

XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for increased medicare reimbursement for physician assistants, to increase the delivery of health services in health professional shortage areas, and for other purposes.

S. 387

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 387, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide equity to exports of software.

S. 419

At the request of Mr. BOND, the names of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG], and the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] were added as cosponsors of S. 419, a bill to provide surveillance, research, and services aimed at prevention of birth defects, and for other purposes.

S. 496

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 496, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against income tax to individuals who rehabilitate historic homes or who are the first purchasers of rehabilitated historic homes for use as a principal residence.

S. 499

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 499, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an election to exclude from the gross estate of a decedent the value of certain land subject to a qualified conservation easement, and to make technical changes to alternative valuation rules.

S. 563

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 563, a bill to limit the civil liability of business entities that donate equipment to nonprofit organizations.

S. 564

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 564, a bill to limit the civil liability of business entities providing use of facilities to nonprofit organizations.

S. 565

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 565, a bill to limit the civil liability of business entities that make available to a nonprofit organization the use of a motor vehicle or aircraft.

S. 566

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 566, a bill to limit the civil liability of business entities that provide facility tours.

S. 678

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] was added as a cosponsor of S. 678, a bill to provide for the appointment of additional Federal circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

S. 738

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the names of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] were added as cosponsors of S. 738, a bill to reform the statutes relating to Amtrak, to authorize appropriations for Amtrak, and for other purposes.

S. 775

At the request of Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 775, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude gain or loss from the sale of livestock from the computation of capital gain net income for purposes of the earned income credit.

S. 828

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 828, a bill to provide for the reduction in the number of children who use tobacco products, and for other purposes.

S. 834

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 834, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure adequate research and education regarding the drug DES.

S. 883

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the names of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] were added as cosponsors of S. 883, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage savings and investment through individual retirement accounts, to provide pension security, portability, and simplification, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 94

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK], the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 94, a resolution commending the American Medical Association on its 150th anniversary, its 150 years of caring for the United States, and its continuing effort to uphold the principles upon which Nathan Davis, M.D. and his colleagues founded the American Medical Association to "promote the science and art of medicine and the betterment of public health."

SENATE RESOLUTION 98—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. BYRD (for himself, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. INOUE,

Mr. WARNER, Mr. FORD, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. HELMS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. GLENN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BOND, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. DEWINE, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. GORTON, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. FRIST, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. MURKOWSKI) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

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 time-tables 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; and

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: 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.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am submitting a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, and joining me in the introduction of this resolution are the following Senators: Mr. HAGEL, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. INOUE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. FORD, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. HELMS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. BURNS. As I say, Mr. President, I urge other Senators and their staffs to take note of this resolution and to consider joining as cosponsors within the next day or so because we welcome the support of Democrats and Republicans.

This resolution addresses some central issues regarding the conditions for U.S. agreement to revisions to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. In particular, it addresses the clear need for the participation of developing nations in the ongoing negotiations to undertake such revisions to the global climate change convention, first signed in Rio in 1992, at the so-called Earth Summit.

As my colleagues know, President Bush signed the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in 1992, which was subsequently approved by the Senate and ratified. The treaty calls on all signatories to adopt policies and programs to limit their greenhouse gas [GHG] emissions on a vol-

untary basis. The goal was to exhort industrialized nations to attempt to scale back their emissions to 1990 levels by the end of the present decade, a goal that has not been achieved by the U.S. nor by the vast majority of the developed nations. Those nations that have met the voluntary goals are those like Russia, whose economy has been in a free fall, its industries idle and its people hurting. This is not the way that anyone wants to meet an emissions reduction target.

This is an important negotiation attempting to address the fundamental issues of man-created climate changes and how to limit the adverse consequences that have been projected by recent scientific analysis. The perceived culprits in the warming of the globe—emissions of so-called greenhouse gases, including, particularly, carbon dioxide—are caused partly by fossil fuel combustion. Limiting and reducing such combustion and its resultant carbon dioxide are a principal objective of the treaty. It is an effort which has been led by Vice President AL GORE and he is to be highly commended for his sustained effort and achievement in moving this multinational negotiation along. The schedule for the negotiations to revise the Rio Pact is to culminate in meetings in Kyoto, Japan early this December.

