

inspection process, has carefully made his infrastructure, which has gone on creating the weapons of mass destruction, be they biological, chemical, or indeed his vigorous efforts to acquire a nuclear capability. They have gone right on throughout this entire period of time. And they have been constructed in such a way that they are moveable. He did that recognizing that at some point in time another inspection regime could be imposed upon him by the United Nations, as was done with Resolution 1441.

I think the inspectors have tried. They have unearthed very little. They have not received the cooperation from Saddam Hussein that was the predicate on which Resolution 1441 was adopted. It simply said you are to cooperate, the inspectors to verify and destroy. But in reality the inspectors have been converted to a group trying to search out, given the failure of cooperation, where these weapons might be located.

I will discuss later this morning a letter I received yesterday from the Central Intelligence Agency, under the signature of George Tenet, responding to the cooperation that our country has given the inspection efforts of Hans Blix, by virtue of sharing the intelligence information we had with regard to the location of probable caches of these weapons.

In fact, it has not borne out to be very fruitful because of Saddam Hussein's skill of moving these caches, of moving the infrastructure of manufacturing in such a manner that they cannot be detected and discovered without his cooperation, which he has steadfastly refused to give. Our President addressed that issue last night.

I wonder if my colleague would comment a little bit on the inspection process. As we are speaking, Blix is giving his most recent report. As you know, there are statements to the effect, from other nations, that perhaps the period of time should be extended. The President last night, when confronted with those questions, simply said, as I think he should and very properly said: Time will tell.

I invite the Senator's observations.

Mr. LUGAR. I thank the Senator for his inquiry. The Senator is correct, times have changed with regard to inspection. Let me offer as an anecdote the Russian facility at Pokrov. This situation is not well known, but it is an agricultural chemical station. Pokrov is an example of the problems which confront Hans Blix and the inspectors.

As I and others went there at the invitation of Russians, we looked around at a rather desolate-looking place with run-down buildings. We were led to a room in which people were making shampoo. They were using stainless steel equipment. I would say, without two Russians at my side, I would have had no idea about the history of that room, quite apart from the facility. But they pointed out that just months before, anthrax was produced in the

same machinery. This is dual use in a dramatic way. Equipment used for biological weapons had been easily converted to producing a commercial product. Likewise on this premise, but clearly not within view, were stores of anthrax. In fact, on the third floor of another building they had been making anthrax. In another building, they had been making dual-use materials for agricultural livestock. One was to produce antidotes so they could protect, they thought, the Russian livestock. The other use was to produce toxins, deadly toxins, out of 14 serums that were in vials in a room, in an icebox, that could kill all the livestock in the United States.

My point is that we would have been clueless without those who could give us a 25-year history of the activities at Pokrov. All of it could have been completely hidden. There was not a ghost of a chance an inspector would find anything there in years, quite apart from months.

These are old facilities. Saddam Hussein, and others, have gone to school on dual use. Therefore I simply say, as the chairman already knows, the production of chemical weapons is clearly enveloped in dual use. There is not a ghost of a chance you will find a scintilla of it unless Iraq wants you to find it.

Regarding the biological situation, as Secretary Powell already pointed out in his public address at the U.N., the Iraqis are able to break down all the equipment, put it in vans and cart it down the road 200 miles. Unless the inspector is clued in that this particular van out of all the vans in Iraq has a biological laboratory in it, there is not a chance, zero, of finding anything there.

This is the reason why the inspection business is at best a holding action. Those who argue in favor say: After all, with all those inspectors there, with all of the press following them out every day, surely Saddam Hussein cannot now be producing a whole lot.

But that doesn't solve the problem of what is there, detailed by the U.N., after all these years. Nor does it solve the problem of the intellectual inquiry of scientists who even as we speak are working on new formulations. They don't need huge factories and installations visible from the air. They need only the necessary scientific knowledge and, ultimately, fissile material from somewhere else to get the bomb. And each intelligence report that we have all seen—those now made public—say Iraq may be a year, 2 years, 3 years from making a nuclear weapon. But there is always the footnote: If they get the fissile material from somewhere else—it will take far less time.

That is the basis on which our President has to say the security of the American people is at stake. This is not a speculative business for we all know fissile material exists in the world, a lot of it in Russia. A lot of it is still not pinned down by the cooperative threat reduction program or any-

thing else. That is a tremendous danger, and we all ought to recognize that. It is not going to go away with inspectors.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my distinguished colleague. I guess what both you and I find so perplexing is how responsible world leadership, most particularly France and Germany, which have seen the same facts, have access to basically the same intelligence, and cannot reach those logical conclusions which our President and the Prime Minister of Great Britain have reached.

Mr. LUGAR. We must continue to assist them in reaching those conclusions.

Mr. WARNER. I must say, if I could just ask the indulgence of my colleague, my father served in World War I as a doctor in the U.S. Army in the trenches in France. My most prized possession, I say to my good friend, is on the wall in my Senate office. For these 25 years that I have been here, on that wall hangs this Croix de Guerre awarded him by the French Government for his heroism in the trenches for administering healing to Americans, British, Frenchmen, and Germans. I sometimes thought myself, and when the French ambassador visited my office a few days ago, in a courteous way I pointed it out and I said, you know, I am thinking of taking it down, but perhaps better judgment will prevail in your leadership. And therefore for a while I am going to leave it up, in the hopes that reality can be brought to bear.

I thank my colleague for his time.

I recognize the order entered into at the direction of both the majority and minority leaders of the Senate was that the Senate would proceed this morning on the debate with regard to the worldwide situation on terrorism with an emphasis on Iraq, North Korea, and other areas, and the time under the control of the Senator from Virginia, the time having been equally divided, is rapidly approaching the 2-hour mark which is the halfway.

I see a colleague desiring recognition, but I remind that colleague, who courteously advised me that perhaps the subject matter was not that in the order, but I would have to say the time that he uses would have to be charged to the other side.

I have some maybe 15 minutes remaining under the control of the Senator from Virginia, which I will hold in reserve for such rebuttal as may be required on the issues specifically recited in the order before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. DOLE). The order before the Senate is for morning business. Those in control of time may choose to speak on any matter they so choose.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Chair.

AIR POLLUTION AND GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, my subject is different but it is similar in

that it talks about loss of lives and possible threats, the apparent and real threats to the people in this country from a different angle but a much more serious one and one that is going to result in many more deaths. I wish to speak on the subject of the threat to lives in the United States of a different and more insidious nature, and in the long run much more costly in human lives as well as health conditions—air pollution and the administration's failure to recognize this threat through adequate pollution controls.

I rise today to draw Senators' attention to the administration's flawed plans on air pollution and global warming. I am pleased to see that the administration has finally revived an interest in dangerous public health and environmental threats like acid rain and smog. They have even acknowledged that climate change could have severe and damaging consequences. Unfortunately, the administration's solution seems to be little more than a public relations distraction from what is really going on: corporate regulatory relief.

What Americans really need now is relief from air pollution, and swift and serious action to avert global warming. They have a right to breathe air that isn't contaminated by greed. They have a right to full and vigorous implementation of the Clean Air Act. Sadly, the administration has lost sight of these rights.

The devastation caused by dirty air is staggering. As many as 60,000 premature deaths each year are linked to air pollution, according to an American Cancer Society study and researchers at the Harvard School of Public Health.

A study by the respected Abt Associates says that 30,000 of these deaths are due to power plant pollution alone. That is an enormous loss of human potential, and a huge cost to society. There is no good reason to allow such a tragedy to continue unfolding.

This chart illustrates the magnitude of this terrible situation. More people are dying from power plant pollution every year than die from homicides or drunk driving accidents.

With real reductions in air pollution, such as those in S. 366, the Clean Power Act of 2003, which I introduced almost 3 weeks ago with Senators COLLINS, LIEBERMAN and 17 others, we can save two-thirds of those lives.

This benefit is reflected on the right side of the chart.

