

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Kuttner, Hanns: Files
Folder Title: Global Climate Protection Act
Box: OA 16601

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: **reagan.library@nara.gov**

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

Last Updated: 12/15/2023

Hanna

1/4

Pls. touch
base with Linda
Fischer. Is this
on their radar scope?
What does
Lee suggest?
Does Lee agree
with **RET's**
recommendation?
And what to do
next. Mx

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON
December 29, 1987

MEMORANDUM FOR NANCY J. RISQUE

THROUGH: RALPH C. BLEDSOE *Ralph Bledsoe*
FROM: ROBERT E. JOHNSON *Robert E. Johnson*
SUBJECT: The Global Climate Protection Act

Issue: What steps should the Administration take in response to a statutory requirement that the President propose a national policy on global climate change?

Background: On December 22, 1987, the President signed the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Title XI of which is the Global Climate Protection Act. This Act requires the President, through EPA, to propose a national policy on global climate change (date unspecified). The State Department and EPA must submit reports to Congress within two years, concerning scientific understanding of the greenhouse effect and U.S. efforts to gain international cooperation in limiting global climate change. State is to promote the early designation of an International Year of Global Climate Protection.

Current Administration policy is that more research is required before a policy on global climate change can be established. Administration research efforts on global climate change are coordinated by OSTP through its Committee on Earth Sciences (CES). A report submitted to Congress earlier this month said that an International Year of Global Climate Protection is not warranted at this time. Discussions with OMB indicate that research funding is increasing from \$57 million in FY87 to \$112 million in FY88.

Discussion: Several organizations (State, Energy, and OPD) have informally suggested that the DPC consider this issue. (State plans to send a memo formally requesting this.) Their rationale is that, given international and Congressional pressure for action, it may be wise for the DPC to consider the issue before Congress acts further. OSTP has strongly opposed the Global Protection Act and consideration of policy actions on global climate change, arguing that the science is not understood well enough to formulate meaningful policies. Although the statute requires policy consideration of this issue, DPC action now could be premature before the science "is ready."

Recommendation: I recommend that, after receiving the State Department memo, the CES brief the ENRE Working Group on the status of global climate change research. The working group could recommend whether the DPC should consider the issue.

funnel their intelligence personnel through the U.N. Secretariat. This practice condoned by the United Nations files in the face of the United Nations' stated commitment to a neutral and international civil service as called for in the U.N. Charter. While the practice of secondment, or temporary assignment, which has been the principal means to achieve this infiltration, has a legitimate role at the United Nations when properly used, there is no excuse for any member state having 100 percent of its nationals employed in the Secretariat on a temporary basis. It is long past time for this Soviet abuse to end. Since the United Nations failed to take the initiative to stop this abuse, I determined to find a legislative way to call a halt to this totally unjustifiable practice.

Mr. President, the conference report incorporates the essential thrust of my amendment in section 702. In that section, the President is authorized to give the United Nations 40 percent of our assessed and appropriated contribution immediately. Another 40 percent can go when the President certifies that, among other things, progress is being made to reduce use of secondment at the Secretariat to no more than 50 percent for each member state. The final 20 percent of the funds can be released 30 days later, provided the Congress does not enact a joint resolution blocking transfer of these funds.

While the conference report is not as strong as my legislation, I am willing to permit the President, as this legislation provides, the opportunity to produce results. I hope that the administration realizes that the Congress is very serious about maintaining momentum for reform at the United Nations. The deal struck in this conference report calls for good faith efforts by the administration to use U.S. funding as leverage for change. The Senate expects this leverage to be put to good use.

Mr. President, in early November of this year, 27 of my Senate colleagues joined me in writing to Secretary of State George Shultz on the secondment matter, registering our strong concern about the problem and asking what actions the State Department was taking to counter this particular abuse of the U.N. system.

I received a response last week. In the State Department's letter, it is made clear that secondment has become a serious concern for the U.S. Government, and that our concern is being communicated to the U.N. and to member states. I hope that this concern is accompanied by a commitment to change things. The conference report we will pass here today provides the tools for the administration to do the job. We will be watching closely to see whether these tools are put to good use.

Mr. President, I ask that the letter from me and my colleagues to Secretary Shultz and the State Depart-

ment's response be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
Washington, DC, November 3, 1987.
Hon. GEORGE SHULTZ,
Secretary of State, U.S. Department of State,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We are writing to express our concern about a continuing abuse of the personnel system of the United Nations Secretariat by the countries of the Soviet bloc.

As you know, on September 25, 1987, during consideration of the Defense Authorization Act, the Senate unanimously adopted an amendment concerning the abuse of the practice of secondment at the UN Secretariat by a vote of 95-0. The provision was later added to the Senate version of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1988.

The language of this provision stipulates that 50% of US assessed contributions to the United Nations be withheld until the President can certify that significant progress has been made at the United Nations in eliminating the excessive use of secondment. This practice of temporary assignment, which is used by the Soviet Union for up to 99% of its nationals in the Secretariat, is a clear violation of the letter and spirit of the UN Charter. The UN member states have themselves recognized the serious problems posed by excessive secondment in the recommendation of the Group of 18, which called for a cap of 50% on such temporary assignment by member states.

The use of secondment, as well as other abuses such as blatant control of Secretariat employes by missions to the UN and salary remission schemes, all undermine the independence of the international civil service. It is also well understood that these abuses facilitate the use of Soviet bloc nationals working for the Secretariat in New York City for intelligence activities directed against the United States.

We believe the Senate has given a clear and strong signal of concern of this issue. Regardless of the eventual outcome of a House-Senate conference on the State Department bill with regard to the UN secondment issue, we feel it is imperative that the United States begin to address this problem with seriousness and concrete action. We ask that you provide us with information on your plans to address the problem of secondment at the United Nations Secretariat, including any multilateral efforts within the General Assembly context.

Your cooperation in this matter will help insure that the Senate and the Administration can work closely together to correct the most egregious abuses now undermining the integrity of the United Nations system.

Sincerely,

Senator JOHN HEINZ
with 27 colleagues.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN HEINZ,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HEINZ: Thank you for the letter of November 3, 1987, from you and your colleagues regarding the Soviet bloc abuse of the United Nations personnel system.

We share your concern that the Soviet and East European practice of seconding of their nationals to the United Nations contravenes the spirit and intent of the United Nations Charter, which envisaged an inde-

pendent international civil service. Secondment, per se, is not in violation of the rules or regulations, and it can be a positive mechanism for attracting high caliber staff to the UN in certain circumstances. Indeed, the U.S. second staff to the UN and other international organizations on a limited basis. However, as you know, we are limited object to the Soviets' exclusive use of secondment and believe that practice must be changed.

Secretary Shultz wrote to UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar in May forcefully stating our concerns on this matter. In September we instructed our Embassies to include the issue of secondment as a priority issue in their demarches to over 120 foreign governments in preparation for this year's General Assembly. On November 13, 1987, we formally signaled our intention in a speech to the Fifth Committee of the United Nations to seek urgently to change this practice.