The administration, as a result of the disappointing results of the voluntary goals contained in the 1992 agreement, has moved toward supporting mandatory, legally-binding, limitations on emissions to address the long-term effects of the greenhouse gases on the global climate. Worrisome as the prospects of adverse climate change are for all of us, I believe it is unfortunate that the developing world has not seen fit to step up to the plate and assume its clear responsibility to share in the effort being proposed by the United States to limit and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This is most troublesome because without the participation of the developing world, the goals of the treaty will be largely frustrated, since the amount of carbon dioxide which will be produced by the developing world will exceed—get that—exceed in total, that produced by the industrial OECD nations very soon—by the year 2015. That is not very far away. Indeed, the amount of carbon emissions produced by China alone in that year will exceed the amount produced by the United States. So we are talking about the country with the greatest population in the world, China. India is another, and India probably has 800 million people, perhaps more. But I should emphasize that China alone, in the year 2015, which is only 18 years away, will exceed the United States in its production of carbon dioxide. China is rapidly accelerating her demand for electricity, soon to exceed that of the United States, but China has resisted all efforts to include her as a responsible party in the renegotiation of the Rio Pact.

Mr. President, the big carbon dioxide emitters of the developing world—including, as I have just indicated, in addition to China, the countries of India, Mexico, Brazil, South Korea, and Indonesia—cannot expect to continue or expand their extremely inefficient methods for fossil fuel combustion, producing huge, growing quantities of carbon dioxide, and at the same time insist that only the developed nations, the so-called Annex I nations under the Treaty, agree to legally-binding targets and schedules for limiting these gases. This is particularly troublesome, I believe, because, first, without the participation of the developing nations the process of climate change will continue without much human control. Second, there are certainly technological ways that fossil fuel combustion techniques can be made far more efficient than at present in these nations, so that the extent of economic sacrifice that may be required to limit greenhouse gas emissions may not be onerous if all nations will pull together. Third, under the Treaty, industrial facilities in the Annex I countries will be tempted to move behind the borders of developing countries in order to escape legally-binding controls on their greenhouse gas emissions because that means that if the developing countries are not also on the hook with the Annex I countries like the United States, industries will be tempted to go overseas and to send their factories overseas to those so-called developing nations that are not required, if they are not required, to commit themselves to abide by the standards that are to be negotiated by our Government. It would be cheaper, then, for U.S. industries to go overseas. That means our jobs will go overseas. We have seen too much of that already in West Virginia.

This would also frustrate the goals of the Treaty, and cause economic distress, as I have indicated, in the Annex I countries. The developing world should be encouraged to expand its industries in an environmentally responsible manner, knowing that it, too, must prepare to meet limits on greenhouse gas emissions, and not sink to the temptation for quick and dirty development by harboring industrial fugitives from the developed world's mandatory emissions controls.

Therefore, Mr. President, the resolution I am introducing today on behalf of myself and Senator HAGEL and the other Senators whose names I have stated, resolves that the United States should not be a signatory to any protocol to the Rio Pact or to any other agreement which would “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 Countries within the same compliance period.” In other words, what is good for the developed goose

should be good for the developing gender, in that both should be responsible for their actions if the effort to clean up the global barnyard is to be anything other than a halfway effort. And a halfway effort, in the final analysis, serves nobody.

In addition, Mr. President, it is not yet clear what regulatory and legislative initiatives may be required in the United States to implement the binding agreement now under negotiations. Therefore, the resolution would also require that any Treaty signed by the United States, when it is submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent, 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 agreement." I understand that the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HAGEL], Chairman of the relevant Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee will be holding hearings on this matter beginning on June 19, and I commend him for this initiative.

This is a matter that will require substantial consensus building. That will take time. And I am delighted that Senator HAGEL will begin those hearings in the very near future, June 19. I hope that consideration of the resolution that we are offering today will be seen as a contribution to that consensus building process.

