on the issues of greenhouse gases. They will be negotiating how quickly the industrial nations must rein in the emissions of carbon dioxide and other so-called greenhouse gases. These talks are in preparation for later negotiations in December in Kyoto, Japan.

Global warming has been an issue of great debate and discussion in Congress. Nearly all of the discussion on global warming surrounds the mandatory reduction of carbon dioxide through costly government controls. The Clinton administration's own studies show that this effort would result in substantial increases in energy prices and damage to the economy.

Quoting from `Economic Effects on Global Climate Change Policies' published by the administration's own Interagency Analytical Team, the higher energy costs would produce GDP losses between 0.2 and 1.0 percent of GDP. For an economy which grew 5.1 percent last year, 1.0 percent would financially hurt every single American.

There is no doubt that everyone agrees that we need to keep our planet clean. To this end, we are here today to put the House on record as supporting proper management of our Nation's forests to maximize reductions of greenhouse gases. Science has conclusively proven that carbon dioxide can be reduced in the atmosphere by allowing a young vibrant forest to absorb carbon through photosynthesis and store it in wood.

Proper management of our forests is important to the environment as well as our economy. There is no doubt that how we are currently managing our Federal forests is neither good for the economy nor is it good for the environment. This resolution puts us on record as supporting good forest management. The forests can and should be managed to help reduce greenhouse gases from the atmosphere.

REGARDING MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL FORESTS TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GASES (House of Representatives - October 21, 1997)

[Page: H8859]

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to restate what has been said very eloquently by the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. Chenoweth], the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Hansen], and my good friend, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. Faleomavaega]. We cannot have it both ways. We must have sound forest management and we must have young trees growing today.

I remember when there was the old saying `plant a tree today for tomorrow,' and we have forgotten that. Many people now want the old trees, the constant dying old trees, which contribute very little to mankind. They will either burn or they will die from beetle kill and they will stand and they do nothing to clean the air.

All this concurrent resolution says is we say it is time for us to have sound management, scientific management of our new forests; to plant those trees, to harvest the older trees and have these forests clean up our air.

*

REGARDING MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL FORESTS TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GASES (House of Representatives - October 21, 1997)

[Page: H8860]

* Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. Over the last several months the Committee on Agriculture has held a series of hearings on the management of our Nation's forest resources. The scientists who have appeared before the committee have taught us a great deal about the environmental benefits of proactive forest management. This resolution on the minimization of greenhouse gases addresses one of the foremost of these benefits.

* Those who truly care for the environment should be quick to realize that wood is our most environmentally friendly building material. Processing construction grade wood releases a tiny fraction of the carbon dioxide produced by steel, concrete, brick, and other non-renewable construction materials that are processed using fossil fuels.

* Wood also stores vast amounts of carbon for long periods of time. Wood extracted from the forest for construction purposes continues to store carbon. Furthermore, the resulting regeneration of trees in the forest sequesters carbon from the atmosphere. In other words, when we use wood for homes, furniture and pulp and paper products, we both minimize carbon releases into the atmosphere and provide an efficient means of removing carbon from the atmosphere. This is a win-win proposition for both the environment and our economy.

* In contrast, failing to actively manage our forests to both provide useful wood products to society and to maximize the ability of our forests to store carbon can have devastating results. In 1996, six million acres of national forest burned in one of the worst fire seasons of the century. This tragedy came on the heels of the 1994 fire season during which over 4 million acres of national forest burned.

* These fires, because of their size and intensity, released staggering amounts of particulate matter into the air. One study indicates that the fires of 1994 alone emitted as much as a ton of particulate matter into the atmosphere for each acre of forest burned and over 400 million tons of carbon in the aggregate.

* Proactive forest management, that focuses on reducing fuel loading and tree density in overstocked timber stands, can significantly reduce carbon emissions caused by wildfire. It can also improve the ability of the forest to store carbon by replacing denser stands of sick, fire prone small diameter trees with more vigorous, fire resistant stands where tree growth and health are both maximized.

* Scientifically managing our forests to reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide levels is a policy that America should enthusiastically embrace, particularly in preparation of the upcoming conference in Kyoto. Yet, surprisingly, the administration does not yet appear to have included a forest management component to its official policy position.