Our delegation to the General Assembly is circulating a draft resolution which is designed to initiate the needed changes in personnel policies. Specifically, the resolution calls upon Member States to limit the number of their nationals temporarily seconded for service with the United Nations, with the goal of obtaining a reasonable balance between fixed-term and permanent employees from all Member States. The delegation has advised us that positive response to the draft resolution from other Member States is not as forthcoming as we would prefer, due in large part to the low level of U.S. funding. We are continuing to pursue this issue vigorously in New York.

We remain firmly committed to the independence of the international civil service of the United Nations. We believe it is in the interest of all nations to strengthen the international civil service by ensuring its neutrality and impartiality.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

J. EDWARD FOX,
Assistant Secretary,
Legislative Affairs.

TITLE IV—GLOBAL CLIMATE PROTECTION ACT TO
STATE DEPARTMENT AUTHORIZATION

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, the authorization for the State Department contains important legislation addressing the serious threat posed by the continued release of gases which will disrupt the global climate. The Global Climate Protection Act embodied in title IV of the legislation before us, (1) recognizes the serious environmental threat posed by these pollutants and (2) sets in place a mechanism for the Environmental Protection Agency to identify a domestic policy and for the State Department to ensure that the worldwide community participates in fully addressing the problems posed by global climate change.

Man's activities are altering the world climate. Burning of fossil fuels and the continued release of trace gases such as chlorofluorocarbons, nitrous oxides, and methane along with a continued decrease in worldwide forest cover are responsible for these changes.

There exists a scientific consensus that these activities will alter climate. The question that remains is how much change will occur, over what timeframe, and when will climate change stabilize.

The climate has been slowly changing throughout the Earth's existence. Approximately 18,000 years ago, near the end of the last ice age, the global climate was approximately 5 degrees Celsius cooler than it is today.

This climate change occurred slowly over a period of thousands of years.

The global climate change confronting the world today is not one that will occur over thousands of years. We are talking about climate changes becoming visible to the public over the next decade. And, within the next century—during our children's lifetime—we could encounter a climate warmer than has existed for over 100,000 years. Projections of climate change indicate that the continued buildup of greenhouse gases will result in a temperature 1.5 to 4.5 Celsius warmer than exists today.

The wide range of temperature projections is not caused by a lack of knowledge as to the amount of greenhouse gases being released to the environment. The uncertainty in projections is due to a mechanism known as the feedback mechanism. In other words, the oceans can absorb vast amounts of carbon monoxide and then release these gases at some point in the future, leading to massive swings in climate.

We don't understand how the oceans will react. We are subjecting the world to a global experiment with consequences we can't identify. The question that must be asked is what other unforeseen changes are possible.

The uncertainty and potential magnitude of the impacts forces us to begin to take responsible action now. None of us can assume the changes in climate will be positive.

Sea level rise is one of the better understood impacts of a warming climate. Sea level is expected to rise about 1 meter by the middle of the next century. This impact alone is significant. About one-half of the world's population as well as a large number of the world's major cities and urban developments are located in coastal regions. Massive coastal areas could be inundated and whole islands could disappear.

But consequences do not stop here. We can expect to see changes in precipitation, winds, humidity, and the severity and frequency of extreme events such as droughts and floods. The impacts of these changes can be expected to be felt on agriculture, forests, water resources, health, and energy demands.

Climate change cannot be prevented. Our goal, as stated in this legislation, is to "limit global climate change." It should be clear that what we mean by "limiting climate change" means limiting the change in the concentration of greenhouse gas buildup in the atmosphere. Adaptation is not what we mean by "limiting climate change"; adaptation is a way of coping with climate change.

I think it would be useful to spell out some of the means that will have to be considered in order "to limit climate change" and thus to "stabilize or reduce" the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. We know, for example, that we must reduce the emissions of carbon dioxide which make up about half of the greenhouse gas emissions. What method should the Secretary of State and the Administrator of EPA consider in this regard? Recent State testimony has suggested a number of policies which will have to be considered in order for the United States to reduce its carbon dioxide emissions which account for almost a quarter of the global total. Carbon dioxide emissions are tied to the types and amounts of fossil fuels which we use in our economy. Therefore, to control carbon dioxide emissions will require changes in the way we manage our energy use in the future. Consideration should be given to improvement in energy end-use efficiency, such as lighting, and across the board in new appliances; the efficiency of supply energy technology can also be improved. New gas-fueled powerplant technologies appear to improve efficiency substantially. A vast improvement of auto efficiency standards for cars sold in the United States must be considered in order to lower the use of gasoline. Pricing initiatives must be considered in order to reflect the "externalities" in the price of fossil fuels. A number of experts have suggested the establishment of a carbon dioxide tax in order to reflect the damage to our climate reflected in the price of energy.

Fuel switching must also be considered since some fuels produce much less carbon dioxide per Btu than others. Coal, for example, produces twice the carbon dioxide per Btu as gas. Stopping the destruction of tropical forest—a significant carbon dioxide sink—is an important step, consideration should also be given to increased reforestation. We also know that the complete elimination of CFC's would provide a major greenhouse benefit. These, too, should be considered. We know that improving the controls on carbon monoxide might control the buildup of methane; we should consider reexamining whether nitrous oxides can be controlled through air pollution control technologies and we may need to control the buildup of tropospheric ozone not just locally, but also on a national basis because ozone in the troposphere is also a greenhouse gas.

We know that the United States will have to share our knowledge in controlling greenhouse gases with other nations; this will be a large task. Therefore, a part of this effort will be to assist other nations in figuring out how to do their share in reducing the concentrations of greenhouse gases.

There are many opportunities to gain international cooperation in lim-

iting global climate change. First, the United States, through UNEP, should begin negotiations to bring about a global convention and protocol on climate change. Second, we can work through our allies at the seven-nation economic summit to bring about a unified call for a global climate convention. Third, it would be appropriate at the next Reagan-Gorbachev summit for the two superpower leaders to call for a global convention on climate. Fourth, the Secretary of State should be working with developing nations to help bring about a greater awareness of the climate change issue and encourage positive working relations on both impacts and economic planning to deal with greenhouse gas emissions.

Dealing with the greenhouse problem is a daunting task. We must not wait; we must begin now. This legislation states that "necessary corrective action must be identified and implemented in time to protect." We are already too late. I think the list of responses mentioned above previously should help us get started in formulating and initiating a response.

I commend Senator BIDEN, the author of this provision, and Senator PELL for their leadership in putting in place the policy mechanisms needed to address this challenge. I also thank my colleagues for their willingness to work with me, Senator CHAFFEE, Senator MITCHELL, Senator STAFFORD, and other Members of the Senate in the development of this provision.

As the Senator has stated, there is an urgent need to move rapidly toward the development of policies to control and mitigate the impacts of global climate change, both domestically and internationally. The purpose of the legislation before us today is to develop those policies. I would be happy to respond to my colleagues' questions.