Now, there may have to be some adjustments made to the verbiage that we have chosen and I am sure that Senator HAGEL and the other cosponsors and I will be willing to consider any proposed adjustments, be willing to sit down and talk about any changes that need to be made. And with the hearings that Senator HAGEL plans to conduct, the opportunity will be offered to Senators to appear and make statements, expressing their support, raising questions, offering suggestions, as I say, or whatever. But the important thing is this. We must begin to engage in this consensus building.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I thank you very much.

I stand this morning to join my colleague, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], in the introduction of a sense-of-the-Senate resolution on climate change negotiation.

The Senator from West Virginia and I agree that the administration needs to understand the Senate is very concerned about the potential adverse consequences of the proposed changes to the U.S. Framework Convention on Climate Change to which this body gave its consent shortly after it was signed by President George Bush at the Rio de Janeiro conference in 1992.

I hope this resolution will be a much needed wake-up call to the administration about the seriousness of the Senate's views on its current negotiating position. I do not think it was proper for this administration to change the position of the United States from a voluntary approach that was endorsed by the entire developed world to a legally binding treaty to impose enforceable greenhouse gas reduction targets by a date certain.

I am particularly concerned the administration did not consult with Congress prior to taking this new position which I am told was reached in the early morning hours of the last day of the Berlin negotiations. Subsequently, the administration has not sought, and certainly not received, consensus support from the Senate on its new approach.

The attitude of this administration toward honest scientific inquiry is very troubling. I do not approve of using political science instead of real science. Mr. President, let me repeat that. I do not approve of this administration's use of political science instead of the real science that is critically necessary when negotiating and understanding an issue of this importance.

It is outrageous that this administration has been running around the country and the whole world, for that matter, claiming, as Deputy Secretary Tim Wirth has done on a number of occasions, that as far as the scientific hypothesis that human activity is warming the planet is concerned, "the debate is over."

Instead of fairly testing that hypothesis, this administration is using its \$1 billion-plus annual budget to try to prove only that carbon dioxide is warming the planet and to discredit any studies that might appear legitimate to the contrary.

The Earth has warmed about a degree centigrade since the depths of the of the Little Ice Age of the early 1600's. All but a tiny amount of that increase occurred prior to World War II before significant human loading of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. In fact, the world's scientists are still debating the extent, if any, to which human emissions of carbon dioxide rather than predominantly actual causes are actually increasing Earth temperatures.

There is agreement on one point, however: That any future change in world temperature caused by human activity will be slight and there is no reason to rush to a new agreement in Kyoto in December of this year.

Finally, Mr. President, it is unacceptable that this administration has refused to admit the details of its proposal or to release any analyses of the anticipated impact of the proposal. The administration has not revealed to us what kinds of differences its proposal would actually have on global temperatures.

The administration's negotiators have refused to release any of their internal economic studies that show

huge decimation in the industrial sector of our economy. One can only assume that it is to ensure that they will have free rein to commit the United States to whatever they decide to do in the early morning hours of the last day of the Kyoto conference in December. This kind of secret planning and hidden agenda is contrary to a democracy, and, Mr. President, it is just flat wrong.

The administration should immediately start a more public debate and a more honest consultation with the Senate, which, after all, has the final say on whether the United States will be legally bound to any international agreement. A great time to begin to bring this position into the sunshine will be during the Foreign Relations Committee's hearings scheduled for next week by my colleague and the prime cosponsor of the resolution that is coming to the floor this morning, Senator HAGEL. So I look forward to a more open and honest airing of the issue.

I see the Senator from West Virginia is in the Chamber and let me again thank him for his leadership in the authoring of this very important sense-of-the-Senate resolution on global climate change. I am proud to be a sponsor and to work with him on this effort.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank my friend, Senator CRAIG, for his comments. He is a cosponsor of the resolution which I introduce, and I welcome his efforts and the work he is doing in support of the resolution. And I hope that we can get additional cosponsors as well. I am sure that he will be working to that end.

