

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak with colleagues about global warming, which quite literally is a cloud that is looming on our horizon. As many have feared, there is evidence that this cloud has recently grown darker and more ominous.

Over the last few months, in fact, the United Nation's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change released its third report on global warming. This report was authored by over 700 expert scientists. Their conclusions, I am afraid, offer convincing evidence of a planet in distress, one that is slowly overheating with very serious—some would say disastrous but certainly very serious—consequences for those who will follow us on this Earth.

According to these scientific experts, unless we find ways to stop global warming, the Earth's average temperature can be expected to rise between 2.5 and 10.4 degrees Fahrenheit during this next 100 years. Such a large rapid rise in temperature will profoundly affect the Earth's landscape in very real and consequential terms. Sea levels could swell enormously, potentially submerging literally millions of homes and coastal properties under our present day oceans. Precipitation would become more erratic, leading to droughts that would make hunger an even more serious global problem than it is today. Diseases such as malaria and dengue fever would spread at an accelerated pace. Several weather disturbances and storms triggered by climate phenomena, such as El Nino, would be aggravated by global warming and become, I am afraid, more routine.

Unfortunately, that is not the first time we have heard such disconcerting predictions, which in their way are so extreme that they may be hard for some to believe, although I find as I go around my State and on occasion around the country that the public is ahead of their political leadership on this issue—at least a lot of the political leadership. The public has been reading these reports and understands that something is happening with the weather that will affect life on this planet unless we do something about it.

For years, scores of scientists from throughout the world have issued warning after warning attesting to the harmful effect of increasing amounts of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases. While it is true that there have been some efforts to curb the release of these gases, I am afraid we have spent a lot more time debating the credibility of the warnings than doing something about them.

Truly, this new data does not end the serious debate about whether global warming is a fact. This most recent scientific report is the most advanced study we have had on the subject. I personally conclude that the science is now incontrovertible.

As this latest report reminds us, the threat is being driven by our own be-

havior. Remember the old Pogo cartoon: We have met the enemy and it is us. That is, unfortunately, the case with global warming. Let me quote the scientists in the report directly.

There is new and stronger evidence that most of the warming observed over the last 50 years is attributable to human activities.

Human beings have added more than 3 billion metric tons of carbon to the atmosphere every year for the past two decades. In fact, the current levels of carbon dioxide are likely the highest they have been in 20 million years of history.

In the face of this mounting evidence, what have we done? I am afraid we have a statement from President Bush saying that he "takes the issue of global warming very seriously." But, unfortunately, thus far the acts that have followed that statement do not match the statement.

I am afraid the only global cooling that will occur under this administration is the cooling of our foreign relations with countries around the world, including some of our foremost allies who are very anxious to work with us to do something about global warming. Last month the administration unilaterally announced, without consultation with Congress, and apparently without consultation with our allies or others around the world, that it had "no interest in implementing" the Kyoto Protocol. In doing so, the administration did not just back away from America's signature on an international agreement. They backed away from the process that resulted in the accord, and that action not only undermines our global environment but it also undermines our credibility with our allies.

This is one issue that is so serious and will so profoundly affect the lives of our children and grandchildren and those who follow us here on Earth that we ought to be at the head as the greatest nation in the world of international efforts to stop this problem, to deal with it, and not be viewed by most of the rest of the world as loners going our own way not listening to science experts and not acting responsibly.

I am afraid the Bush administration has also walked away from its chief domestic initiative on climate change, which was a very hopeful initiative, when it reversed the President's campaign pledge to adopt a market-based trading mechanism regulation of carbon dioxide emissions from powerplants. Those emissions account for up to 40 percent of our Nation's carbon dioxide emissions and 10 percent—one-tenth—of the global carbon dioxide emissions at this point coming from American powerplants.

We have to take firm and decisive action—we ought to be taking it together; we ought to be taking it across party lines—to address global warming. If we act soon, we can still avoid the bleak fate that will otherwise await our children and grandchildren on this

good Earth that the Good Lord gave us. We are visitors here, temporary visitors. We have an obligation to act not only as good visitors but as trustees of the planet for those countless generations that will follow.

Science is giving us a warning. We all ought to put ideology aside and figure out a way to cooperate to respond to that warning, to protect the planet and those who will follow us on it. Doing so will require two things. One is global leadership, and the other is a shared effort to change the source of the problems and deal with them through technology and through cooperative effort.

In the clear absence of Presidential action thus far, we in the Senate, I am pleased to say, have begun to provide some leadership on this issue. Just before the recess, we passed an amendment to the budget resolution that re-established funding for all climate change programs throughout our Government, including funding for energy efficiency programs, funding for programs to encourage emissions reductions in developing countries, and the funding for full and adequate participation in international negotiations.

I hope President Bush and others in the administration will take note of the Senate's concern about climate change, represented by this amendment, and join with us in taking action on this problem. There have been some strong voices within the administration that clearly understand the dimensions of the problem and want to work to be leaders in dealing with it. I am speaking of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. O'Neill, and the Administrator of the EPA, Ms. Whitman.

The alarming conclusions of the U.N. scientists' report should be of concern to all of us. Global warming is most decidedly not a partisan issue; it is a human problem. It is a problem for all of us who inhabit the Earth. Neither party wants to allow the apocalyptic future projected by the scientists' report. The evidence is compelling. Our planet is, in fact, slowly overheating. So now we have to join together across party lines and international borders and agree to act. This is a challenge because we are talking about a problem whose beginnings we can see now but whose worst effects will probably, hopefully, not be felt until some years have passed.