Mr. BIDEN. I am sure you are aware that EPA has two studies underway on the greenhouse effect. The first is a review of the effects of climate change. The second is the development of policy options to stabilize the concentrations of greenhouse gases. How do you see the relationship between this legislation and those studies?

Mr. BAUCUS. My intention is that these two studies should be completed long before the report to Congress as envisioned in this legislation. Those studies may be utilized in the development of the report to Congress. But this legislation is not in any way intended to delay those studies that were requested by members of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee.

I thank the Senator. The Global Climate Protection Act addresses one of the major environmental threats to the Earth, that of global warming and concomitant global climate change. The driving force behind this unprecedented change in the Earth's climate is the release of carbon dioxide and

other trace gases into the Earth's atmosphere at unparalleled rates. It is my understanding that the gases of concern to global warming include carbon dioxide, chlorofluorocarbons, methane, tropospheric ozone, and nitrous oxide.

Carbon dioxide concentrations have increased by 25 percent in the last century and continue to increase at a rate of 4 percent per decade, methane concentrations have risen 30 to 40 percent in the last 35 years and continue to grow by 1 percent per year, two of the primary chlorofluorocarbons—CFC-11 and CFC-12—are growing at a rate of 5 percent per year, nitrous oxide concentration are increasing by two-tenths of 1 percent per year, and ozone in the lower atmosphere is increasing by about 1 percent per year in the Northern Hemisphere.

This is a tremendous amount of gaseous pollution that we are adding to the atmosphere. Scientists tell me that in the last 20 years or so, the contribution of the trace gases to global warming is equal to that of from carbon dioxide.

My concern is that any legislation seeking to address global warming must take into consideration the combined effects of both carbon dioxide and the trace gases. I wonder if the Senator would clarify what greenhouse gases are covered in this bill?

Mr. BIDEN. I concur with the statements of my distinguished colleague. Certainly both carbon dioxide and the trace gases, are important contributors to global warming and should all be considered in any policy discussions related to global climate change. That is the intention of this legislation.

Mr. BAUCUS. The global climate change phenomenon is highly complex, and there are many unanswered scientific questions. We need improved multidimensional models to provide more accurate temperature predictions; better regional predictions of rainfall patterns, vegetation shifts, and agricultural growing regions; and an increased understanding of the possible feedback mechanisms such as cloud cover, the oceans, and sea ice changes that may dampen or intensify the temperature increases. While the severity of the problem demands that we cannot wait for all the uncertainty to be resolved before we begin the policy debate, it still remains imperative that we continue and expand our scientific research effort. Could the sponsors explain how the research highlighted in this proposal will build on the investigations already underway?

Mr. BIDEN. The Global Climate Protection Act recognizes the significance of the important research now being conducted by both the U.S. Government and international agencies. What we are requiring is to continue and intensify this research on global climate change. It is not meant to supplant ongoing research. One goal of the U.S. policy outlined in the act is to

foster cooperation among nations to provide more extensive and effective scientific research efforts. In formulating our national policy, the act also mandates that the Environmental Protection Agency consider the research findings of the relevant Federal agencies and other research organizations engaged in global climate research.

TITLE IV OF STATE DEPARTMENT AUTHORIZATION—GLOBAL CLIMATE PROTECTION ACT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, there is growing concern about the complex and serious issue of global climate change. Human activities are accelerating the so-called "greenhouse effect" by continuing to increase the concentrations of greenhouse gases and disrupting the global atmospheric radiation balance. Mankind has been described as conducting a gigantic environmental experiment of unprecedented magnitude on the Earth's atmosphere.

The Global Climate Protection Act incorporated as title IV of the State Department authorization will provide a strong beginning in our efforts to grapple with the climate change problem, nationally and internationally. The act mandates that the United States take the lead, through the Environmental Protection Agency, to develop policies to both increase our understanding of climate change and identify technologies to stabilize the concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. The act also directs the Secretary of State to coordinate the U.S. policy on a worldwide basis through the United Nations Environment Programme and other diplomatic channels.

This legislation is timely and vital to lay the ground work for the challenge ahead in addressing global climate change. Concentrations of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases—methane, chlorofluorocarbons, nitrous oxide and ozone—are continuing to increase. This leads to increased trapping of infrared radiation from the Sun, thereby increasing the average temperature of the Earth and altering the climate system. Past additions of these gases to the atmosphere have already committed us to a 2.5 degrees Centigrade—4.5 degrees Fahrenheit—increase. Predictions indicate that at the current emissions rates of these same gases, the average global temperature will rise another 1.5 to 4.5 degrees Centigrade by the middle of the next century.

The concomitant environmental changes will be dramatic and unparalleled. They include sea level rise; increased precipitation and humidity over the globe generally, but with regional differences such as hotter, dryer conditions over the midcontinents in the midlatitudes; increased frequency and intensity of tropical storms and severe weather; and major changes to ecosystems resulting in shifts in vegetation patterns.

The economic, social, and political consequences of these changes may be

severe and intractable. The ramifications and disruptions certainly will be felt worldwide.

The issue of global climate change is challenging for both the scientific community and the policymakers. The changes are likely to occur suddenly and with unpredictable magnitude, limiting our ability to cope and adapt. The Antarctic ozone hole, which was not anticipated by any of our scientific theories, serves as a dramatic example of the complexity, magnitude, and unpredictable nature of mankind's potential to impact the atmosphere.

These are not issues where a "quick fix" solution is available. There are no ready or easy regulatory alternatives, nor would an infusion of dollars provide enough answers. Controlling carbon dioxide, caused largely by the combustions of fossil fuels, and the other greenhouse gases on an international scale will be both technically and socially difficult to achieve.

Yet the impacts of global climate change are of such consequence that we cannot afford to wait for all the questions to be answered with certainty. We are behind in our efforts to begin policy analysis and development to respond to this threat.

The Global Climate Protection Act should foster the beginning of the policy debate, and augment the efforts already underway at the environmental Protection Agency. At the same time, the world's top scientists must continue their investigations into this phenomenon to increase our knowledge and understanding. The key elements of success in dealing with an unprecedented environmental problem of this nature are cooperation and commitment on an international basis.

I commend my colleagues Senators BIDEN and PELL for their leadership in introducing this legislation, and for their willingness to cooperate with members of the Environment and Public Works Committee and other Members of the Senate in its development. With his permission, I would like to ask Senator BIDEN, the author of this legislation, a clarifying question.

Mr. BIDEN. I would be glad to answer any questions from the distinguished Senator.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thank Senator BIDEN. I am certain that he shares my concern for the urgency related to the development of control strategies and corrective actions. Scientists have told us that we are already committed by past emissions of greenhouse gases to an average global temperature increase of 2.5 degrees Centigrade—4.5 degrees Fahrenheit. If we continue at the current emissions rates of greenhouse gases, scientists predict that the global average temperature will rise by an additional 1.5 to 4.5 degrees Centigrade—2.7 to 8.1 degrees Fahrenheit—by the middle of the 21st century. This is a warmer Earth than has existed over the past 70 million years. Rec-

ognizing this urgency, how does the Global Climate Protection Act insure that we proceed on a timely course to solutions?