Mr. President, I see Senator HAGEL on the floor. He is the chief cosponsor of this resolution. I do not have the authority to yield to him unless he is appearing on my time, and I will do that. I have 30 minutes at the beginning, as I understand it, so I yield such time as he may consume from the time under my control to the distinguished Senator, Mr. HAGEL.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I am pleased to join the senior Senator from West Virginia in cosponsoring the resolution that he has brought to the floor this morning. As my distinguished colleague has already noted, this resolution deals with U.S. policy on the global climate issue. This is a very serious issue, with potentially disastrous consequences to the United States economy. Next week I will begin, as Senator BYRD noted, hearings in the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on International Trade and Export Promotion on the global climate negotiations.

Like Senator BYRD, I believe that the Senate must not simply wait until the negotiations are completed and then respond. If we do that, it then would be too late to exercise our constitutional responsibility to not only give our consent to treaties but, even more important, to give our advice to the President.

Next week, my subcommittee will be hearing from the Under Secretary of State for Global Affairs, Tim Wirth. Secretary Wirth has been the administration's chief negotiator in the U.N.'s global climate negotiations.

I will be following that first hearing a week later with a second hearing. We will ask fair questions, tough questions, and we will expect honest answers.

All Americans are concerned about our environment—of course, they are and should be—and how to ensure that it is protected for our children and our grandchildren.

The responsibility we have as public servants, as policymakers, is to seek the best solutions where problems exist and come to a strong and commonsense bipartisan consensus on what is the best policy to deal with this problem.

This resolution offers a general baseline for what we can accept as sensible, commonsense policy.

This resolution does not address all the specific concerns many of us have over this issue. We know that.

As the necessary debate over the global climate issue progresses over the next few months, we will have an opportunity to hear from all sides, just as Senator BYRD pointed out, and further open up this issue and talk about the specifics associated with the global climate issue.

How we deal with this issue of climate control will have serious consequences—serious consequences—for our economy, the environment, Americans' future standard of living, energy costs, energy use, economic growth, our global competitiveness, impact on jobs, trade, national security and maybe, Mr. President, most important, our national sovereignty.

All of these dynamics will be explored before the December meeting in Kyoto, Japan, formally known as the "Third Meeting of the Conference of Parties to the Framework Convention on Climate Change."

Mr. President, this is clearly a very serious issue that demands a major national debate.

The purpose of this resolution that Senator BYRD and I are offering today, with a number of our distinguished colleagues representing States from all over this country with varied economies, varied interests, is to begin that debate, to begin that debate today and to let the world know that the U.S. Senate intends to have a very serious and strong voice in shaping the American position on this global climate issue.

Mr. President, thank you, and I yield back my time.

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

Mr. HAGEL. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator made a very important point in closing his speech. Here sit the representatives of the people in this body. Here sit the representatives of the States. It is the only forum in this country which represents

the States. And so it is that it is important that this body have a voice, it is important that this body have a responsibility for oversight under the Constitution, has a responsibility to monitor the events and proceedings and developments.

It is not my desire to kill the treaty. We are going to have to face up to this problem. It is going to impact on our grandchildren and their children and their children and their children. And so we have a responsibility to face up to it now. It is not a pleasant thing to consider, to contemplate. But that is the purpose of the resolution. That is the purpose of the hearings the distinguished Senator will conduct. We want to be in on the takeoff, not just on the landing. We have a responsibility to our people, we have a responsibility to this country and to its future. So that is why we have introduced the legislation today, and I compliment the distinguished Senator, and I look forward to working with him in this important, all important, matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution which I shall send to the desk may remain open for other signatories until the close of business today.

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

Mr. BYRD. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair, and I thank my colleague again. I reserve the remainder of my time, send the resolution to the desk and yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and referred to the appropriate committee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senator BYRD's sense of the Senate Resolution on the issue of climate change. A few weeks ago I was back in Kentucky and my youngest grandson, Morgan, wanted some help on his math homework. At first we were both stumped over the list of word problems his teacher had assigned. Then, after all those years, a lesson one of my teachers taught me came back. She taught us to cut out all the extraneous words in those problems. Once we'd stripped it down, she promised we'd have a clear-cut math problem we could recognize how to solve. It wasn't long before Morgan and I had zipped right through those problems.

