

So I encourage my other colleagues to contact the Senators in question—Senators HELMS, JEFFORDS, INHOFE, and SMITH of Oregon, because we would like to host others in Alaska and let them see for themselves as they address many of the issues that are going to determine the manner in which Congress authorizes resource development on public lands in our Nation's largest State.

With that, I thank my colleague who has been patient, and I yield the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we just voted earlier today 95 to 0 to direct the President of the United States not to enter into treaties in Japan dealing with global warming at this time. Those of us who care about the Earth on which we live want to make sure we are good stewards of this planet that we are blessed to have and we care about it very deeply.

I have had the opportunity to serve on the Environment and Public Works Committee and have heard testimony from some of the Nation's most outstanding experts on the question of global warming. I am a new Senator, just having come here in January, and was very interested and fascinated by the possibility of trying to learn more about this problem that I have been reading about, as have so many Americans.

I must admit to you that I have been somewhat surprised by a number of things, including a lack of unanimity among scientists, a lack of data among scientists, and a serious disagreement among scientists. I am also somewhat surprised, despite the very strong feelings of people who study this, that the President continues to be determined to enter into treaties that could adversely affect the economic well-being of the United States.

Let me say first, in my simple way of thinking about this problem, a regulation is the equivalent of a tax. It would be no different for us than if we were to regulate the electric power industry and added costs to companies by mandating environmental controls in addition to the ones that they have implemented to preserve the environment for years. If we implement those controls, their customers are going to pay in terms of rate increases. Increases will be paid by the citizens who consume power, and every American consumes power.

So we have to understand that a regulation that imposes a burden on some big company, like a power company, is really a tax on all of us. It is a regulation that impacts all of us. It adds to the cost of doing business in America. Every small business that utilizes electricity will have to pay for that power at a higher cost. It will make them, therefore, less able to compete with

other people around the world. I think that is a fundamental principle we must not look for.

The Atlantic Monthly recently had a most marvelous article about economic growth, progress, and technological advancement. Those, it said, are the greatest ways to fight pollution and to clean our environment. The areas that are most polluted, the areas that are least safe to live in and where people have the shortest lifespan are the undeveloped nations of the world. This article devastated the myth that progress and technological advancement imperil the environment. Indeed, just the opposite is the case. Improved technology and improved progress allow us to do more for less and improve our environment.

We do know, though, that we are already, as a nation, facing a difficult challenge around the world. We are having a difficult time protecting the jobs of working Americans in the face of lower-wage nations that are taking our jobs. Ross Perot, in running for President, used the phrase "a giant sucking sound," as he referred to jobs going overseas. The fact is, every day we place greater and greater burdens on the productive businesses in our Nation. At some point, the cumulation of those burdens reach a point that makes those businesses uncompetitive in the world and can severely damage the economic strength of this Nation. That is why the AFL-CIO and working unions all over America are questioning and opposing this treaty, because they see it will add one more burden to the United States and one more advantage to undeveloped nations who already have these low-wage rates to knock down and take away the productive capacity of American industry. I think it is a valid concern.

Second, Mr. President, my simple mind, as I have been here, has caused me to think about how many treaties I see that we are entering into. I have this vision in my mind of Gulliver among the Lilliputians lying there with strings tying the giant down where he couldn't get up. Hundreds of little threads tied him down, and he could not move.

We are a great nation, the greatest really on Earth, the greatest perhaps in the history of the world. We have great privileges and great requirements as a great nation. We ought not to lightly enter into treaties that bind us, keep us from being able to fully effectuate the capabilities that we have and enter into treaties with other nations, some of whom may not honor those treaties. It is one thing for them to sign up. We have seen nations sign up and say they won't use poison gas and then they have used poison gas, and nothing is done about it. What if we sign a global warming treaty and other nations who sign it do not comply? What will we do then? I suggest we will do nothing. We will honor that treaty, as we always do, because we take those things very seriously.

Let me make a couple of points. The first thing that I have learned in our committee hearing is just how small a part of the problem we are facing is caused from humankind. Look at this chart. It is a remarkable chart—CO₂ emissions, natural versus man-made.