The Abt Associates report also says that power plants are responsible for the following statistics each year: 20,000 hospitalizations; 600,000 asthma attacks; 19,000 cases of chronic bronchitis; and 5 million lost work days due to illness.

Fine particulate matter is a serious form of air pollution that poses an especially severe health threat. Fine particles result from the interaction of water vapor with sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions.

Most of these pollutants come from power plants. These tiny particles reach easily into the deepest depths of the human lungs.

A host of scientific studies have linked particulate matter with a barrage of health problems.

I ask unanimous consent that a representative list of such studies be printed in the RECORD.

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

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SELECT RESEARCH ON THE HEALTH IMPACTS OF SOOT

2002:

National Environmental Trust 2002. "Toxic Beginnings: Cancer Risks to Children from California's Air Pollution." See http://environet.policy.net/health/toxic_beginnings02.pdf.

Pope, C. Arden III, Burnett, Richard T., et al. March 6, 2002. "Lung Cancer, Cardiopulmonary Mortality, and Long-Term Exposure to Fine Particulate Air Pollution." *Journal of the American Medical Association* 287(9):1132-1141.

2001:

Avol, E.L., Gauderman, W.J., et al. 2001. "Respiratory Effects of Relocating to Areas of Differing Air Pollution Levels." *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 164:2067-2072.

Brown, K.H., Suh, H.H., et al. April, 2001. "Characterization of Personal-Ambient PM 2.5 Relationships for Children and Older Adults." Health Effects Institute Annual Conference, Program and Abstracts.

Katsouyanni, K., Touloumi, G., et al. 2001. "Confounding and Effect Modification in the Short-Term Effects of Ambient Particles on Total Mortality: Results from 29 European Cities within the APHEA2 Project." *Epidemiology* 12:521-531.

Lewtas, J., Binkova, B., et al. 2001. "Biomarkers of Exposure to Particulate Air Pollution in the Czech Republic." In: *Teplice Program: Impact of Air Pollution on Human Health*. Academic Press: Prague.

Ostro, B., Lipsett, M., et al. 2001. "Air Pollution and Exacerbation of Asthma in African-American Children in Los Angeles." *Epidemiology* 12(2):200-208.

Otto, D., Skalik, I., et al. 2001. "Neurobehavioral Effects of Exposure to Environmental Pollutants in Czech Children." In: *Teplice Program: Impact of Air Pollution on Human Health*. Academia Press: Prague.

Peters, Annette, Dockery, Douglas, et al. 2001. "Increased Particulate Air Pollution and the Triggering of Myocardial Infarction." *Circulation* 103:2810-2815.

2000:

Abt Associates, Inc. with ICF Consulting. October, 2000. "The Particulate-Related Health Benefits of Reducing Power Plant Emissions." Bethesda, MD; and Clean Air Task Force. October, 2000. "Death, Disease & Dirty Power: Mortality and Health Damage Due to Air Pollution from Power Plants." Boston, MA.

Gauderman, J.W., McConnell, R., et al. 2000. "Association between Air Pollution and Lung Function Growth in Southern California Children." *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 162:1383-1390.

Goldberg, M.S., Ballar, J.C. III, et al. October, 2000. "Identifying Subgroups of the General Population That May be Susceptible to Short-Term Increases in Particulate Air Pollution: A Time-Series Study in Montreal, Quebec." Health Effects Institute, Research Report Number 97.

Heinrich, J., Hoelscher, B., and H.E. Wichmann. 2000. "Decline of Ambient Air

Pollution and Respiratory Systems in Children." *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 161:1930-1936.

Krewski, D., Burnett, R.R., et al. July, 2000. "Reanalysis of the Harvard Six Cities Study and the American Cancer Society Study of Particulate Air Pollution and Mortality." Health Effects Institute: Boston, MA.

Pope, C.A. III. 2000. "Epidemiology of Fine Particulate Air Pollution and Human Health: Biological Mechanisms and Who's at Risk?" *Environmental Health Perspectives* 108(suppl 4):713-723.

Samet, J.M., Dominici, F., et al. June, 2000. "The National Morbidity, Mortality and Air Pollution Study. Part II: Morbidity, Mortality and Air Pollution in the United States." Health Effects Institute Research Report 94, Part II; and

Samet, J.M., Zeger, S.L., et al. May, 2000. "The National Morbidity, Mortality, and Air Pollution Study. Part I: Methods and Methodological Issues." Health Effects Institute Research Report 94, Part I.

Schwartz, Joel. 2000. "The Distributed Lag Between Air Pollution and Daily Deaths." *Epidemiology* 11:320-326.

Thurston, G.D. September 1, 2000. "Particulate Matter and Sulfate: Evaluation of Current California Air Quality Standards with Respect to Protection of Children." California Air Resources Board, Office of Health Hazard Assessment.

Tolbert, P., et al. 2000. "Air Quality and Pediatric Emergency Room Visits for Asthma in Atlanta, Georgia." *American Journal of Epidemiology* 151(8):798-810.

1999: Bobak, M. and D. Leon. 1999. "The Effect of Air Pollution on Infant Mortality Appears Specific for Respiratory Causes in the Postneonatal Period." *Epidemiology* 10(6):666-670.

Holgate, S.T., Samet, J.M., et al. (eds). 1999. *Air Pollution and Health*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Loomis, D., Castillejos, M., et al. 1999. "Air Pollution and Infant Mortality in Mexico City." *Epidemiology* 10:118-123.

Norris, G., Young Pong, N., et al. 1999. "An Association Between Fine Particles and Asthma Emergency Department Visits for Children in Seattle." *Environmental Health Perspectives* 107(6):489-493.

Pope, C. Arden, III., Dockery, D. 1999. "Epidemiology of Particle Effects." In: Holgate, S., Samet, J., et al. (eds.) *Air Pollution and Health*. Academic Press: London, UK, pp. 673-705.

Pope, C. Arden, III., Gold, D., et al. 1999. "Particulate and Ozone Pollutant Effects on the Respiratory Function of Children in Southwest Mexico City." *Epidemiology* 10:8-16.

Pope, C. Arden, III., Dockery, D., et al. 1999. "Oxygen Saturation, Pulse Rate, and Particulate Air Pollution: A Daily Time-series Panel Study." *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 159:365-372.

Pope, C. Arden, III., Hill, R. and G. Villegas. 1999. "Particulate Air Pollution and Daily Mortality on Utah's Wasatch Front." *Environmental Health Perspectives* 107:567-573.

Pope, C. Arden, III., Verrier, R., et al. 1999. "Heart Rate Variability Associated with Particulate Air Pollution." *American Heart Journal* 138:890-899.

Pope, C. Arden, III., Dockery, D., et al. 1999. "Daily Changes in Oxygen Saturation and Pulse Rate Associated with Particulate Air Pollution and Barometric Pressure." Health Effects Institute Research Report Number 83.

1998: Thurston, G.D. 1998. "Determining the Pollution Sources Associated with PM Health Effects." *AWMA VIP-81(2):889*.

Zmirou, D., Schwatz, J., et al. 1998. "Time-Series Analysis of Air Pollution and Cause-Specific Mortality." *Epidemiology* 9(5):495-503.

1997:

Anderson, H.R., Spix, C., et al. 1997. "Air Pollution and Daily Admissions for Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease in 6 European Cities: Results from the APHEA Project." *European Respiratory Journal* 10:1064-1071.

Brunekreef, Burt. November, 1997. "Air Pollution and Life Expectancy: Is There a Relation?" *Occupational Environmental Medicine* 54(11):781-4.

Katsouyanni K., Touloumi G., et al. 1997. "Short-Term Effects of Ambient Sulphur Dioxide and Particulate Matter on Mortality in 12 European Cities: Results from the APHEA Project." *British Medical Journal* 314:1658-1663.

Spix, C., Anderson R., et al. 1997. "Short-Term Effects of Air Pollution on Hospital Admissions of Respiratory Diseases in Europe. A Quantitative Summary of the APHEA Study Results." *Archives of Environmental Health* 53:54-64.