* This resolution fills that void. It frames a policy that will enable

the United States to lead the world in pursuit of scientific, proactive forest management practices that will both clean our air and improve our quality of life. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Emerson). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Young] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 151, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read:

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should manage its forests to maximize the reduction of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere among many other objectives, and that the United States should serve as an example and as a world leader in managing its forests in a manner that substantially reduces the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2107, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998 (House of Representatives - October 24, 1997)

I could mention a number of other things, but I think those are the important ones. More money to the States, spread this over the Nation, get the education component in, and limit what any one State can get, plus, of course, having the oversight of Members of Congress.

I might also add, we have reduced the overhead. We

reduced the amount that can be spent on people downtown by $566,000, and there is another feature in here, many of my colleagues who object to NEA say privatize it. Well, we start that. We have a beginning. We give the NEA authority to seek private funds. I think this could lead to an evolution of private financing for the National Endowment for the Arts.

I hope that in making decisions on this, that people will consider what we have done by way of restrictions to ensure that the NEA is focused on the cultural heritage of this Nation; that the NEA is focused on inspiring people to do things that are worthwhile, such as what we saw last night with the National symphony. The other area of contention is in the Forest Service area. I want to point out a few things here.

First of all, we have one of the lowest allowable cuts we have ever had. Just for example, about 10 years ago, we provided for 11 board feet to be cut. This bill limits it to 3.8 billion, a very substantial reduction. I think this should make those of you who are concerned about the environment very happy with this in the bill.

We also provide money to close more roads than we build. That is another very proenvironmental feature of the bill. We provide for forest health. We recognize that we need to have healthy forests for those that want to recreate in our forest, for those who want to enjoy the out of doors.

As a footnote, I might say that twice as many people use the National Forests for recreation as use the national parks, and that is one of the reasons that good roads are very important, because we do not want a family going out there with their kids to camp or to hunt or to fish, going off the road. We do not want these roads pushed through by a bulldozer so when you get the first rain the road goes down in the local creek. So we want them built to certain standards. That is the reason there is an element of Federal control.

We also want roads that when we have insect problems, disease prevention, fire suppression, that our people can get in in a safe way.

So I hope Members will give some thought to that as you make a decision on whether or not to support the rule and support the bill.

We also provide significant withdrawal funds for refuge maintenance. This does not get a lot of attention. But we provide money that they can build dikes, that they can make these facilities more accessible. I know that the Ducks Unlimited people are very supportive of the bill for the reason that we do that, and we are going to have the 100th anniversary of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the year 2003 and we are doing everything we can to make sure that the facilities are in first class condition.

I think there are a lot of positive things in this bill that I would recommend to Members.

[redacted]e last comment. We have heard a lot about global warming in the last few [redacted]ys, and I think this is another very, very proenvironmental feature of this bill. People are talking about global warming.

How do you address global warming? By reducing emissions. What do we do in this bill? Under the energy section, we have a $42 million increase for conservation programs. Conservation, burn less and do it more efficiently. Part of that is clean coal, part of it is the way we use natural gas and many other things.

But that is the real world of global warming, and that is conservation. We do it. We have increased by $42 million the amount we can allocate to that.

Alternate fuels, new ways. Fuel cells, for example, new technology. Again, this bill provides funding for a number of critical programs, but I want to point out again one feature throughout the bill, and that is we want matching funds. On our energy programs, on the technological developments, we require a match from the private sector, so they, too, have a stake in what is done, and the same thing is true in other parts of the bill.

I think that this partnership approach is an important element in everything we do in terms of research.

There are a lot of other technological items in here, weatherization, which again is designed to conserve fuel to impact on the problem of global warming.

Just let me close by saying to all of my colleagues I am sure that you will [redacted]ind things you do not like about this bill. We all can find things. But we [redacted]e one Nation, and, on balance, this bill I think overall is good for the [redacted]nited States of America. It is good for the environment. It is fair, it tries to address the problems that we have out there in a way, and we try to do it in a very economical way. That is the reason we were able to reduce the cost $400 million under last year, while at the same time increasing the parks by $79 million, increasing the forest by $42 million, and I could go on.

One last feature I would mention is that we provide 100 percent of the fees collected at the parks, at the forests, in the Fish and Wildlife Service, at the BLM facilities, 100 percent stays in the service. It does not go to the Treasury. It used to go to the Treasury so there was no incentive.

Now, when the management of the parks collect a very modest fee from those parks or forests or any of those facilities, they get to keep it. If you do not think it is great, just talk to a park superintendent about how they have been able to do things that otherwise they were not able to do because of this.