Mr. BIDEN. I agree that, despite its effects not being fully felt until the long-term, global climate protection is a near-term issue. By early in the next century we may witness alterations in agricultural production, sea-level rise, and dramatic impacts from increases in the Earth's temperature. This bill requires that within 24 months, the Secretary of State and the Environmental Protection Agency must submit a report to Congress that describes the international scientific and policy efforts that are underway. This report must also outline the United States strategy for focusing international cooperation to limit global climate change. This timeframe should insure that we begin preparation of an international effort, including the development of appropriate policies.

THE GLOBAL CLIMATE PROTECTION ACT OF 1987

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, as reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senate bill that preceded this conference report included a title, title VI, known as "the Global Climate Protection Act of 1987." That portion of the bill was designed to address the problems of global climate change due to the greenhouse effect.

With the cooperation of my colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] the bill's managers and the title's original sponsors, an amendment of mine was included in the Senate passed version of this bill. I am pleased to see that the conference report includes, as title XI, a modified version of the Global Climate Protection Act of 1987. This new version addresses some of the concerns I expressed on October 8 and retains the essential elements of my amendment.

The greenhouse effect is a major environmental threat that I, along with my colleagues on the Environment and Public Works Committee and other interested Senators, have been examining and working on for quite some time. In addition to holding numerous hearings, we have initiated several important studies, including two that are being conducted by the EPA: One examining the health and environmental effects climate change, and another examining the policy options that, if implemented, would stabilize current levels of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

Through a process of continued oversight and participation in meetings with experts from the scientific community and the Federal Government, we have made significant progress during the past 20 months. A consensus has developed around the three propositions that we set forth in June 1986: First, the problems and threat of global climate can no longer be treated solely as important scientific questions; second, we need to expand efforts to understand more

fully the effects that atmospheric pollution has on the environment; and third, we need to develop an extensive range of policy options for dealing with the serious global problem of climate change due to the greenhouse effect. One of the most significant developments has been the ever increasing public awareness and understanding of the problem.

Senators PELL and BIDEN, as well as all of the conferees on this bill, are to be congratulated for including provisions dealing with the greenhouse effect. The effort being devoted to this problem by our Government and the governments of the world have been woefully inadequate. The bill before us seeks to correct this.

This legislation is particularly well-timed. At the recent Reagan-Gorbachev summit, this important issue was discussed and, at the conclusion of the summit, an agreement was reached to have our two countries devote more attention to the problem of global climate change. The significance of the fact that this issue was on the agenda of these two world leaders should not go unnoticed and the President should know that we appreciate his efforts in this regard.

As modified, title XI directs the United States to begin an international process to more fully understand and come to grips with the threats of global climate change.

The international process that led to the Montreal protocol on protection of the ozone layer should serve as a model for dealing with the greenhouse effect. The United States can and should be a world leader in this area but we must also take care to work with other nations every step of the way. Not only must we convince the doubting Thomases that the problem is real but we may find that, by working together, we come up with solutions that did not occur to us before or find that some solutions are easier to implement than we originally thought.

To those who suggest that global climate change will produce "winners and losers" and that, therefore, some countries may not share our concern I say you need to look at the complete picture. The magnitude of the changes being predicted—changes such as the flooding and virtual elimination of whole countries such as Bangladesh, or the conversion of the United States grain belt into a dust bowl—these changes will create so much turmoil, such sociopolitical instability that no one will be a winner. Continued reference to "winners and losers" is misleading and may undermine our ability to achieve international cooperation.

Using the international process that led to the ozone agreement once again, we need to start thinking of initial, preliminary steps that we can begin to take immediately.

No one expects to solve this problem quickly or all at once. But there are things that we can do in the short term to buy time, to give us the

chance to develop more lasting solutions. We cannot afford to wait until we fully understand this problem. We must act on the information we have now. Each day of delay places us further down a path that threatens our very existence. We may be committing ourselves to environmental changes that are irreversible. By the time we have more information, it may well be too late.

Mr. President, I had some reservations about how well the new inter-agency task force that was being proposed by the Senate would work. Fortunately, the conferees saw fit to delete that portion of the Senate bill. As modified, the EPA is clearly chosen as the lead agency for development of policy options and the State Department is similarly chosen to lead the international process.

Although the Office of Science and Technology Policy does have an appropriate role to play in the coordination of scientific research, neither that office nor any other office or agency may intrude upon the domain of EPA and the State Department as set forth in this new law. It would defeat the clear intent of Congress if, as has been suggested by some, references to "the President" were interpreted to mean "the Office of the President." Congress knows the difference between the two and would have said "the office of" if that is what we meant. This bill was carefully crafted to prevent a repeat of the domestic process that threatened to undermine the role of the United States as a world leader at a crucial point in the ozone negotiations.

Mr. President, in conclusion, we cannot expect to enact this bill, sit back and wait for the report to show up. This project will require constant attention, oversight and guidance from those of us in the Congress who are concerned about these problems. As a senior member of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, the committee with primary jurisdiction over the greenhouse effect, I plan to continue our work in this area and to make sure that this effort is a success.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. SYMMS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank all Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

FARM POLICY.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise to respond to an editorial that ap-

furthering the interests of the PLO, to receive anything of value, except information, from the PLO, makes it unlawful to spend funds provided by the PLO, and makes it unlawful to establish or maintain an office within the jurisdiction of the United States at the behest or direction of, or with funds provided by, the PLO. In addition, the Senate amendment requires the Attorney General to enforce these provisions in the United States District Courts and grants those courts authority to issue the necessary decrees to enforce these provisions.

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute (sec. 1001-1005) is the same as the Senate amendment.

TITLE XI—GLOBAL CLIMATE PROTECTION

The Senate amendment (secs. 401 to 409) contains congressional findings concerning manmade pollution and its effect on the climate of the earth and directs the President to establish a task force on the global climate which shall be mandated to determine and supervise research for a coordinated national strategy on the global climate. The Senate amendment also details the composition of the task force and the advisory role of the Congress, and requires the task force to develop and transmit to the President, not later than 12 months after the date of enactment, a U.S. strategy on the global climate. The President is required to submit the strategy on the global climate, together with recommendations for further legislative action, to the Congress not later than 3 months after receipt of the strategy.

The Senate amendment also directs the President to appoint an Ambassador at Large to coordinate U.S. Government participation in the task force and represent the Secretary of State in its operations.

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute (secs. 1101-1105) contains a revised set of findings, calls on the President to work with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, along with other appropriate Federal agencies, to develop and propose to Congress a coordinated national policy on global climate change. The National Climate Program Office continues to have authority for developing a coordinated research agenda for the Federal Government in the area of climate research and assessment pursuant to Public Laws 95-367 and 99-272. The Office of Science and Technology Policy's Committee on Earth Sciences remains charged with developing long-range plans for Federal research and development in earth sciences and man's impact on global environment. Nothing in this title should be construed to effect the scientific research conducted by any Federal agency, or as authorizing or requiring the adoption of any regulatory or control measures.