Sunyer J., Spix C., et al. 1997. "Urban Air Pollution and Emergency Admissions for Asthma in Four European Cities: The APHEA Project." *Thorax* 52:760-765.

Timonen, K.L. and J. Pekkanen. 1997. "Air Pollution and Respiratory Health Among Children with Asthmatic or Cough Symptoms." *American Journal of Respiratory Critical Care Medicine* 156:546-552.

Touloumi, G., Katsouyanni K., et al. 1997. "Short-Term Effects of Ambient Oxidant Exposure on Mortality: A combined Analysis with the APHEA Project." *American Journal of Epidemiology* 146:177-185.

Wang, X., Ding, H., et al. 1997. "Association Between Air Pollution and Low Birth Weight: A Community-Based Study." *Environmental Health Perspectives* 15:514-520.

Woodruff, T.J., Grillo, J., and Schoendorf, K.C. 1997. "The Relationship Between Selected Causes of Postneonatal Infant Mortality and Particulate Air Pollution in the United States." *Environmental Health Perspectives* 105:607-612.

1996:

American Thoracic Society, Committee of the Environmental and Occupational Health Assembly. 1996. "Health Effects of Outdoor Air Pollution. Part 1." *American Journal of Respiratory Critical Care Medicine* 153:3-50; and

American Thoracic Society, Committee of the Environmental and Occupational Health Assembly, Bascom R., Bromberg P.A., et al. 1996. "Health Effects of Outdoor Air Pollution. Part 2." *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 153:477-498.

Touloumi G., Samoli E., et al. 1996. "Daily Mortality and 'Winter Type' Air Pollution in Athens, Greece—A Time Series Analysis within the APHEA Project." *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 50 (suppl 1):S47-S51.

1995:

Katsouyanni, K., Schwartz, J., et al. 1995. "Short Term Effects of Air Pollution on Health: A European Approach Using Epidemiologic Time Series Data: The APHEA Protocol." *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 50(Suppl 1):S12-S18.

Pope, C.A., Thun, M.J., et al. 1995. "Particulate Air Pollution as a Predictor of Mortality in a Prospective Study of U.S. Adults." *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 151:669-74.

1993:

Dockery, D.W., Pope C.A., et al. 1993. "An Association Between Air Pollution and Mortality in Six U.S. Cities." *New England Journal of Medicine* 329:1753-9.

1992:

Pope, C.A., Dockery, D.W. 1992. "Acute Health Effects of PM 10 Pollution in Symptomatic and Asymptomatic Children." *American Review of Respiratory Disease* 145:1123-1128.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, when these tiny particles get deep into the lungs, they can lead to premature death, as well as health problems like: heart and lung disease; aggravated asthma; acute respiratory symptoms; chronic bronchitis; decreased lung function; and even lung cancer.

There is even evidence that this pollution causes an increased incidence of low birth rate and infant mortality. Sensitive populations like children, asthmatics, and the elderly are at particular risk of health damage.

Power plant emissions of nitrogen oxides and emissions from mobile sources contribute to the formation of ground-level ozone as well. This is another serious threat that scientists increasingly believe to be a chronic health problem, not just one that poses acute risks.

Recently, respected scientists from the University of Southern California School of Medicine, and elsewhere published an important asthma study.

They found that children in communities with high average ozone levels who compete in three or more team sports have a three-to-four-times higher risk of developing asthma than non-athletic kids. They have three times the normal expectations of illness than nonathletic kids. This is because athletes get a higher dose of pollutants to the lung, and because they breathe rapidly and deeply.

We should listen to these and other scientific findings, and take to heart the suffering that many Americans experience due to air pollution. Power plants are a major culprit. It is our duty as lawmakers to do something now to curb these dangerous emissions and protect public health.

While the Clean Air Act has been successful in removing millions of tons of particulate-forming emissions from our air, it has not gone far enough, and these health problems remain. Plus, there are major signs that this administration is slowing down implementation and enforcement of the act. This delays its benefits and increases human health damage.

Air pollution causes significant harm to our natural environment as well. Sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides—emitted mainly from fossil fuel combustion—eventually fall to earth as acid.

Acid rain washes vital minerals out of the soil, weakens the health of trees, lowers the pH of water bodies, and leaches aluminum into lakes where fish slowly suffocate from the lack of oxygen. A stunning 41 percent of lakes in the Adirondacks are acidified.

A 1996 EPA report admitted that the Acid Rain Program of the present Clean Air Act could only slow the rate of ecosystem damage that, despite this

program, more lakes would die. Acid rain scientist Dr. Gene Likens has said:

We still have a very major problem with acid rain. That is scientific fact. In that regard, the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments have not worked very well.

An important new study by researchers at the University of Vermont confirms that the acid rain problem is far worse than previously thought. Tightening sulfur emissions further—combined with strict, new controls in nitrogen emissions—would help restore our forests, lakes, and streams.

The Hubbard Brook Research Foundation knows what is required to ensure biological recovery from acid rain by mid-century in the northeastern U.S. They say we must reduce utility sulfur dioxide emissions by 80 percent beyond what is currently required in the year 2010. It is clearly time to act.

Current air pollution levels are also hindering visibility at our majestic National Parks. Chronic air pollution continues to envelop the Great Smoky Mountains, Acadia National Park, Shenandoah, and other sites in a blanket of haze.

This not only costs regions vital tourism dollars, but endangers the health of park visitors, plants, and wildlife.

Air emissions of mercury cause severe health effects as well. Mercury is a potent nervous system toxic. After being emitted into the air, it falls into lakes and streams. Mercury then bioaccumulates in fish and animal tissue, taking on a highly toxic form.

Eating contaminated fish can cause serious nervous system impairment, especially to a pregnant mother's developing fetus, or to a young child.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1 in 12 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have mercury levels above those considered protective of newborns by the EPA. That means as many as 390,000 children are born each year at risk of developmental problems.

We have such a widespread mercury contamination problem in our country that 41 States currently post fish consumption warnings.

Power plants, especially coal-fired utilities, emit the bulk of uncontrolled mercury emissions in the U.S. Yet the technology exists today to save lives. As James Willis, Director of the UN Environment Programme 2003 Global Mercury Assessment, states:

There are technologies available already which will reduce mercury emissions from power stations by about 80% . . . what we can do now is often cheap—and it can cut other pollutants as well.

I have highlighted some of the ways in which air emissions of sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, and mercury—especially from power plants—threaten the health and safety of millions of Americans and the natural environment. But I am afraid to say that Americans may face an even greater long-term threat from greenhouse gas pollution.

Carbon dioxide is the most significant greenhouse gas emitted as a result of human activities. The National Academy of Sciences faults fossil fuel combustion with causing most of the global warming problem. In fact, fossil fuel-burning power plants are responsible for 37 percent of all U.S. carbon dioxide emissions.

The U.S. made a commitment under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to adopt voluntary measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels. But despite this goal, emissions from the power sector have grown steadily and are now 20 percent above those levels.

Our world has already seen about one degree of warming in the last century. The NAS and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change generally agree that the Earth will warm another 2.5 to 10 degrees Fahrenheit over the next 100 years. This could cause significant, abrupt climate changes, as well as threaten our public health, the economic infrastructure, and many ecosystems.

The President's own Climate Action Report says, "the best scientific information indicates that if greenhouse gas concentrations continue to increase, changes are likely to occur."

Global warming is expected to have wide-reaching and mostly negative impacts on human health. We are likely to see direct impacts like death and illness due to heat stress and extreme weather. We are also likely to see indirect impacts from worsened air pollution and allergens, and increases in the occurrence and transmission of diseases like malaria and, perhaps, West Nile Virus.

We have already seen a dramatic number of heat-related deaths since the 1980s. A 1980 heat wave in the U.S. resulted in 1,700 deaths, while those in 1983 and 1988 killed around 500 people each. Also, we all remember the deadly heat wave of 1995 that killed 765 people in Chicago alone. That is what we are looking towards if we continue to allow the carbon to accumulate.