So this requires leadership—political leadership—to avoid a problem whose worst effects most of us will not experience in our lifetimes, but it is the responsible thing to do to take such action.

Kyoto set a framework. I was at Kyoto when that agreement was negotiated. It is not a perfect document by far. But considering the fact that we were dealing with so many of the nations of the world, approaching this problem from different places, it is a framework for international cooperation.

I hope the administration, on second look, will view it that way, will go to

the international meeting in Germany in July, which is the next step in the Kyoto process, will consult with our allies and others in the world, and will find a way, together with us—both parties in Congress—to move forward to deal with this problem.

We deal with serious problems every day in the Senate. It is part of the challenge and, indeed, the excitement of the privilege we have to serve our Nation. It is when we deal with those problems effectively that we have together—all of us—the moments of greatest satisfaction.

This, in the long run, is one of the largest problems which any of us in this Chamber will ever confront. The sooner we get together and make some progress to deal with it, the better will be the world's future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will please call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—
S. 149

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, there has been a lot of discussion and effort over the past couple of years put into trying to address the export administration issue. I know that Senator GRAMM and the ranking Democrats and Senator SARBANES have worked on this issue. I know there are a number of Senators who have reservations about this whole area and this particular piece of legislation.

It is my understanding that the new administration has had input and a number of previous concerns have been addressed. I understand this is an area where we need to be careful to make sure we do it in the right way and that we pay attention to very important security concerns.

I think one of the only ways, though, to have those issues properly aired and addressed, and hopefully resolved, is to begin the discussion and see if we can get a final agreement and move on this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of calendar No. 26, S. 149, the export administration bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF
2001—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to S. 149, and I understand that there are some opening statements that can be made. I hope that we

can work through the objections so that we can actually move to the legislation. I move to proceed to the bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion, and it is debatable.

The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for moving to bring this bill to the floor of the Senate. As many of my colleagues know, the Congress has not reauthorized the Export Administration Act on a permanent basis since the early 1990s. As a result, we have been in a period where we have sought to get multilateral action on export controls to protect critical national security secrets, but we have had a very difficult time having standing on those issues among our allies when we do not even have a regime in place to monitor exports coming out of the United States of America.

I think it is a terrible indictment of the Congress that for so many years we were unable to enact a bill to restore our export control authorities. I understand that these are very difficult issues, and they are difficult for a very simple reason: the Nation has apparently conflicting goals. We want to export high-tech items, we want to dominate the world in new technology, we want new innovations to occur in America, and we want to be the principal beneficiary of the technological revolution that is changing our lives and the life of every person who lives on the planet. And to do these things, we want Americans to be able to sell high-tech products on the world market.

Wages in these industries are among the highest wages in the world. They really will determine the future of economic development on the planet, and it is a very high American priority to see that we generate these new technologies, that we generate these new jobs, and that Americans be the highest paid workers on the planet.

Our problem comes in that we also have an objective of trying to prevent sensitive technologies that have defense applications from getting into the hands of people who might, at the current time or in the future, become adversaries of the United States of America. First of all, I think we have to admit to ourselves that there is an apparent conflict in these two goals and, hence, you have the difficulty in dealing with this problem.

Now, I want our colleagues to understand that, first, the Banking Committee has very large jurisdiction as it relates to national security. In fact, other than the Armed Services Committee, no committee in Congress has authorizing jurisdiction in defense that rivals the Banking Committee.

Let me give some examples. The Defense Production Act is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Banking Committee.

The Trading with the Enemy Act is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Banking Committee.

The International Emergency Economic Powers Act, which has frequently been used for export control purposes, is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Banking Committee.

The Export Administration Act, which is before us today, is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Banking Committee.

The Exxon-Florio amendment, which set up the process whereby we look at foreign ownership of defense industries, to look at the national security implications of foreign investments and mergers, is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Banking Committee.

Sanctions bills that imposes economic sanctions against any country, whether it be the Iran-Libyan Sanctions Act, or whether it be any sanction imposed in the future, would be imposed in legislation that falls under the jurisdiction of the Banking Committee.

Quite frankly, I believe some of this dispute is about jurisdiction. I did not write the rules of the Senate, but I believe that when this jurisdiction was put under the Banking Committee, it was the right decision because the Banking Committee is basically the Banking and Economic Committee. These issues have to do with economic matters that have defense implications. I think the correct decision was made in placing these items within the jurisdiction of the Banking Committee.

We have spent 2 years exercising our responsibility in trying to come up with a workable and, I believe, if I may say so immodestly, a superior Export Administration Act. We have held extensive hearings on the Export Administration Act.

I want to show my colleagues some of the studies that have been done that we have looked at. We have had the authors of these studies appear before our committee.

The first, of course, is the now famous Cox Commission report. This was focused on China, and it was focused on the loss of American defense secrets. The Cox Commission report made a series of recommendations. Those recommendations are now embodied in the bill that is before the Senate.

Rather than trying to go through all of the elements of this lengthy report at this time, which obviously would empty the Chamber for several days as I would be standing alone talking about them, given how voluminous they are, I will share with the Senate one point that CHRIS COX made in presenting these reports to us and giving us the recommendations which we have incorporated in this bill.

And this is critically important because I have colleagues who say that now is not the time to do this bill because of our recent problem with China. I say to my colleagues, we should have done this in 1995, but given the problems we have had with China,