The conference substitute also authorizes the Secretary of State to coordinate aspects of U.S. policy through international organizations. In addition, the conference substitute requests that the Secretary of State and the Administrator of EPA submit to all relevant committees of the Congress a report that includes: a summary analysis of current international scientific understanding of the greenhouse effect; an assessment of U.S. efforts to gain international cooperation in limiting global climate change; and a description of the strategy by which the United States intends to seek further international cooperation to limit such change. The committee of conference intends that this report not duplicate or replicate ongoing studies and reports on global climate change. Finally, the substitute calls on the Secretary of State to undertake all neces-

sary steps to promote within the U.N. system the early designation of an International Year on Global Climate Protection, and calls on the President to include the problem of climate protection on the agenda of bilateral discussions with the Soviet Union.

TITLE XII—REGIONAL FOREIGN RELATIONS MATTERS

PART A—SOVIET UNION AND EASTERN EUROPE SOVIET BALLISTIC MISSILE TESTS NEAR HAWAII

The Senate amendments (sec. 520) contains congressional findings concerning recent Soviet heavy intercontinental ballistic missile tests near the islands of Hawaii and expresses the sense of Congress that this test has increased the threat of nuclear war, and that the Congress condemns the Soviet Union for its actions as demonstrating an utter disdain for civilized and acceptable standards of international behavior, as well as probable violations of the SALT II treaty, and demands a public apology.

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute (sec. 1201) retains the congressional findings, and expresses the sense of the Congress that these actions by the Soviet government were provocative and unnecessary, that the United States should officially protest these actions and seek assurances from the Soviets that such missile firings will not occur in the future, and that the President should report to the Congress on the details of these tests, including the irradiation of U.S. monitoring aircraft, on Soviet explanations offered in response to U.S. protests, and steps to be taken to ensure that such activities will not happen in the future.

SOVIET VIOLATIONS OF THE ABM TREATY

The Senate amendments (sec. 568) requires the President to report not later than 30 days after the date of enactment on whether Soviet violations of the ABM Treaty and the failure of the Treaty to reduce or limit the increase of Soviet offensive ICBM systems jeopardize the supreme national interests of the United States, and whether the United States should withdraw from the ABM Treaty.

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute deletes the Senate provision on the failure to achieve permanent constraints on Soviet strategic offensive forces which could threaten the survivability of U.S. strategic offensive forces, and U.S. intentions regarding possible withdrawal from the ABM Treaty. The committee of conference notes that the Senate conferees expect that the President will address the issues raised by the original Senate provision in the context of the annual report required by section 52 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

EMIGRATION OF JEWS AND OTHERS WHO WISH TO EMIGRATE FROM THE SOVIET UNION

The House bill (sec. 178) contains congressional findings and a statement of policy regarding Soviet policy regarding Soviet Jews and other Soviet citizens denied their basic human rights, including the right to emigrate.

The Senate amendment contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute (sec. 1202) expresses the sense of Congress that the Soviet Union respect the human rights of those Soviet Jews and other Soviet citizens wishing to emigrate from the Soviet Union, practice their religion, exercise cultural rights or engage in free intellectual pursuits.

The committee of conference regards the release of jailed dissidents and the resolu-

tion of longstanding emigration cases as positive developments in the Soviet human rights situation and hopes that this action continues. However, the committee of conference notes with concern that there continues to be political prisoners and unresolved emigration cases, including Jewish refuseniks and U.S.-Soviet divided spouses and continues to be concerned about violations of human rights in the Soviet Union, including restrictions on the practice of religion, the exercise of cultural rights, and the denial of freedom of religion.

SYSTEMATIC NONDELIVERY OF INTERNATIONAL MAIL ADDRESSED TO CERTAIN PERSONS RESIDING WITHIN THE SOVIET UNION

The House bill (sec. 179) contained findings and a statement of policy regarding the systematic nondelivery of international mail by the Soviet Union. The Senate amendment contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute (sec. 1203) expresses the sense of the Congress that the President and the Department of State should express American disapproval of the systematic nondelivery of international mail to the Soviet Government and should ask other member countries of the Universal Postal Union to support the adoption of amendments to the Universal Postal Convention and other measures to encourage improved postal performance by the Soviet Union.

The committee of conference found that postal items mailed in the United States are systematically not being delivered to selected addresses in the Soviet Union; that such nondelivery is a violation of the Universal Postal Convention, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe; and that explanations required under international law and given by the Soviet postal administration have been inaccurate, insufficient, or untimely.

U.S. POLICY AGAINST PERSECUTION OF CHRISTIANS IN EASTERN EUROPE AND THE SOVIET UNION

The Senate amendment (sec. 515) contains extensive findings about the denial of religious freedom to Christians in each of the countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The Senate amendment contains a statement of policy expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should continue to express to the Soviet and East European governments the deep concern and opposition of the United States to the harassment of Christians, the Soviet and East European governments should comply with their international commitments to respect human rights and should immediately cease the persecution of Christians. The House bill contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute (sec. 1204) is similar to the statement of policy section of the Senate amendment expressing concerns about the harassment and persecution of Christians and other believers. The committee of conference notes with grave concern the restrictions on the right to practice and profess religion in the Soviet Union, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and Yugoslavia and the persecution of Christians and other religious believers in those countries. The harassment and persecution of Christians and other believers occurs, in practice, despite the professed policies of most of these countries, and that such harassment and persecution is a violation of the Helsinki Act. The committee of conference also notes the obligations undertaken by each of those nations, except Alba-

TERMINATIONS.—Therefore, the Com-
termines that the PLO and its affilia-
a terrorist organization and a
the interests of the United States, it
nd to international law and should
efit from operating in the United

PROHIBITIONS REGARDING THE PLO.
ll be unlawful, if the purpose be to
the interests of the Palestine Libera-
ization or any of its constituent
any successor to any of those, or any
hereof, on or after the effective date
ille—

receive anything of value except in-
onal material from the PLO or any
constituent groups, any successor
or any agents thereof;
expend funds from the PLO or any
constituent groups, any successor
or any agents thereof; or
withstanding any provision of law
ntrary, to establish or maintain an
adquarters, premises, or other fa-
or establishments within the juris-
of the United States at the behest or
n of, or with funds provided by the
e Liberation Organization or any of
tituent groups, any successor to any
or any agents thereof.

ENFORCEMENT.
TTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney
shall take the necessary steps and
e the necessary legal action to effec-
e policies and provisions of this

RELIEF.—Any district court of the
States for a district in which a viola-
his title occurs shall have authority,
tion of relief by the Attorney Gen-
grant injunctive and such other eq-
relief as it shall deem necessary to
the provisions of this title.

EFFECTIVE DATE.
FFECTIVE DATE.—Provisions of this
ll take effect 90 days after the date
ment of this Act.

TERMINATION.—The provisions of this
ll cease to have effect if the Presi-
ties in writing to the President pro-
Of the Senate and the Speaker of the
at the Palestine Liberation Organi-
its agents, or constituent groups
no longer practice or support terror-
ns anywhere in the world.