These numbers are much too high, and they are only going to get higher if the climate models are right. Experts predict that in cities such as New York, Philadelphia, Cleveland, and Los Angeles, heat-related deaths could increase 100 percent.

According to EPA and others, sea-level rise from global warming will bring on another set of consequences. Sea level is predicted to rise by one foot in the next 20 to 50 years. In the next 100 years, a two-foot rise is most likely, and a four-foot rise is possible.

To put this in perspective, the EPA says that simply raising existing bulkheads and sea walls along the Manhattan shoreline alone to help protect it from a one to three-foot rise would cost up to \$140 million.

According to the Pew Center on Global Climate Change, a 20-inch sea level rise could have significant cumulative impacts on coastal property in the U.S.

These impacts could range from about \$20 billion to about \$150 billion by the year 2100.

The environmental impacts of sea level rise would be devastating as well. Nationwide, a two-foot rise in sea level could inundate 17 to 43 percent of U.S. wetlands, and could eliminate a total of 10,000 square miles of wet and dry land in our country. I do not want to see that happen.

Because of global warming, our forests will see dramatic changes as well. A 3.6 degree Fahrenheit warming could shift many North American forest species 200 miles north.

Given the likely time frame for this warming, these tree species would have to migrate about two miles every year to stay viable.

This poses a grave threat to my State's maple syrup industry, since about half of the hardwood species like maple will disappear. I do not want to see this happen either.

A recent article in the journal *Nature* shows there is strong new evidence of global warming impacts on animal and plant worlds. Researchers say that as many as 677 species are already reacting to global warming by adjusting their range northward in search of cooler temperatures, or breeding earlier in the spring in response to warmer temperatures.

A recent study by the American Bird Conservancy and the National Wildlife Federation reports that some birds like the Baltimore Oriole may completely disappear from their home States. The Nation's 63 million birdwatchers will likely be frustrated by the coming changes in bird habitat.

Also, the EPA has predicted that even a modest warming would eliminate nearly 90 percent of Idaho habitat for the majestic grizzly bear, which will likely have impacts on Yellowstone tourism income.

Even the Iditarod Trail Sled Dog Race is running into problems because of global warming. Unseasonably warm temperatures have meant that the race will have to take detours for the first time in its history. Much of the snow has melted. The Alaskan route is now marred by bare ground and open rivers.

Alaska's global warming problems made the news last year as well. As you can see in this poster, a *New York Times* news story from June illustrated that in Alaska, climate change is a stark reality, not an abstraction. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the *New York Times*, June 16, 2002]
ALASKA, NO LONGER SO FRIGID, STARTS TO
CRACK, BURN AND SAG
(By Timothy Egan)

To live in Alaska when the average temperature has risen about seven degrees over the last 30 years means learning to cope with a landscape that can sink, catch fire or break apart in the turn of a season.

In the village of Shishmaref, on the Chukchi Sea just south of the Arctic Circle,

it means high water eating away so many houses and buildings that people will vote next month on moving the entire village inland.

In the Barrow, the northernmost city of North America, it means coping with mosquitoes in a place where they once were non-existent, and rescuing hunters trapped on breakaway ice at a time of year when such things once were unheard of.

From Fairbanks to the north, where wildfires have been burning off and on since mid-May, it means living with hydraulic jacks to keep houses from slouching and buckling on foundations that used to be frozen all year. Permafrost, they say, is no longer permanent.

Here on the Kenai Peninsula, a recreation wonderland a few hours' drive from Anchorage, it means living in a four-million-acre spruce forest that has been killed by beetles, the largest loss of trees to insects ever recorded in North America, federal officials say. Government scientists tied the event to rising temperatures, which allow the beetles to reproduce at twice their normal rate.

In Alaska, rising temperatures, whether caused by greenhouse gas emissions or nature in a prolonged mood swing, are not a topic of debate or an abstraction. Mean temperatures have risen by 5 degrees in summer and 10 degrees in winter since the 1970's, federal officials say.

While President Bush was dismissive of a report the government recently released on how global warming will affect the nation, the leading Republican in this state, Senator Ted Stevens, says that no place is experiencing more startling change from rising temperatures than Alaska.

Among the consequences, Senator Stevens says, are sagging roads, crumbling villages, dead forests, catastrophic fires and possible disruption of marine wildlife.

These problems will cost Alaska hundreds of millions of dollars, he said.

"Alaska is harder hit by global climate change than any place in the world," Senator Stevens said.

Scientists have been charting shrinking glaciers and warming seas in Alaska for some time. But only recently have experts started to focus on what the warming means to the people who live in Alaska.

The social costs of higher temperatures have been mostly negative, people here say. The Bush administration report, which was drafted by the Environmental Protection Agency, also found few positives to Alaska's thermal rise. But it said climate change would bring a longer growing season and open ice-free seas in the Arctic for shipping.

"There can no longer be any doubt that major changes in the climate have occurred in recent decades in the region, with visible and measurable consequences," the government concluded in the report to the United Nations last month.

It does not take much to find those consequences in a state with 40 percent of the nation's surface water and 63 percent of its wetlands.

Here on the Kenai Peninsula, a forest nearly twice the size of Yellowstone National Park is in the last phases of a graphic death. Century-old spruce trees stand silvered and cinnamon-colored as they bleed sap.

A sign at Anchor River Recreation Area near this little town poses a question many tourists have been asking, "What's up with all the dead spruce trees on the Kenai Peninsula?" The population of spruce bark beetles, which have long fed on these evergreen trees, exploded as temperatures rose, foresters now say.

Throughout the Kenai, people are clearing some of the 38 million dead trees, answering the call from officials to create a "defensible

space" around houses for fire protection. Last year, two major fires occurred on this peninsula, and this year, with temperatures in the 80's in mid-May, officials say fire is imminent. "It's just a matter of time before we have a very large, possibly catastrophic forest fire," said Ed Holsten, a scientist with the Forest Service.

Joe Perletti, who lives in Kasilof in the Kenai Peninsula, has rented a bulldozer to clear dead trees from the 10 acres where he lives.

"It's scary what's going on," Mr. Perletti said. "I never realized the extent of global warming, but we're living it now. I worry about how it will affect my children."

Mr. Perletti, an insurance agent, said some insurers no longer sold fire policies to Kenai Peninsula homeowners in some areas surrounded by dead spruce.

Another homeowner, Larry Rude, has cut down a few trees but has decided to take his chances at the house he owns near Anchor Point. Mr. Rude says he no longer recognizes Alaska weather.

"This year, we had a real quick melt of the snow, and it seemed like it was just one week between snowmobiling in the mountains and riding around in the boat in shirt-sleeve weather," Mr. Rude said.

Other forests, farther north, appear to be sinking or drowning as melting permafrost forces water up. Alaskans have taken to calling the phenomenon "drunken trees."

For villages that hug the shores of the Bering, Chukchi and Beaufort Seas, melting ice is the enemy. Sea ice off the Alaskan coast has retreated by 14 percent since 1978, and thinned by 40 percent since the mid-1960's, the federal report says. Climate models predict that Alaska temperatures will continue to rise over this century, by up to 18 degrees.

Kivalina, a town battered by sea storms that erode the ground beneath houses, will have to move soon, residents say. Senator Stevens said it would cost \$102 million, or \$250,000 for each of the 400 residents.

The communities of Shishmaref, Point Hope and Barrow face a similar fate. Scientists say the melting ice brings more wave action, which gnaws away at ground that used to be frozen for most of the year.

Shishmaref, on a barrier island near the Bering Strait, is fast losing the battle to rising seas and crumbling ground. As the July 19 vote on whether to move approaches, residents say they have no choice.

"I'm pretty sure the vote is going to be to move," Lucy Eningowuk of Shishmaref said. "There's hardly any land left here anymore."