I found one little interesting thing. I visited one of the parks out in California, and the people there told me that since they have had the fee program, vandalism has gone down. Why? Because the individual has got a stake in it.

When they are paying something, they realize that there is value to this. They take better care of it, and at the same time visitation was going up.

[redacted] this is a great policy issue that is part of this program, and this is a [redacted]ood bill. This is a good bill. Members should vote for it. It is important

to all of us. It is important to the environmental future. It is important to the recreation future. It is important to the conservation, global warming, all of these things. This bill tries to address them in the best possible way.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote for the rule and vote for the bill.

News From U.S. Senator **Robert C. Byrd** West Virginia

For immediate release:
Wednesday, October 22, 1997

Contact: Ann Adler Phone (202) 224-3904
(202) 224-3904

Statement by U.S. Senator Robert C. Byrd
On The White House Global Warming Initiative

I commend the President for his efforts to develop a proposal to address the growing problem of global warming with credibility and leadership, and to take into account the concerns which have been raised by the Senate on the architecture of any treaty which might be concluded. The President has indicated he will be forceful in attempting to bring the developing countries, particularly big Greenhouse Gas emitters, such as China, Mexico, India, South Korea and Indonesia, to the table to make binding commitments. The problem is global and can only be solved over a global basis. Also, the proposals unveiled by the President today indicate an attempt to arrive at policies and market mechanisms which will take full advantage of new technologies, innovations by affected businesses, and tax incentives to solve the problem without harming the American economy.

I do not know whether the achievement of 1990 emission levels by 2012 is too much, too soon, and the Administration must provide additional analysis in this regard. In addition, the Administration must be more specific as to how they will deal with the issue of the developing world, so as to ensure that global fairness, practicality, and an appropriate pace in attacking the problem, are observed, if any final treaty arrived at in Kyoto in December is to be approved by the Senate.

The developing world needs to be fully aware that the Senate is acutely interested in their commitments and performance, because global warming will directly impact their economies and environment as much as ours, and this problem cannot be solved without their acceptance of binding commitment up front to restrain their future emissions of greenhouse gases, and to clean up their energy mix and upgrade their technologies and infrastructures.

The President and the Vice President appear to be moving in a constructive direction, and I look forward to developing an effective long-term solution to this vital matter in the months to come.

###

Committee On Environment & Public Works

John H. Chafee (RI), Chairman
410 Dirksen Senate Building, Washington, D.C. 20510
202-224-6176

NEWS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Wednesday PM, October 22, 1997

Contact: Nicholas J. Graham
202/224-6167

CHAFEE SAYS PRESIDENT HEADING DOWN "RIGHT PATH" ON GLOBAL WARMING TREATY

Chairman of Senate Environment Committee Calls for Binding Emissions Targets for All Signatory Nations - Including Developing World

Washington, D.C. – U.S. Senator John H. Chafee - the Chairman of the Environment & Public Works Committee - today declared that the President and the Administration were heading down the right path on a new international treaty designed to set mandatory global guidelines and timetables in order to reduce greenhouse gases.

The international environmental conference will take place from December 1st-12th in Kyoto, Japan. About 167 industrialized nations are expected to attend the conference and adopt a new global warming pact requiring industrialized countries to control emissions of greenhouse gases.

Chafee, as Chairman of the EPW Committee and co-author of the 1990 Clean Air Act, has been a leader this year in the effort to bring public attention to the threats of climate change and has held several Congressional hearings on the issue

Chafee has also been asked to help lead a group of twelve bipartisan lawmakers called the Global Climate Change Observer Group. The official, bipartisan delegation of Senate lawmakers - appointed by Majority Leader Trent Lott - is tasked with monitoring the status of international negotiations on the Global Climate Change Treaty.

The senator issued a statement today in response to the President's speech in Washington, at which the President outlined the United States' policy positions in regard to upcoming global warming treaty negotiations.

"I am encouraged by the President's policy announcement this afternoon on climate change. While I am still reviewing the details, it seems that the overall, basic approach is consistent with what I have been calling for since March of this year.

- MORE -

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

"I believe that the overwhelming majority of independent, peer-reviewed scientific studies have demonstrated the need for an international treaty that includes realistic, achievable and binding emissions targets for signatory nations, including major greenhouse gas emitters of the developing world," Chafee added.

"Experience proves that if this treaty is designed in a way that maximizes the potential of the marketplace, we will be able to meet the extraordinary challenge of preserving the Earth and its atmosphere.