I think my colleagues will find the same method will work with the Global Climate Change Treaty that's currently being negotiated. It sounds complicated and impressive when you first look it over, but once you strip away all the extraneous language, it comes down to this simple equation. Rules benefitting the economies of developing nations plus rules penalizing the economies of developed nations add up to a big fat zero in net gains for the global environment.

That's because only developed nations would be legally bound by the

treaty hammered out by negotiators—the so-called Berlin Mandate. Developing nations are off the hook.

Right now, developed nations and developing nations have about equal levels of carbon emissions. But within five years of the deadline, developing nations will have more than 1½ times the 1990 level of the developed world.

So when you subtract all the half-baked environmental promises, you find the equation is heavily weighted against America and especially against American workers. That's because the United States will have to make the steepest reductions and suffer the costliest and most damaging consequences. Preliminary estimates put the loss at 600,000 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 could be especially bad. Not only would miners working in the coalfields of Eastern and Western Kentucky suffer job loss, but many of the businesses and factories that have created a golden triangle in Northern Kentucky would be forced to close. And every single Kentuckian will face higher electric bills and higher gas prices.

But what should really make you scratch your head over this puzzler is that when you add it all up, we won't get a cleaner environment. We won't stop global warming. We won't even get reduced carbon emissions.

That's 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.

So, here's a quick math review. You've got a treaty with devastating consequences for the American economy. You end up with virtually no environmental benefit. Stripped down it looks like nothing more than a massive foreign aid package paid for with American jobs.

It's 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.

Time is limited for the Senate to act to make it clear that the treaty, as currently reported, will get a failing grade. A December signing ceremony is already set for December in Kyoto, Japan.

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

And next time my grandson grumbles about why he has to learn things he'll probably never use again, I'll just remind him that when you get right down to it, even the most complicated

global policy problems can be solved with some simple math.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to join Senators BYRD, HAGEL, and CRAIG to speak about the threat posed by the administration's support of an international global climate treaty. This is a very serious issue, and for too long it has not received the attention it deserves. I applaud Senator BYRD for focusing attention on this matter through his sense of the Senate resolution and I am pleased to be an original cosponsor.

In December of this year, the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change will conclude negotiations on a binding treaty to control the emissions of greenhouse gases by the developed nations. The Clinton administration has been pushing hard for such an agreement and intends to implement this treaty in the United States. I would note, however, that this treaty applies only to developed nations. Emerging nations are not included. Countries such as China, India, and South Korea will not pay the costs of the energy taxes or be constrained by the caps on manmade emissions as will the United States. It will be business as usual for these nations despite the fact that emissions of carbon dioxide, the primary greenhouse gas, from developing nations will shortly surpass those of the developed nations.

Despite this obvious flaw, such a treaty might yet be logical if we knew that clear benefits would be derived as a result, but we do not. Scientists are sharply divided as to whether the Earth is warming because of human activity. How then can we justify supporting a treaty which even the U.S. Department of Energy has concluded will be devastating to the economy? How can we seriously consider any proposal which will cost American jobs, slow economic growth, and encourage domestic industries to move offshore when the next century's greatest contributors of greenhouse gases will not share even the smallest portion of this burden. Mr. President, the answer is simple: We cannot and should not.

The United States has made dramatic improvements in pollution control in the last two decades. A clean environment is of paramount importance to Americans, and we will continue to work responsibly toward protecting this Nation's air, water, and land. We must not, however, saddle our economy with new taxes and regulations the sole purpose of which is to limit American productivity. We cannot enter into an agreement which will do significant harm to our economy and put us at a competitive disadvantage relative to emerging nations when the jury is still out on the effects that mankind may have on climate change.

If future research provides irrefutable evidence that manmade emissions are contributing to global warming, then all Nation's should work together in concert to identify and reduce the greenhouse gases responsible

for such a phenomenon. Today, we are far from having such evidence, and to act without it is simply not sound policy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SENATE RESOLUTION 99—RELATIVE TO OVER-THE-COUNTER MEDICATIONS

Mr. DASCHLE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

S. RES. 99

Resolved,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Food and Drug Administration has proposed that the content and format of over-the-counter (OTC) drug product labels be made more user-friendly to help consumers better understand how to properly use these medications.