Barrow, the biggest of the far northern native villages with 4,600 people, has not only had beach erosion, but early ice breakup. Hunters have been stranded at sea, and others have been forced to go far beyond the usual hunting grounds to find seals, walrus and other animals.

"To us living on the Arctic coastline, sea ice is our lifeline," Caleb Pungowitig testified recently before a Senate committee. "The long-term trend is very scary."

A 20-year resident of Barrow, Glenn Sheehan, says it seems to be on a fast-forward course of climate change.

"Mosquitoes, erosion, breakup of the sea ice, and our sewage and clean-water system, which is threatened by erosion as well," he said. "We could be going from a \$28 million dollar sewage system that was considered an engineering model to honey buckets—your basic portable outhouses."

The people who manage the state's largest piece of infrastructure—the 800 mile-long Trans-Alaska Pipeline—have also had to adjust to rising temperatures. Engineers responsible for the pipeline, which carries about a million barrels of oil a day and gen-

erates 17 percent of the nation's oil production, have grown increasingly concerned that melting permafrost could make unstable the 400 or so miles of pipeline above ground. As a result, new supports have been put in, some moored more than 70-feet underground.

"We're not going to let global warming sneak up on us," said Curtis Thomas, a spokesman for the Alyeska Pipeline Service Company, which runs the pipeline. "If we see leaning and sagging, we move on it."

North of Fairbanks, roads have buckled, telephone poles have started to tilt, and homeowners have learned to live in houses that are more than a few bubbles off plumb. Everyone, it seems, has a story.

"We've had so many strange events, things are so different than they used to be, that I think most Alaskans now believe something profound is going on," said Dr. Glenn Juday, an authority on climate change at the University of Alaska at Fairbanks. "We're experiencing indisputable climate warming. The positive changes from this take a long time, but the negative changes are happening real fast."

Mr. JEFFORDS. Cities in Alaska are having to cope with mosquitoes where they once did not exist. Hunters are being trapped on break-away ice. Houses are sinking due to slouching and buckling permafrost.

Mean temperatures in Alaska have risen by five degrees since the 1970s. That is an extremely rapid rate of change, and I am afraid Alaska is somewhat of a testing ground for what is yet to come around the globe.

These are just some of the environmental and economic consequences of global warming that may affect our country and our people. My colleagues can imagine the potential harm that less developed economies will face.

I have spoken now in some detail about the ways in which our serious air pollution and global warming problems threaten public and environmental health, as well as economic prosperity.

I have shown how millions of people suffer the ill effects of particulate pollution and mercury contamination. I have explained how acid rain continues to strip our beautiful forests of vegetation, leach nutrients out of our once-rich soils, and suffocates many of our lakes and streams.

It is time now to take a look at what our administration is doing to relieve Americans from these costly burdens.

Over the last few months, I have joined my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to speak out in defense of a vital Clean Air Act program called New Source Review, or NSR. NSR plays a crucial role in ridding our air of some of industry's most harmful air emissions, and it results in hundreds of millions of dollars in health-related benefits.

However, the administration has chosen to ignore public health concerns and side with industry. These new NSR rules will make it much easier for polluters to send even more poison into our air.

The administration tells us not to worry about these so-called NSR "reforms"—that any holes left in clean air protections will be patched up by another proposal that was reintroduced

in Congress last week, called Clear Skies. I am afraid Clear Skies will not provide such a safety net.

In fact, a look at the fine print shows that Clear Skies actually provides less protection—less protection—than existing law. More importantly, it will not do enough to address this country's already significant air pollution problem.

Unlike the new NSR changes, which affect all major sources of air pollution, Clear Skies only addresses some of the air pollution coming from one source—powerplants. So purging broad NSR protections while promoting a narrower proposal doesn't make any sense.

Plus, Clear Skies will eliminate important Clean Air Act programs that protect local air quality, not supplement them. For utilities, Clear Skies will strip the Clean Air Act of the Mercury Air Toxics Rule and the Regional Haze Rule.

And, while the administration's new NSR rule could allow 50 percent of all sources to avoid environmental review, Clear Skies will give powerplants even greater exemptions.

Clear Skies will also degrade the ability of States to pursue interstate air pollution problems, and will prevent evolution of tougher New Source Performance Standards.

As you can see from this chart beside me, the true result of Clear Skies will be less protection and more pollution than business as usual.

In the chart, blue, gray, and red bars represent the so-called Clear Skies reduction plan for sulfur, nitrogen, and mercury emissions, respectively. But take a look at the yellow bars. These yellow bars represent where we would already be headed with full and faithful implementation of the present, existing Clean Air Act. We are not even doing that under this administration.

In other words, the administration's plan allows more pollution. It is a serious weakening of current programs. In fact, Clear Skies will result in hundreds of thousands of tons more emissions than full implementation of these and other Clean Air Act programs.

According to EPA's own estimates, by the year 2010—Clear Skies would allow 125 percent more sulfur dioxide, 60 percent more nitrogen oxides, and 420 percent—420 percent—more mercury pollution than enforcement of current law. Total carbon dioxide emissions would continue to grow by leaps and bounds, despite the administration's goal of reduced emission intensity.

I ask my colleagues to be wary of the administration's proclamations about the benefits of Clear Skies. While they tout reductions of 70 percent for sulfur, nitrogen, and mercury emissions, they are actually using outdated information to arrive at these numbers. Real reductions in 2010 from the year 2000 would be only 60 percent for SO_x and NO_x, and 46 percent for mercury.

Clear Skies will also push compliance deadlines out further into the future

than present law, by as much as 10 years. Compared to the Clean Air Act, emission reductions would occur 8 years later for nitrogen, 6 years later for sulfur, and 10 years later for mercury.

This delay would result in thousands of additional asthma attacks, hospitalizations, and deaths.

To be more specific, EPA's own data shows that full implementation of the Clean Air Act will result in approxi-

mately 200,000 avoided deaths from air pollution. The Administration's Clear Skies rollback, on the other hand, will allow 100,000 of those lives to end prematurely—100,000 lives prematurely.

Approaches such as the Jeffords-Col-lins-Lieberman Clean Power Act are what we need to save these lives.

Our bill would surpass the Clean Air Act in saving as many as 250,000 lives—150,000 more lives saved than the Bush Clear Skies plan.

Our bill will also result in benefits of \$100 billion more per year in health and visibility improvements than the Clear Skies plan.

I ask unanimous consent that a table illustrating the differences between these three approaches be printed in the RECORD.

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

COMPARING THE CLEAN AIR ACT, CLEAN POWER ACT, AND "CLEAR SKIES"

	Clean Air Act ¹	Clean Power Act ²	"Clear Skies"
SO₂:			
Total emissions (cap)	2 mil tons (2012)	2.2 mil tons (2009)	4.5 mil tons (2010)
Percent reduction from 2000	82%	81%	60%
NO_x:			
Total emissions (cap)	1.25 mil tons (2010) ³	1.51 mil tons (2009)	2.1 mil tons (2008)
Percent reduction from 2000	76%	71%	60%
Hg:			
Total emissions (cap)	5 tons (2008)	5 tons (2008)	26 tons (2010)
Percent reduction from 1999	90%	90%	46%
CO₂:			
Total emissions (cap)	Business as usual: 3.5 bil tons (no cap)	2 bil tons (2009)	Business as usual: 3.5 bil tons (no cap)
Percent change from 2000	46% increase in 2018	21% decrease	46% increase in 2018
Lives saved (from PM reductions):			
Total lives by 2020	190,000–238,000	210,000–250,000	74,000–102,000
Nonattainment areas:			
PM 2.5	prior to imp of new PM std: 2020: 100 (national)	2010: <23 (eastern) 2020: 100 (national)	2020: 46 (national)
Ozone (8-hour NAAQS)	2020: 41 (national)	2010: <28 (eastern)	2020: 33 (national)
Health and visibility benefits/yr:			
From SO ₂ and NO _x cuts (incremental)	N/A	At least \$184 billion/yr	\$11–96 billion/yr
Costs/year (incremental)	N/A	\$6–22 billion/yr	\$4–6.5 billion/yr

¹ The Clean Air Act column assumes full implementation of current Clean Air Act programs, not including the Bush Administration's recent rulemakings.
² The Clean Power Act also assumes full implementation of current Clean Air Act programs, including vigorous enforcement of, and continued maintenance of, the New Source Review program, the NAAQS, Regional Haze Rule, Mercury Air Toxics Rule, and others. It would ensure achievement of reductions from those programs.
³ Subject to stringent new rulemaking by the EPA.