Eighty to eighty-five percent of emissions that cause global warming are supposed to be CO₂. This is a big problem. 96.9 percent of the CO₂ emissions on this Earth come from natural causes; things which combustion and other things do not affect. The rest of the world contributes 3.1 percent. The U.S. contribution is less than 1 percent, .6 percent. If we eliminated all the production of CO₂ in the United States, we would only make a small dent in the overall problem of CO₂ emissions. That is why people are saying they are not sure what is causing global warming, if we have global warming at all. I think we have to know that. Those of us who are talking about imposing tremendous economic burdens on American industry place us in a position of not being able to remain competitive in the world, for a benefit perhaps nonexistent. I think this is a matter we have to consider seriously.

Do we have global warming? That is a matter that I know is a given—it is said. Some 2,000 scientists say it is, but many do not know why. There remains a lot of dispute about global warming. I am not sure what the real situation is. I am certain that there is some slight warming, but I must say that it is not clear.

Dr. Christy, a NASA contractor and a professor at the University of Alabama in Huntsville, a premier university in scientific research, has studied satellite data for 20 years. He has been able to ascertain from that data what the atmospheric temperatures are around the world, not just on one seashore where the gulf stream may affect it or some prevailing winds may have affected the temperature temporarily. This is a global change. He has studied this over 20 years, beginning in 1979.

Dr. Christy reached a remarkable conclusion based on his studies of temperature changes. As stated in his testimony before the full Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, the level of the atmosphere he is testing should be warming, according to those who believe in the global warming models, because global warming caused by the greenhouse effect should be an atmospheric effect, but he found the atmosphere has not warmed. This black line reflects the temperature, and it has actually gone down during the almost 20 years that he studied.

No one has contradicted that evidence. It wasn't evidence that he went out and gathered. It was evidence that he just took from the satellite information that was already available to the public, and he made a comprehensive study of it.

What is interesting is, based on his information, we may not have global

warming at all. As I said, that information has not been disputed in any way.

Not many years ago, the prediction was that we were going to show a 4-degree increase in climate temperature in the next 100 years; 4 degrees growth would be the average increase in temperature in the next 100 years.

Now, those numbers have dropped to 2 degrees. The experts have reduced those already just in the last few years to 2 degrees.

Dr. Patrick J. Michaels, professor of environmental sciences at the University of Virginia and senior fellow of environmental studies at the CATO Institute, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on June 26, 1997. This is what he said:

Critics argued some years ago, as I did, [he said] that this would have to be a dramatic reduction in the forecast of future warming in order to reconcile fact with hypothesis.

In other words, he realized that the people who were predicting this 4-degree increase were wrong, and some time ago he predicted they would have to modify this.

By 1995, [he said] in its second full assessment of climate change, the IPCC [the U.N. panel] admitted the validity of the critics' position [his position]. When increases in greenhouse gases only are taken into account, most climate models produce a greater warming than has been observed to date—

In other words, we predicted a greater warming than we were actually seeing, than nationally has been observed.

unless closer climate sensitivity to the greenhouse effect is used.

In other words, we were predicting too high a sensitivity to the greenhouse effect.

The IPCC continued:

There is growing evidence that increases in aerosols are partially counteracting the warming.

There are many things that are involved there.

Dr. Michaels then added this comment. I thought it was very instructive, Mr. President. He said:

I believe the secular translation of this statement is that either it is not going to warm up as much as was previously forecast or something is hiding the warming. I predict every attempt will be made to demonstrate the latter before admitting that the former is true.

I thought it was interesting he used those words: "I believe the secular translation of that document." I thought about why he did that, why he used those phrases. He is a scientist, a University of Virginia scientist. Why would he say that? I think he is saying that because he senses in many of the people who are promoting this agenda almost a religious bent, a commitment beyond rationality, a commitment beyond science, a sort of supernatural belief that we have to clean this Earth, and nothing we do as human beings here is healthy, and it is all bad. It goes beyond rationality. I tend to agree that we have some things that are said, that I have observed on our committee, that would indicate that that is true.