(2) Almost 60 percent of total OTC drug product sales of \$29,000,000,000 are made by community retail pharmacies, where a pharmacist is available for consultation with the consumer about the product.

(3) A significant number of potent prescription medications have been switched to OTC status over the last few years and others are likely to be switched over in the next few years. Many consumers may be unaware of the potential problems that may occur when OTC and prescription drugs are inappropriately used together, and should be encouraged to consult with their doctor and pharmacist. The pharmacist may have the only complete record of all the medications being taken by the consumer that would help avoid these problems.

(4) Pharmacists can help the consumer select the most cost-effective OTC drug product based on the symptoms presented to the pharmacist.

(5) Interaction with the pharmacist on using OTC drug products is particularly important for older Americans, who already use one-third of all prescription drug products and one-third of OTC drug products. As the population ages, older Americans are expected to use almost half of all OTC drug products by the year 2000. According to recent studies, the health care system, including the Medicaid and Medicare programs, incur billions of dollars in unnecessary costs each year as a result of medication-related problems.

(6) The importance of consumer interaction with the pharmacist about OTC drug products was recognized by Congress when it required that Medicaid prospective drug utilization review programs include screening for "serious interactions with nonprescription or OTC medications".

(7) Encouraging pharmacist interaction with consumers on OTC drug products is consistent with recent attempts by consumer groups, the pharmacy community, and the Food and Drug Administration to increase the quality and quantity of written and oral information being provided to consumers with their prescription medications.

SEC. 2. CONSULTATION.

It is the sense of the Senate that the Food and Drug Administration should include a provision in the Administration's new final regulation on the content and format of over-the-counter drug labels which requires that such labels include the phrase "Consult your doctor or pharmacist".

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, today I am submitting a resolution that rec-

ognizes the essential role our Nation's community pharmacists play in protecting the public health and educating consumers about over-the-counter [OTC] medications.

The Food and Drug Administration has proposed revisions to the content and format of OTC product labels to make them more informative and consumer-friendly. Among these changes, FDA has proposed adding to OTC labels the recommendation: "Ask your doctor or pharmacist." The FDA is currently soliciting comments on this proposed change, particularly on the benefits and appropriateness of referring consumers to pharmacists for guidance on OTC medications. By demonstrating strong support for a labeling change that refers consumers to pharmacists as well as to doctors, this resolution acknowledges the relevant expertise of community pharmacists and the contribution they make in assuring proper use of OTC medications.

Each year, millions of Americans purchase medications such as painkillers, allergy medications, cold and flu remedies, and other products to treat nonacute medical conditions. Most of these products are purchased at pharmacies, where an on-site pharmacist is always accessible to help the consumer select the medication that is most appropriate and cost effective for them. The labeling change this resolution supports acknowledges that consumers face an intimidating array of medication options, and it reinforces the fact that pharmacists have the experience and expertise to help consumers make the right choice about their medications.

Making this labeling change is also a matter of public health. A significant number of potent prescription medications are now available on an over-the-counter basis, and many more are likely to be introduced. Most consumers are unaware of the potential problems that may occur when prescription drugs and OTC products are taken together. In some cases, the pharmacist may be the only health professional with a complete record of all medications being taken by the consumer. The pharmacist's intervention may well prevent tragic consequences.

Recommending that consumers consult with their pharmacist is particularly important for older Americans, who already use one-third of all prescription and OTC drug products. With the aging of the population, older Americans are expected to use almost half of all OTC medications by the year 2000. As OTC products proliferate and more potent medications become available, the risks to seniors and other consumers compound. It makes sense to foster the pharmacist-consumer link to minimize the potential problems that may result from this trend.

Finally, this labeling change can save the health system money. According to recent studies, Medicare, Medicaid, and the health care system as a whole incur billions of dollars in unnecessary costs each year as a result of