Notes.—These are EPW Committee staff estimates, based on latest available data from EPA (2/12/2003).
 NO_x and SO₂ 2000 levels from 2000 EPA Air Trends report. See <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chieftrends/trends00/trends2000>.
 Mercury 1999 levels from EPA, "Emissions of Mercury by State (1999)." Data from coal-fired power plants only. See <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/combust/utiltox/stxstate2.pdf>.
 CO₂ 2000 levels from EPA's "Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2000," April, 2002. See <http://yosemite.epa.gov/oar/globalwarming.nsf/content/ResourceCenterPublicationsGHGEmissions.html>.
 CAA caps: EPA, "Discussion of Multi-Pollutant Strategy," meeting with the Edison Electric Institute, September 18, 2001. EPA's analysis compares the "straw" proposal for power plant cleanup with the level of cleanup that would occur if existing Clean Air Act programs were fully implemented.
 Lives for CAA, CPA, and CSI: EPA modeling runs, July, 2002.
 Nonattainment for CAA: "Existing programs" on the Clear Skies website. See <http://www.epa.gov/air/clearskies/benefits.html>.
 Nonattainment for CPA: Upper bound represents EPA's Straw proposal in 2020, which CPA would surpass in nonattainment benefits, in 2009. No national-level estimates exist for Straw or CPA nonattainment.
 Nonattainment for CSI: Clear Skies website, <http://www.epa.gov/air/clearskies/benefits.html>. Clear Skies nonattainment includes some existing programs (e.g., Title IV, NO_x SIP Call, some state NO_x reductions).
 Benefits and costs for CAA: Not available. No up-to-date and reliable analysis of the benefits and costs of current and planned Clean Air Act programs exists.
 Benefits and costs for CPA: EPA data for Straw proposal, representing a lower bound for Clean Power Act benefits.
 Benefits and costs for CSI: EPA's Clear Skies website, <http://www.epa.gov/air/clearskies/benefits.html>. (2 scenarios.)

(Mrs. DOLE assumed the chair.)
 Mr. JEFFORDS. Madam President, the choice seems easy to me. While the Clean Power Act would safeguard and surpass Clean Air Act emissions reductions, Clear Skies would be a ticket to pollute.

If Clear Skies legislation becomes law, we will all pay the price in hazy parks, smoggy cities, increased acid rain, and more trips to the emergency room. These are costs we cannot afford.

I hope this message reaches the American public. The public should be very concerned about this administration's efforts to free polluters from environmental regulation. Clear Skies may sound like a good thing, but it is a smokescreen.

In addition, Clear Skies does nothing to address global warming—nothing. As you can see from this chart, Clear Skies ignores our commitment under the U.N. Framework Convention to return to 1990 levels of carbon dioxide.

At a time when we should be adopting real measures to reduce CO₂ levels to around two billion tons, the administration is promoting a "business as usual" approach. This approach will result in around 3.5 billion tons of CO₂. That is no way to protect the American economy or the world from climate change.

The administration says we shouldn't worry, we should trust that their vol-

untary greenhouse gas reduction plan will help prevent climate change. I am not convinced.

I am deeply concerned because I know that voluntary plans to date have not done enough to keep U.S. carbon dioxide emissions from rising. The administration's newly announced proposal—the inappropriately named "Climate Vision" plan—is part of the President's goal to reduce emissions intensity by 18 percent during the next decade.

Emissions intensity is a term to describe emissions per dollar of GDP. It may sound like a respectable goal to reduce intensity by 18 percent, however, the truth is, that this approach will not reduce actual emissions of greenhouse gases. Even if emissions decline per dollar, overall emissions will grow—grow—by 16 percent.

We must not base our national strategy to prevent global warming and its harmful and costly impacts on a 16-percent increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Again, I find it very unfortunate that the administration appears to be promoting policies based on fuzzy math.

I am confident the American public would rather see legislation such as the Clean Power Act passed. Our bipartisan bill would require reductions of CO₂ by 21 percent, a return to our 1990 levels.

The Business Council for Sustainable Energy supports our approach. The organization's president, Michael Marvin, says:

These ideas will encourage the deployment of clean, efficient, economical and secure energy resources for our nation.

Our clean power approach will reduce the risks of climate change. The Administration's voluntary plan will not.

In fact, Jim Connaughton, Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, has admitted to this failure. In a July 2002 Commerce Committee hearing, he confessed:

Greenhouse gas emissions will rise under our approach, no question about that.

Does this sound like an administration concerned about improving our air quality and protecting our global climate from irreparable harm? No.

Or could this be an administration that puts the interests of polluters first?

I urge my colleagues to look at the fine print in the President's proposal and ask questions. If you're very lucky, you might just get a helpful and honest response.

Frankly, I doubt you will get a response. As Chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee in the last Congress, I asked this administration, namely the Environmental

Protection Agency, the Council on Environmental Quality, and the Department of Energy, to respond to straightforward questions about their legislative proposals, their rulemaking proposals, and their testimony before our committee. These are hardly unusual inquiries.

In some instances, I have yet to receive a reply. When I have received a reply, it has been either incomplete or inadequate, and without fail, quite late.

Simply stated, the American public, through laws such as the Freedom of Information Act, and also through its elected officials, is entitled to know the basis of government decision-making. The Congress has a responsibility to oversee and understand the activities of the executive branch, particularly when it implements the laws we write.

It is apparent through my experience and that of other Members I have consulted, that the American public is being kept in the dark by this administration on important changes to vital environmental and public health policies. The Clear Skies proposal dims even further their hopes and right to expect a cleaner and brighter future.

I thank the Senate for allowing me this time. I want to point out we should not lose sight of the fact there are things that are costing thousands of lives in this country we could prevent that are not being looked at well enough to give us the security we need.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, we have, under the order that now is in effect, morning business until 12:30. I see four colleagues, at least I have been notified, two on this side, two on that side, who desire to continue the debate on matters of national security. I am wondering if I might suggest a framework and then see if we can have a mutual understanding.

Mr. DODD. Time is moving.

Mr. WARNER. Time is moving. On my side, the distinguished Senator from Utah and the distinguished Senator from Alabama desire 4 to 5 minutes each. They have been here for some period of time. If they were to take those periods, then the other side would allocate their time as they desire, and perhaps we would be willing to extend the time to accommodate such additional time as you might desire.

Mr. DODD. May I inquire, if my colleague will yield, how much time remains on both sides of this discussion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority side has 11 minutes and 30 seconds.

Mr. DODD. I am prepared to say, use your 11 minutes and then we will pick up our time here. We ought to not waste any more and get to it.

Mr. WARNER. I don't know that we are wasting any time. We are just trying to do our best. We have been here

since 9:30. We have had the chairmen of the Appropriations and Foreign Relations Committees and this humble Senator.

Let us try the following. That would not leave the Senator from Virginia, who has control of this side of the debate, any time whatsoever to provide for some rebuttal.

Mr. DODD. If my colleague will yield, if you use your 11 minutes, Senator KENNEDY and I want to take some time. Others may come. Certainly we can engage in some discussion. I would say use the 11 minutes now.

Mr. WARNER. With that understanding, I thank my good friend from Connecticut and I thank my good friend from Massachusetts.

We will proceed to have the Senator from Utah, followed by the Senator from Alabama, for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise to declare my support for the President and his administration as he prepares this country for the coming war with Iraq.

