

from international inspection. If they were to pledge to join the Nuclear Suppliers Group that would be a different thing. But the Zangger committee has the loophole necessary to proliferate nuclear technology with the potential of nuclear weaponry to places that don't have international inspection. China is the only nuclear weapons power in the world that has not joined the Nuclear Suppliers Group and they remain unwilling to do so.

The national security arguments for United States-China nuclear cooperation are far from compelling, and the economic rationale is exaggerated. As the Washington Post notes this morning, United States big business is lobbying hard for nuclear cooperation with China in hopes that this market will boost exports.

I want United States businesses to benefit from possible export markets, but China is seeking nuclear cooperation with the United States to increase the number of bidders for and to lower the price of Chinese power projects. Once China obtains nuclear technology, they will reverse engineer our products and they will start building those products themselves and be our competitors in other export markets.

As Dan Horner of the Nuclear Control Institute notes in the Post article this morning, China is only seeking enough technology to develop a domestic production capability.

The United States should not enter into nuclear cooperation with China until real and observable progress is made in China's nonproliferation record. Before we send our nuclear technology to China, Beijing should cut off all nuclear cooperation with terrorist states, such as Iran. Before we send our nuclear technology to China, Beijing should maintain at least for 1 year an exemplary nonproliferation record for all weapons-of-mass-destruction technology, including technologies other than nuclear—chemical technologies and biological technologies.

The threat of weapons of mass destruction has become a broader issue than that of nuclear-proliferation technology alone. Chemical weapons, biological weapons and the missile systems to deliver those weapons are all part of the weapons-of-mass-destruction threat. China's improvements in nuclear nonproliferation are questionable at best, but even the administration can't defend China's broader weapons-of-mass-destruction nonproliferation record.

Even though the administration argues that China has honored its May 1996 pledge not to transfer nuclear material to unsafeguarded nuclear facilities, doubts persist about China's recent nuclear-proliferation activity. A June 1997 CIA report released this year states that:

During the last half of 1996—

After its assurances of May 1996—

During the last half of 1996, China was the most significant supplier of [weapons of

mass-destruction]-related goods and technology to foreign countries. The Chinese provided a tremendous variety of assistance to both Iran's and Pakistan's ballistic-missile programs. China was also the primary source of nuclear-related equipment and technology to Pakistan, and a key supplier to Iran during this reporting period.

Clearly, the Chinese record does not develop a sense of confidence in those who observe her objectively, and it certainly does not justify a bill of good health that nuclear cooperation would signify.

Therefore, I hope the President does not accord to China a standing it does not deserve in a way that would jeopardize our capacity to restrain the proliferation of nuclear technology.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended by 5 minutes and that I be permitted to speak therein.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Chair.

CAMPAIGN FOR HEALTHIER BABIES MONTH

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today on a very, very important mission, and that is to highlight the important work of the March of Dimes and its over 3 million dedicated volunteers across America. I thank and congratulate them on the most worthwhile of endeavors.

During the month of October, the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation is celebrating Campaign for Healthier Babies Month by stepping up its efforts to reach more women of childbearing age with valuable information which will give every baby a better chance of being born healthy.

These efforts are critical to prevent birth defects, low birthweight and prematurity, which are the leading causes of infant death and morbidity and also a tremendous cause of heart-break and tragedy for so many families in the United States today.

As all of us know, the March of Dimes is a national voluntary health agency whose mission is to improve the health of babies by preventing birth defects and infant mortality. Through its campaign for healthier babies, the March of Dimes funds programs of research, community services, education and advocacy. To enhance these efforts, the foundation has started the March of Dimes Resource Center.

The resource center provides accurate up-to-date information and referral services to the public. It consistently offers high-quality, reliable, and

prompt responses. It is staffed by highly trained professionals. The March of Dimes helps people one on one to address personal and complex problems relating to maternal and child health. The center provides information on numerous topics in which the March of Dimes has been in the forefront, such as the dangers of drug and alcohol use and other hazards during pregnancy. And most important, it is promoting the use of folic acid by women of childbearing age.

We know now that 400 micrograms of vitamin B folic acid taken regularly by women of childbearing age before they become pregnant can reduce by one-half, or even 70 percent, the incidence of neural tube defects in babies born in America today. I don't know how many of my colleagues know of a family that has been afflicted with the loss of a child who was born with a severe and fatal neural tube defect. Many of us know good friends who were born with spina bifida and other problems which could be substantially reduced if women of childbearing age regularly take 400 micrograms of vitamin B folic acid every day.

The March of Dimes professionals and the resource center answer questions from parents, health providers, students, librarians, Government agencies, health departments, social workers—people from all walks of life. The good people at the March of Dimes estimate that through the resource center, they will provide information to almost half a million individuals in the first year alone.

The center is a state-of-the-art facility which can be contacted by people around the world through both a toll free number and e-mail. March of Dimes is shortened to MODIMES, M-O-D-I-M-E-S, MODIMES. The toll free number is 1-888-MODIMES, or by e-mail, the Web site is www.modimes.org. I urge people to take advantage of the toll free number or the Web site.

I congratulate the March of Dimes on the success of the resource center, and I thank them for the years of dedicated work to prevent birth defects and to reduce infant mortality.

Mr. President, we rank far too high in infant mortality in this country. Many, many countries do better than we do because we don't provide the care and the attention that expectant mothers need.

Many of my colleagues in this body know that I have been a long-time supporter of a particular priority, the March of Dimes and the Birth Defects Prevention Act I first introduced in 1992. It has been passed time and time again by the Senate. In June of this year, this vital piece of legislation passed the Senate by a unanimous vote. A House companion bill currently has over 130 cosponsors. Both bills have strong bipartisan support in our body, the majority leader and the minority leader both, along with most of the people on all the relevant committees.

The groups endorsing this include the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the National Association of Children's Hospitals, the American Hospital Association, the National Easter Seals Society, the Spina Bifida Association of America, and numerous others.

I urge all of my colleagues and people who may be listening around the country to urge the House to take up this important legislation and pass it this year. As we get to the end of a particular year's session, there are always so many things, so many other bills that people think are priorities. Let me ask anybody to name me a priority that would be higher than helping the families of America of each of our States avoid the tragedy of the loss of an infant through birth defects or the permanent disability of a child born with birth defects.

America's families and all of us have waited too long for this measure because it can go a long way in preventing birth defects, which is the leading cause of infant death. Quite simply, a little prevention goes a long way in avoiding family pain and heartache. It is up to Congress, it is up to us to seize this excellent opportunity to protect our most valuable resources—our children. I urge all of my colleagues to pay attention and to take an interest in this vital matter.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m. today.

Thereupon, at 12:39 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. COATS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in his capacity as a Senator from the State of Indiana, suggests the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERRY. 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. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized to speak as in morning business.

GLOBAL WARMING

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 negotia-

tions 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, INOUE, 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.