Let me add one more thing before I conclude.

The other thing we have learned is that global warming is hard to fix obviously if 97 percent of—by far, the No. 1 problem of greenhouse gas—CO₂, is from natural causes. So we have a problem.

We had testimony recently from four scientists before our committee. And I would like to share with you one of the exchanges that took place there.

One professor thought that even though he was supporting the treaty, he thought we should take only modest steps at this time. And he believed that a significant tax on fuel and carbon products would be the way to do it. That is what he proposed. He said, "I think we need to start moving in that direction."

Dr. Richard S. Lindzen was a member of that panel. He is an Alfred P. Sloane Professor of Meteorology at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. When testifying before the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works on July 10, 1997, Dr. Lindzen said, "I'm saying more than that. I'm saying that Dale"—talking about the professor—"that what he's proposing, take the scenario that you expect, an increase of 4 degrees"—so Dr. Lindzen is saying, OK, let us assume that you are predicting a 4-degree increase in temperature in the next century, what affect would this tax, a significant tax on oil and all carbon products, have on our environment?

This is what he said, "... take the scenario that you expect an increase of 4 degrees, if we imposed his tax, that would knock the temperature down over 100 years to 3.95 degrees. Only five one-hundredths of a degree would be affected by a tax to reduce that kind of emission of gases."

We are dealing with a very serious problem. I am concerned about American economic growth. I want the American people to have good jobs and be competitive in the world. I want a healthy environment. I believe in that. I am willing to invest some money in that. But I am not willing to invest money in a project that will have almost no effect and perhaps is dealing with a problem that may not even exist.

We need more science, more study before we ask the people of this Nation to commit their resources into an effort that we could do somewhere else; \$10 billion, \$100 billion spent on this is \$100 billion we could spend on child health care, emergency room admissions, and a lot of other things that we desperately need in this country.

So, Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to share those thoughts with you. I think we are dealing with an important issue. And I hope that the American people will pay close attention to it as we go forward.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

MILITARY SERVICE AND HOMOSEXUALITY

Mr. COATS. I want to take just a few moments to put something in the RECORD that has not really been high profiled recently but which is I believe important.

I picked up the Washington Post earlier this week and was reading through the Post, and in there was a small story detailing what the President's press secretary, Mike McCurry, had to say about an earlier statement made by the White House relative to the law which governs the service in the military of people with homosexual persuasion.

The administration had issued the comment in response to some court rulings that they thought that the law was working as intended. And then Mr. McCurry, after admitted pressure from the gay rights lobby, issued a clarification which changed the response or at least was intended to change the response. I quote from the Washington Post article which said:

After protests from gay rights groups, McCurry yesterday said that contrary to an earlier statement, the Clinton administration does have concerns about how its [so-called] "don't ask, don't tell" policy [so-called] is my emphasis on homosexuality is being enforced in the military.

First of all, let me state that this, the current policy which is described by many as a "don't-ask, don't-tell policy," is not descriptive of the particular policy. Therefore, I think it is important that we understand that what we are dealing with here is a law enacted by this Congress on a bipartisan basis, signed into law by the current President of the United States, and not subject to different interpretations but subject to exactly what is printed in the statute.

Mr. McCurry needs to understand and the White House needs to understand that the prohibition against homosexuals serving in the military is a statutory requirement that was passed overwhelmingly by Congress and signed into law by the President, his President.

The true test of whether the Department of Defense is faithfully executing the law is whether those who have engaged in or who have a propensity to engage in homosexual conduct are being separated from military service. That is the statute. That is the intent of the statute. That is the intent of the Congress, as enacted into statutory language and signed by the President.

And that standard is that those who have engaged in or have a propensity to engage in homosexual conduct find themselves at a great inconsistency with longstanding military policy and are therefore eligible and should be separated from military service. That is the law of the land.

Just a little bit of history.

In January 1993, just days after his inauguration, President Clinton announced his intent to reverse the military's longstanding prohibition against