I do this sharing the President's reluctance to go to war. But I offer my support with admiration and respect for the President for facing this decision without reluctance or avoidance, for the forbearance he has demonstrated by pursuing all other reasonable options, for courage he has shown in making the decision, and for the honesty with which he has included the American public, and the world at large, in his administration's deliberations.

The President has not shirked from the problem of Iraq. Since coming to office his administration has recognized that the United States could not ignore a stale and festering policy that had devolved to inattention and a self-deluding hope. A war never concluded in 1991—for Saddam Hussein has never abided by the ceasefire terms of disarmament that the international community declared a condition of the end of the first Gulf War—had devolved to a collapsed inspections regime and a deteriorating sanctions regime. The international community could pass 16 resolutions declaring disarmament our goal and expectation—now 17—but the international community could not impose the inspectors to guarantee that disarmament, nor could it sustain the sanctions to force the regime to comply.

President Bush came to office recognizing the nature of Saddam Hussein's regime was not changing: Saddam was overtly intent to threaten the region, and he was covertly dedicated to amassing the terrible weapons necessary to achieving this goal. Years of inspections reports and defectors' stories confirmed, for all to see, that Saddam's behavior was not changing, and that, in fact, he was emboldened by over ten years of successfully deceiving and confronting the international community.

The administration could have looked the other way. They could have presented a rationale, heard from the streets protests today, that this was not a threat to the U.S., that Saddam was always brutal and dangerous, but that, after all, we'd never caught him plotting against us.

I wonder where the signs are saying: Saddam disarm; Saddam quit being the way you are.

I am amazed that those aren't the signs in the street demonstrations.

A previous administration looked the other way on another threat—the threat of Osama bin Laden. In 1996, I began warning that this man was a threat to the United States. Every time we acted against him, I applauded the President, but I urged us to do more. In 1998, after the attacks on our embassies in Africa, President Clinton responded by cruise missile attacks against Sudan and Afghanistan. A few people accused the President of “wagging the dog,” using force to distract from his other problems. I told the President two things: One, good job, Mr. President. Two, but don't let this be the only strikes. Finish the job.

Osama bin Laden lived to launch the attacks of September 11, 2001, and today he remains at large. But last weekend's capture of Khalid Shaikh Mohammed demonstrates that our war on terrorism continues relentlessly, and that the cooperation we have with foreign nations and our intelligence and law enforcement professionals will disrupt, capture and liquidate al-Qaida.

Osama bin Laden and Shaikh Khalid Mohammed launched an attack that changed the way America sees the world, and I am grateful that the Bush administration has changed American foreign policy in response. We recognize, finally, that the concept of imminence is not an abstract idea as we contemplate the preemptive use of force. Preemption is not a new concept in international law, as many of the President's critics suggest. It is as old as Grotius, the founder of modern international law. And contrary to critics' misinformed assertions, the U.S. has never forsworn the use of preemption. Not since the U.N. Charter, and not under either Democratic or Republican administrations.

Preemption has always been conditioned on the idea of imminent threat. In the pre-nuclear era, we could see the armies amassing on a border. In the nuclear era, the idea of imminence grew murkier. Was it the fueling of the ICBM? Was it the glare on the rocket as it left the launch pad? Was it the warhead's return through the atmosphere? These were the reasons why the U.S. did not adopt a no first-use policy during the era of strategic competition with the Soviet Union.

Imminence becomes murkier in an era of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. When did the threat of al-Qaida become imminent? I know when it became manifest: Not, by the way, on September 11. Osama bin Laden had

struck many times before then. On September 11, the threat became catastrophic. It was well beyond imminent.

All Americans must be grateful to President Bush because he will never allow imminence to slip into catastrophic reality. None of us can read Saddam Hussein's intentions, Madam President. We don't know when, or if, he gives the command to pass his countless biological or chemical weapons to his numerous contacts in the international terrorist network.

We know, however, that Saddam has shown no intention of disarming.

And we know of Saddam's capabilities. As this administration has repeatedly stated to American and foreign audiences alike, there is a huge weapons gap in biological and chemical weapons. The evidence of this gap is not fabricated here; it has been meticulously collected, vetted and authenticated by the international community.

Our intelligence community, meanwhile, has asserted through the years that Saddam's Iraq is a safe harbor for international terrorism. This Congress has approved, through the last decade, these conclusions.

Association is not causation, every logic professor would say. And a cautious national security establishment would reiterate: Associating with terrorist groups, as we know Saddam Hussein has done, even training them, or giving them moral and financial support, is different than directing them. True enough. But the days of measuring imminent threat on this conservative notion are done. We will no longer confuse the reluctance to act with the self-deception that a threat is not there.

And I admire President Bush for plainly saying to the American people that the nexus of Saddam's regime of weapons of mass destruction and terrorist links is a threat we can no longer ignore. I admire the courage that says: American security cannot be held to a hope against reality but must eliminate a threat before it is too late.

I admire the President for pursuing all diplomatic options available to him. Last night he said he would submit another resolution before the Security Council, and I think that's a gutsy move. But the President has been clear, since he first took the case himself to the United Nations last September 12, that American national security would not be constrained by endless international resolutions without resolve. If the United Nations wishes to become a spineless debating society, that is its right. If it or anyone else believes that it can pervert international law to constrain the legitimate use of American force for the protection of our national security, then it will begin the 21st century on its self-imposed decline to irrelevance. I hope all members of the Security Council recognize this, as they recognize the diplomatic courage and honesty that the Bush Administration has demonstrated to that body.

Madam President, a war with Iraq will be the most serious exercise of American power in this century. We have reason to be optimistic: If we succeed militarily, and I believe without a doubt that we will, we will show the political commitment to ushering in a new era of stability and, I hope, democracy, for the people of Iraq.

At the beginning of the 20th century, colonial powers had their hand in shaping the Middle East. At the beginning of the 21st century, America is the lone superpower, but we are not a colonial power. The Administration has repeatedly stated that Iraq is for the Iraqi people, that their land, society, resources are for them to shape and mold. We will remove the oppression of Saddam and his Arab Stalinist Ba'athist dictatorship. And we in Congress, I hope, will provide the resources and support to sustain our commitment to a transition to a self-determining Iraqi society. We will work with the Iraqis, we will stay as long as we need, and we will not stay one day longer.

I admire President Bush for the candor he has shown the American people and the world. I admire him for facing difficult choices without reluctance, and I admire him for the courage he has shown in making the most difficult decisions a president can face. I join my prayers to those of countless other Americans as they pray for the success of our Armed Forces and for President Bush and his administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I, too, wish to join my distinguished colleague, Senator HATCH, in saluting President Bush for his courage and commitment to principle, his steadfastness, his integrity, and his moral approach to foreign policy. He believes the United States has a high calling in the world. We must meet high standards, and high standards mean that we try to work with our neighbors when possible, but we do not submit ourselves to requirements from other nations that keep us from doing what is the right thing. I am proud of what the President has done. I am proud of the way he has handled himself. I thought at his press conference last night, facing all the media in America and giving them his best shot, he handled it with great skill, dignity, integrity, and wisdom. So I am really proud of that.

We are now entering the final stages of diplomacy. There is still an opportunity for Saddam Hussein to take advantage of the days and hours he has been given by the President to change his ways, to totally disarm and abdicate his country in order to avoid a war. But the answer to what will happen is now in Saddam Hussein's hands.

This great Nation has committed itself to a course. This Senate has backed the President overwhelmingly. The House of Representatives has also done so. Last year, when this Senate was in the majority of the other party,

we voted 77 to 23 to authorize this President to take action if need be. I have sensed no retreat from that support by any Member. In fact, if we voted today, the vote would probably be larger. I don't know precisely what Hans Blix will report today in the U.N., but I will tell you one thing he will not say. He will not say that Saddam Hussein is in compliance. He will not say that Saddam Hussein has taken advantage of the 15-to-0 vote on U.N. Resolution 1441 last fall to disarm his country. Had he done that, we would not be facing a military conflict today. He has not done it, and we should not, in my view, continue to give extra time to him and reward him for his failure.