**XI—GLOBAL CLIMATE PROTECTION
SHORT TITLE.**

title may be cited as the "Global Cli-
tection Act of 1987".

FINDINGS.
ngress finds as follows:
ere exists evidence that man-made
n—the release of carbon dioxide,
orocarbons, methane, and other
ises into the atmosphere—may be
ng a long term and substantial in-
the average temperature on Earth,
menon known as global warming
the greenhouse effect.

early in the next century, an in-
Earth temperature could—
alter global weather patterns as to
effect on existing agricultural pro-
and on the habitability of large por-
the Earth; and

use thermal expansion of the oceans
tial melting of the polar ice caps
iers, resulting in rising sea levels.
portant research into the problem of
change is now being conducted by
United States Government and
ional agencies, and the continu-
nd intensification of those efforts
ucial to the development of an ef-
fined States response.

the consequences of the green-
fect may not be fully manifest until

the next century, ongoing pollution and de-
forestation may be contributing now to an
irreversible process. Necessary actions must
be identified and implemented in time to
protect the climate.

(5) The global nature of this problem will
require vigorous efforts to achieve interna-
tional cooperation aimed at minimizing
and responding to adverse climate change;
such international cooperation will be
greatly enhanced by United States leader-
ship. A key step in international coopera-
tion will be the meeting of the Governing
Council of the United Nations Environment
Program, scheduled for June 1989, which
will seek to determine a direction for world-
wide efforts to control global climate
change.

(6) Effective United States leadership in
the international arena will depend upon a
coordinated national policy.

**SEC. 1102. MANDATE FOR ACTION ON THE GLOBAL
CLIMATE.**

(a) GOALS OF UNITED STATES POLICY.—
United States policy should seek to—

(1) increase worldwide understanding of
the greenhouse effect and its environmental
and health consequences;

(2) foster cooperation among nations to
develop more extensive and coordinated sci-
entific research efforts with respect to the
greenhouse effect;

(3) identify technologies and activities to
limit mankind's adverse effect on the global
climate by—

(A) slowing the rate of increase of concen-
trations of greenhouse gases in the atmos-
phere in the near term; and

(B) stabilizing or reducing atmospheric
concentrations of greenhouse gases over the
long term; and

(4) work toward multilateral agreements.

(b) FORMULATION OF UNITED STATES
POLICY.—The President, through the Envi-
ronmental Protection Agency, shall be re-
sponsible for developing and proposing to
Congress a coordinated national policy on
global climate change. Such policy formula-
tion shall consider research findings of the
Committee on Earth Sciences of the Federal
Coordinating Council on Science and Engi-
neering Technology, the National Academy
of Sciences, the National Oceanic and At-
mospheric Administration, the National Sci-
ence Foundation, the National Aeronautic
and Space Administration, the Department
of Energy, the Environmental Protection
Agency, and other organizations engaged in
the conduct of scientific research.

(c) COORDINATION OF UNITED STATES POLICY
IN THE INTERNATIONAL ARENA.—The Secretary
of State shall be responsible to coordinate
those aspects of United States policy requir-
ing action through the channels of multilat-
eral diplomacy, including the United Na-
tions Environment Program and other
international organizations. In the formula-
tion of these elements of United States
policy, the Secretary of State shall, under
the direction of the President, work jointly
with the Administrator of the Environmental
Protection Agency and other United States
agencies concerned with environmental pro-
tection, consistent with applicable Federal
law.

SEC. 1104. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 24 months after the date of
enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State
and the Administrator of the Environmental
Protection Agency shall jointly submit to all
committees of jurisdiction in the Congress a
report which shall include—

(1) a summary analysis of current interna-
tional scientific understanding of the green-
house effect, including its environmental
and health consequences;

(2) an assessment of United States efforts
to gain international cooperation in limit-
ing global climate change; and

(3) a description of the strategy by which
the United States intends to seek further
international cooperation to limit global
climate change.

SEC. 1105. INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF GLOBAL CLIMATE PROTECTION.

In order to focus international attention
and concern on the problem of global warm-
ing, and to foster further work on multilat-
eral treaties aimed at protecting the global
climate, the Secretary of State shall under-
take all necessary steps to promote, within
the United Nations system, the early desig-
nation of an International Year of Global
Climate Protection.

SEC. 1106. CLIMATE PROTECTION AND UNITED STATES-SOVIET RELATIONS.

In recognition of the respective leadership
roles of the United States and the Soviet
Union in the international arena, and of
their joint role as the world's two major pro-
ducers of atmospheric pollutants, the Con-
gress urges that the President accord the
problem of climate protection a high priori-
ty on the agenda of United States-Soviet re-
lations.

TITLE XII—REGIONAL FOREIGN RELATIONS MATTERS

PART A—SOVIET UNION AND EASTERN EUROPE

SEC. 1201. SOVIET BALLISTIC MISSILE TESTS NEAR HAWAII.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
and the United States are presently negoti-
ating a reduction of nuclear weapons and
have recently concluded an agreement with
respect to reducing the risks of accidental
nuclear war;

(2) the Soviet Union has recently conduct-
ed two tests of its heavy intercontinental
ballistic missiles over trajectories similar to
those which could be used in actual attacks
on the Hawaiian Islands;

(3) the announced impact points for re-
entry vehicles from these tests could have re-
sulted in the overflight of sovereign United
States territory, namely the Hawaiian Is-
lands;

(4) the Soviet Union reportedly encrypted
telemetry from the flight tests in potential
violation of the provisions of bilateral arms
control agreements;

(5) the Soviet Union used a directed
energy device, believed to be a laser, to irra-
diate a United States military aircraft in
international airspace that was monitoring
the tests, having the potential effect of inter-
fering with our national technical means of
verification;

(6) had this test misfired, Soviet ballistic
missile test reentry vehicles could have
landed among the Hawaiian Islands; and

(7) the United States does not test strate-
gic missiles in the direction of or in close
proximity to sovereign Soviet territory.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense
of the Congress that—

(1) the actions of the Soviet Union in test-
ing intercontinental ballistic missiles in the
Hawaiian region and irradiating United
States monitoring aircraft are provocative,
unnecessary, and inconsistent with behav-
ior designed to reduce the risk of nuclear
war;

(2) the United States Government—

(A) should officially and at the highest
levels protest these actions by the Soviet
Union and should inform the Soviet Union
that it cannot tolerate flight tests in close
proximity to sovereign United States terri-
tory or interference with United States mon-
itoring aircraft; and

tions for the resulting damage to United States security.

The conference report also contains several other important provisions:

The conference report provides for United States withdrawal from international organizations which exclude Israel, except for the U.N. Security Council and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

While the conferees extended the timetable for reducing and eventually eliminating foreign service nationals in embassies in Communist countries, the intent of the House provision was maintained.

The conference report provides higher authorization levels than the House bill contained but the Snowe provision adopted in conference ensures that the total authorizations will not exceed the budget summit level.