"At this point in time, I believe that the Administration is heading down the right path on this question.

"To effectively and efficiently reduce carbon dioxide and other manmade greenhouse gas emissions, we must insist upon international acceptance of emissions budgets, emissions trading, joint implementation between developed and developing nations, comparable developing nation treaty participation, and appropriate recognition for early emissions reductions.

"If these critical features are not part of any new climate change treaty, I believe that our participation would be a mistake. A mistake that would harm our economy and the environment, likewise. **To make this work, the world must be involved. To make this work, innovation and ingenuity must be triggered. To make this work, we must begin soon.**

"With respect to the economics of a new binding international climate treaty, I am concerned that the Administration has not been able to do a better job of forecasting impacts. And not only the impacts which may result from taking action... we must also consider the potential impacts to our economic productivity of not taking action. As is the case for the scientific studies, however, I am persuaded that the majority of independent economic models show that this effort is achievable without undue hardship," Chafee concluded.

Chafee cited figures that showed a direct impact of global warming in the northeast. "According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, New England could experience average temperature increases of three to seven degrees Fahrenheit over the next century, with resultant sea level rise of more than one foot. It is believed that commercial and recreational fisheries, as well as beaches, coastal marshes and essential infrastructure would be devastated under such a human-induced climate change scenario," he stated.

###

COMMERCE COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS
Congressman John D. Dingell, Ranking Member

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN D. DINGELL
RANKING DEMOCRAT, HOUSE COMMERCE COMMITTEE
ON THE PRESIDENT'S CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY ANNOUCEMENT

October 22, 1997

The virtues of the President's proposal -- and there are a few -- are problematic. There is no doubt about the need for new technologies and the promise of research. Voluntary measures and incentives are better than mandates. But the fundamental flaw of the Berlin Mandate remains: the developing countries will be under no obligation to limit their emissions, and may be handed a considerable competitive advantage.

Any agreement in Kyoto must do more than extract a vague promise from the developing countries to participate at some point in the future. Leaving aside the unresolved scientific questions, if the climate change phenomenon is real it will not be solved by unilateral action on the part of the United States.

For now, the best that can be said is that they planned to do worse, but could still do much better. I intend to help them do so.

###

(Contact: Dennis Fitzgibbons 202/225-3641)

Back to the Public Record Home Page

Science & Technology

NEWS

October 15, 1997

House Science Committee, Democratic Membership

Mail address:
2320 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
202/225-6375

Office Location:
822 O'Neill House Office Building
fax: 202/225-3895
staff contact: 202-225-4538

http://www.house.gov/science_democrats/welcome.htm

Brown Statement on Clinton Climate Proposal

Congressman George E. Brown, Jr. (D-CA), Ranking Democrat on the House Science Committee issued the following statement upon release of the Clinton Climate Proposal.

"President Clinton's climate change proposal is a sound and reasonable beginning step. For the first time, the White House has taken the global warming problem seriously and committed the United States to a path of economic growth based on wise and efficient use of all of our energy resources.

"Some will urge faster and deeper cuts. But we need to recognize that reducing global CO2 emissions and weaning the nation from its profligate energy habits will require sustained efforts over many years. It is more important to begin to get the national commitment and the international framework in place. A proposal that has no chance of being accepted either at Kyoto or on Capitol Hill will do nothing to help slow down the emission of greenhouse gases.

"The President's approach wisely recognizes the importance of stimulating the development of energy efficient technologies and non-fossil fuel energy resources as a major part of the plan to meet our CO2 reduction goals. American technology leadership can ease our transition to a more energy-efficient economy. And it can lead to new economic growth through the export of technologies to other nations, as exemplified by China's current interest in U.S. advanced-design, passively-safe fission reactors. Finally, new technologies, such as the development of carbon sequestration processes or the use of coal as a petrochemical feedstock rather than a boiler fuel, can help make productive use of our coal resources and maintain jobs in our coal communities."

###

Clinton Presidential Records
Digital Records Marker

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

This marker identifies the place of a tabbed divider. Given our digitization capabilities, we are sometimes unable to adequately scan such dividers. The title from the original document is indicated below.

Divider Title: **Background**

Clinton Presidential Records
Digital Records Marker

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

This marker identifies the place of a tabbed divider. Given our digitization capabilities, we are sometimes unable to adequately scan such dividers. The title from the original document is indicated below.

Divider Title: **Policy Announcement**