If we have had any difficulty in this process, it is from nations that seem to be unwilling to send a clear message. Some people say: You are not respectful of the United Nations. I have spoken on this issue for quite a number of years in the Senate. I have expressed my concern that we are Gulliver on the world scene and that many nations seem to desire to tie us down with a thousand different strings so that our Nation is unable to act in our interest or the world's interest. We want to listen to other nations, but we cannot allow the American power to be tied down in that fashion.

We had an interesting hearing before the Armed Services Committee, and our distinguished chairman, JOHN WARNER, is here today. He is one of the wisest men on military affairs this country has ever produced. James Schlesinger, former Secretary of Defense and former Secretary of Energy, talked about the United Nations.

The problem with the U.N. is not that they are bad, not that we should not try to work with them; but they cannot be depended on. They are not capable of functioning rationally under stress. They are basically a dysfunctional organization when it comes to action. There are a lot of reasons for that. It is the way the U.N. is created. You have nations such as Russia and France permitted to veto any resolution. We have a resolution dependent now on countries that are not really engaged in the area: New Guinea, Angola, or Cameroon can cast key votes. They are not spending \$3 billion a year, as we are, to keep Saddam Hussein in his box.

Secretary Schlesinger said this:

... this is a test of whether the United Nations—in the face of perennial defiance by Saddam Hussein of its resolutions—indeed of his own resolutions...—will, like the League of Nations over half a century ago, turn out to be simply another institution given to talk.

He went on to say this:

Will the United Nations prove as feckless as the League of Nations? Mr. Chairman, in 1935, Mussolini invaded Abyssinia. The League of Nations took note of this challenge to international order. Day after day, week after week, the League deliberated what to do. These sessions went on endlessly. After each session, there was a press conference. After some weeks, one of the reporters summarized the situation as follows: "On

the surface, very little is happening—but beneath the surface, nothing is happening.”

I think we are in a situation where the U.N. may be incapable of acting. This Nation must act if we are to maintain the integrity of the resolution of the U.N.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Alabama. I welcome the opportunity now to listen, and perhaps engage in colloquy with my two good friends, the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Massachusetts. We have been at this debate 2 hours 10 minutes. We are delighted to have them join us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

WAR WITH IRAQ

Mr. DODD. Madam President, first, I say to my friend from Virginia, this is an opportunity for us to spend a few minutes talking about the issue of war with Iraq. We all listened last evening to the comments of the President during his press conference. We all have great respect, obviously, for the Presidency of the United States. I would not call the President's press conference a Churchillian moment, but certainly the President expressed his views on what he believes ought to be done.

On October 11, 2002, I voted for H.J. Res. 114, a resolution providing the President with the authority to use force against Iraq if proved necessary. The vote on that resolution was 77 to 23. I voted for the entire resolution including language which requires the President to first determine that “reliance by the United States on further diplomatic or other peaceful means alone either will not adequately protect the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq or is not likely to lead to the enforcement of all relevant United Nations Security Resolutions.” The particular requirement seems to have gotten lost in recent discussions about Iraq and deserves repeating in the context of our debate this morning.

My concern is that the Bush administration, at this juncture, has not made the case that we have reached the point that we can say that diplomacy has failed.

I do not know of anyone who disagrees with the notion that we would be far better off with Iraq disarmed. Every person I know supports that conclusion. The debate, if you will, is not over whether Iraq should be disarmed but whether there are means short of military conflict for doing so. Knowing all the hazards and dangers that will arise when we send American service men and women into combat to achieve that result, we must not take that decision precipitously, without first exhausting other options, particularly diplomatic options.

As I stated earlier, I voted for H.J. Res 114 last fall, and I would vote for it again because I believe force, coupled with with diplomacy, are needed in this

circumstance. Threats of force alone without diplomacy can too often lead us to unnecessary armed conflict and costly destruction and loss of life.

We fail sometimes to recognize and understand the value of diplomacy and how well it has worked for us in times past. We saw diplomacy at work during the Kennedy administration when President Kennedy diffused the Cuban missile crisis. We saw it at work as well in the Carter administration when Sadat and Begin came together at Camp David to end conflict between Israel and Egypt. We saw it at work in 1993 when, through the efforts of former-President Carter in North Korea, we were able to diffuse a situation that was getting very serious. Diplomacy has successfully resolved many disputes large and small. On each occasion it requires our President to put his credibility on the line and work diligently day in and day out to bring those warring parties together to avoid the conflict that would have ensued.

I think too often we fail to appreciate the value of what can be done through diplomacy. There are countless examples throughout our history.

My plea this morning, is not that we renounce the use of force multilateral or unilateral—in the case of Iraq or any other circumstance where US national security interests are at stake. I would never support a resolution that would deprive our Nation of the opportunity to protect and defend its security and its sovereignty, including by the unilateral use of force. My only concern is that we ought not rush unnecessarily to that conclusion when other options still remain. Do we really want to unnecessarily put at risk the lives of innocent Iraqi people or more importantly the lives of our own young men and women in uniform who have been deployed to the Middle East and await the orders of the Commander in Chief?

My plea today is that the President seriously consider giving the U.N. effort the diplomatic track a bit more time. Obviously, there is a threat in Iraq. We all know that. But it is a threat at this moment that is being effectively contained by the presence of international inspectors and the threat of force. Yes, Iraq is a threat, but there are graver and more immediate threats confronting the United States. I believe that North Korea poses a far greater and far more immediate danger to the United States and the region. U.S./Korean experts across the political spectrum share that view.

I am concerned that our impatience over Iraq is doing great harm to our relationships with our long standing friends and allies. U.N. Security Council Resolution 1441 did not contain an end date by which the inspectors were to conclude their mission. However, from the very beginning, the administration showed very little patience for the inspections process. Almost before it began, members of the Bush Administration were ridiculing the process,

suggesting it would never work anyway; why are we bothering with it?

One might ask the basic question: If we never thought it was going to work, why did we support U.N. Security Resolution 1441 in the first place?

The problem of Iraq and Saddam Hussein is not weeks old, it is years old. We all know that. Nonetheless, we drafted, worked, suggested, and supported the resolution that called for an inspections process. There is no certainty that an inspections process will necessarily succeed, given the size of the country and the difficulties involved, but we voted to send inspectors to Iraq and we supported the terms of their mission as spelled out in the text of the resolution.

Yet as the inspection mission was getting underway, the administration seemed to already have lost patience with it. Perhaps that is why other members of the Security Council began to question whether the United States was ever genuinely committed to an inspections regime.

U.N. weapons inspector Hans Blix spoke before the United Nations this morning. Let me share with my colleagues some of his conclusions—very significant conclusions in my view. Mr. Blix said that the inspectors were in a better position to carry out their work than they had been in the 1990s because of the existence of international pressure. The President should claim victory that his policy is succeeding—the combination of diplomacy and the threat of force is bearing fruit.

We ought to be celebrating the fact that the inspectors have made progress in disarming Iraq. I do not think that a call for inspections without a threat of force would have produced positive results. The combination of the threat of force and the inspections process is, according to those we have asked to perform these duties, producing far better results than we ever could have imagined.

Mr. Blix went on to say that there is no air surveillance over the entire country, and that inspectors can move freely anywhere in Iraq. Even with enhanced Iraqi cooperation, Mr. Blix stated that the mission would need some additional months not years to complete its work.

I am not interested in seeing the inspections process prolonged indefinitely. I do not think that is in anyone's interest. We have men and women in uniform deployed abroad, waiting for orders. We cannot keep them there indefinitely without having the necessary rotations. That poses some problems. I hope we never reach the conclusion that simply because we have deployed our forces to the Middle East, we see that action as putting our credibility on the line if we don't then take military action, even though diplomacy may be working.

American service men and women certainly understand that when they are called to duty, there may be times