The conference report prohibits the State Department from acquiring an official residence for the Secretary of State.

The conference also adopted the Solomon-Kassebaum provision restricting U.S. contributions to the United Nations if U.N. budget reforms are not implemented.

Unfortunately the conference rejected the House-passed Walker amendment restricting the use of United States passports for those planning to assist Communist military activity in Central America.

While the conference report is not everything everyone wanted, it is a product I can support. For these reasons, I commend the conference report to you.

I wish again to thank Chairman FASCELL, Mr. MICA, and Ms. SNOWE for their expert management of this bill during markup, initial consideration by the House, and conference.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE], chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and a conferee on this matter.

(Mr. ROE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to H.R. 1777.

Title XI of the conference report—global climate protection—on which the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology served as conferees, recognizes that global climate change could have profound effects on the habitability of the Earth—effects which could begin as soon as the turn of the century. It is clear that climate protection, by virtue of its inherently global nature, holds tremendous opportunities for international scientific and environmental cooperation. However, any attempts to mitigate climate change will also lead to conflicts—in

part because there will be national winners and losers in the climate change sweepstakes, and in part because the science underlying climate change is presently so incomplete.

We should be proud of the role that the United States has played internationally in understanding and responding to climate change. The recent international expedition to study the disappearance of ozone over Antarctica was predominantly a United States expedition, led by scientists from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the National Science Foundation. The largest worldwide research program aimed at understanding the greenhouse effect is conducted by U.S. scientists with the support of the Department of Energy and other agencies. And the United States has taken the lead internationally in developing a global change program aimed at understanding and responding to the long-term global impacts of man on his environment.

While all of these efforts are laudable and indicative of a well-coordinated U.S. research program on climate change, title XI would take the United States further into national and international policy responses to these potential changes. In view of the stakes involved, it is important that these policy discussions begin in parallel with ongoing scientific studies.

Title XI would foster development of policy responses to climate change by directing the President, through the Environmental Protection Agency, to propose to Congress a coordinated national policy on global climate change and by directing the Department of State to coordinate U.S. policy through the channels of multilateral discussion and negotiation. By placing the authority for this effort with the President, the conferees intend that the White House's Office of Science and Technology Policy play a key role in coordination of an integrated Federal policy. The conferees certainly do not expect that a global treaty on emissions of greenhouse gases can be achieved as readily as the recent Montreal Agreement on ozone-depleting CFC's; after all, while the production figures for CFC's are readily available, there is not even a reliable global inventory for greenhouse gas emissions. However, given the potential importance of global climate change, it is clearly desirable that the United States take a leadership role in international discussions.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by discussing the appropriate roles of Federal agencies involved in global climate change. The provision on climate change originally passed by the Senate would have created considerable confusion among U.S. research agencies by designating EPA and the State Department as leaders of an interagency group concerned with both policy development and research. This problem

was corrected in the conference report language and statement of managers. Title XI, while clarifying the roles of EPA and State in policy development, does not affect the current agency roles and interagency process with respect to research on global climate change.

Therefore, nothing in title XI affects the congressional directives contained in the National Climate Program Act, which establishes within the Department of Commerce a "national climate program to understand and respond to natural and man-induced climate processes and their implications." The National Climate Program Office remains charged with coordination of international climate research programs under the act. Further, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology strongly supports the work of the Committee on Earth Sciences of the Office of Science and Technology Policy in its review and coordination of national and international programs in global change, and of the National Academy of Sciences and the International Council of Scientific Unions in their development of national and international research agendas for global change.

Mr. Speaker, a careful, step-by-step process is already underway to develop international cooperation on a comprehensive set of programs aimed at understanding man's impact on the global environment. This process may lead to unprecedented cooperation and cost-sharing on major space-based and land-based research programs and it should be allowed to unfold, without inserting either EPA or the State Department into major new roles in determining the research agenda. EPA's role, in the view of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, should lie in developing, under a consensus interagency process, policies which may be necessary for an effective national response to global climate change. EPA does not, under title XI, have authority to direct, inhibit, or control scientific research by other Federal agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee and on the Energy and Commerce Committee, who were most constructive and cooperative in crafting the final agreement on title XI. I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report for H.R. 1777. This legislation authorizes the budgets of the State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, the United Nations, and other foreign affairs agencies.

We are bringing this conference report up under suspension of the rules to expedite its passage. Conferees only finished work on the confer-

ence report last Tuesday, and because of the Senate's preoccupation with the continuing resolution last week, the final technical corrections were not completed until Saturday.

Before explaining some of the major provisions in this bill that deserve this body's support, I would like to express my appreciation for the leadership of the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations, Mr. Mica. In his stewardship of this legislation, a process which began last March, the chairman has been professional, bipartisan, and most of all fair. This is in keeping with our activities at the Subcommittee on International Operations, where I serve as ranking Republican. At our subcommittee the chairman sets a good example of bipartisanship and provides an opportunity for the views of all Members to be fully aired, regardless of party or ideology.

Both the House and Senate versions of this bill had strong bipartisan support, and originally passed each body overwhelmingly. In the House the vote was 303 to 111, and all but one of the 49 House and Senate conferees signed the conference report.

MICA-SNOWE AMENDMENT

This conference report contains many important provisions from both the House and Senate bills. It retains the basic provisions of the Mica-Snowe amendment on our Moscow Embassy and Mount Alto. Our amendment will expel the Soviets from Mount Alto unless the President can certify three times within 6 months:

First, that we have or will have a secure embassy in Moscow;

Second, that he has taken actions to eliminate the threat of Soviet electronic penetration from Mount Alto; and

Third, that it is vital to our national security not to terminate the United States-Soviet Embassy exchange agreement.

I would like to emphasize that all three of these determinations must be made for the waiver to be used. They establish a strict criteria, but if that criteria cannot be met, the Soviets should never have been allowed to be there in the first place.

FUNDING/UNITED NATIONS

This bill represents a freeze at the fiscal year 1987 appropriate level, with the exception of an additional \$200 million for the United Nations. This additional authorization was contained in the Senate bill. The conference report authorizes our full assessed contribution for the United Nation and affiliated agencies, in recognition of the budget reforms since the original Kassebaum-Solomon amendment 2 years ago.

In acting on U.N. funding, the conferees were presented with a special problem. On one hand, neither the budget resolution nor the November 20 budget agreement with the administration provides full funding for the United Nations. But because of the

budget reforms at the United Nations, the administration urged conferees to provide full authorization, even though appropriations will fall short.

BUDGET SUMMIT COMPLIANCE

But while the conferees approved full authorization for the United Nations this conference report also ensures that the extra authorization will not be used to exceed the November 20 budget agreement. The conferees adopted a provision I offered to prohibit the appropriation of any funds in excess of the cap for the foreign affairs function contained in the budget agreement.

Thus, this conference report is the first authorization bill to be specifically in compliance with the budget agreement. From the very beginning of the authorization process, the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Mica, and I have worked to produce both a responsible and realistic authorization bill. I am pleased that we are now completing that process in the same spirit.

OTHER PROVISIONS

This conference report also contains other important provisions. It would:

Close the PLO information offices in Washington and New York;

Condemn Toshiba for selling sensitive military technology to the Soviets, and direct the Secretary of State to seek reparations for damage to United States national security;

Require full reciprocity in the treatment of diplomatic personnel and facilities between the United States and the Soviet Union;

Provide a strong American preference for Voice of America contracting;

Prohibit the State Department from acquiring an official residence for the Secretary of State; and

Restrict U.S. contributions to the United Nation if it fails to implement its new budget reforms.

I must inform my colleagues that the State Department does not support this conference report. This is unfortunate, because both parties and both bodies have strongly supported this bill, and we worked in conference to modify areas where we believed the State Department had legitimate concerns. It appears that the Department is now in the uncomfortable position of having little left in the bill to oppose. That State nevertheless continues to oppose the bill, is an indication that the Department doesn't want an authorization bill of any kind. It simply wants its money with no strings attached.

The State Department is threatening to recommend a veto on issues such as:

The Moscow Embassy provisions;

The closure of the PLO office in New York;

Reform in the Department's performance award system, which has been riddled with favoritism and abuse;

Polygraph requirements for the Department's security personnel, which

will bring its security procedures in line with the intelligence agencies and the Department of Defense; and

That we still aren't providing sufficient funding.

All of these point merely give Members of this body more reasons to support this bill.

Finally, I am confident that President Reagan will sign this bill without hesitation if he considers it on its merits. If we stand united we can send a strong message to the State Department that Congress has a legitimate role in determining how this Nation's business ought to be run. I urge my colleagues to provide overwhelming support to this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. LUJAN].

(Mr. LUJAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, as ranking Republican member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, I would like to address my comments to title XI of the conference report—global climate protection. It was this provision that the Science Committee had conferees.

As originally introduced by the Senate, this provision called for the establishment of a task force on the global climate to determine and supervise the research necessary for a coordinated national strategy on the global climate, and to develop and implement such a strategy both domestically and internationally.

As a result of the extensive discussions and negotiations within the House by the Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, and Science, Space and Technology Committees, a consensus was arrived at that the near-term and long-term research agenda of the Federal Government was well in hand.

The House acknowledges and complements that commitment of NASA, NSF, NOAA, DOE, and the Navy in a coordinated Federal effort.

Furthermore, the House notes that through the Office of Science and Technology Policy's [OSTP] Federal R&D Coordinating Committee on Earth Sciences, the United States will have an increased understanding of the global system, as well as the ability to assess mankind's impact on our global environment. The U.S. research agenda is certainly an international one and involves the collaboration of foreign scientists and nations. I would like to acknowledge the concerns raised by the President's science adviser in his December 14, 1987, letter to the conferees that there are already mechanisms and existing legislation to implement a national policy

In order to safeguard against duplication of effort and to secure that various functions within the Government are appropriately placed with agencies' mission, the provision adopted by House and Senate conferees places the responsibility with the President for a coordinated national policy on global climate

in this context, is the Office of the President, and thereby assures that his science adviser, the OSTP and his domestic, economic and international advisors will work toward a truly national and coordinated policy.

The international scientific community, through the International Council of Scientific Unions [ICSU], is working on global geosphere-biosphere modelling, data and information systems, techniques for extracting environmental data from the past, and several atmospheric chemistry, marine and global ecosystem projects. Their capabilities are building upon the results of a joint ICSU-World Meteorological Organization Climate Research Programme.

Finally, the provision adopted by the conferees will call upon the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] to begin thinking of appropriate implementation action, once our understanding of the global climate advances. EPA's input will compliment the activities of other agencies in the Federal Government, as well as recognize the discrepancies in international environmental programs. The Department of State will thereby have the necessary data for negotiating with other countries for a truly comprehensive global effort.

I include the correspondence from Dr. William Graham, Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, following my statement:

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND
TECHNOLOGY POLICY.

Washington, DC, December 14, 1987.

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to transmit to you my views regarding the contents of Title XI, H.R. 1777/S. 1394 (prior to agreed conference report of December 8, 1987), the Global Climate Protection Act of 1987. While the intent of the Global Climate Protection Act of 1987 is certainly laudable, the concerns are today being well met through existing activities. Although it is not the intention, passage of the proposed legislation would conflict with existing legislation and, in fact, seriously disrupt the organized effort underway.

Congress legislated coordination of science activities affecting more than one agency to the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) and its Federal Coordinating Council for Science, Engineering, and Technology (FCCSET) in PL 94-282. The Committee on Earth Sciences (CES) was established under the FCCSET to coordinate the federal research efforts on Earth sciences with the responsibility to increase the understanding of the Earth as a global system, particularly in assessing humankind's impact on the global environment. Scientific understanding is absolutely essential if we are to be able to evaluate technologies and activities that may have adverse effects on the global climate. Several agencies, including NASA, NSF, NOAA, DOE, and Navy, have mounted strong research efforts in the area of global climate change. Since the several appropriate roles for federal agencies are being determined and coordinated by the CES, we do not feel that it is appropriate to name a single lead agency.

International programs are being developed to support national research programs and interests, in concert with U.S. policy. As additional efforts appropriate for the international sphere are identified, they will be incorporated into the present structure.

Therefore further legislation in this area is not necessary.

Global climate protection is a long-term effort that requires a long-term commitment, and a year would indicate a short-term effort. Therefore, I do not support the establishment of an International Year of Global Climate Protection.

In conclusion, I strongly recommend against passage of the Global Climate Protection Act of 1987, Title XI, H.R. 1777/S. 1394. I look forward to continuing to work with you to ensure the conduct of excellent scientific research and international coordination in the U.S. interest, in all areas including that of global climate change.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM R. GRAHAM,
Director.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentlewoman from Maine for yielding me this time.

[Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.]

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to suspend the rules and pass the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, there were some moments on the way to the passage of this legislation when we had some doubts that we would be standing here today in support of the conference report. Our Subcommittee on International Operations moved diligently and swiftly at the beginning of the year, under the effective leadership of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] and the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE]. We finished our work in March. But we were stalled by the administration's resistance to our legislation, even at the point when we were trying to get a rule.

Our leaders persevered, despite a series of apparent security disasters overseas which required extensive personal attention and the rewriting of some part of the bill.

After floor consideration of this legislation, we went into another deep freeze, awaiting Senate action. When they finished working their will on this legislation, we had perhaps 200 items in disagreement.

The able staffs of the two Houses were able to resolve the vast bulk of some 200 items in disagreement in consultation with the Members. When unanimity was lacking among the House and Senate minority and majority, the issue was referred to the full conference. We also had participants from the Ways and Means, Commerce, Science and Technology, Post Office, and Judiciary Committees on matters within the jurisdictions of those panels. We were able to reach final agreement within a matter of a few days because of the enormously cooperative attitude of the other body in laying to rest the few items we had to discuss. I hope that this spirit of cooperation will also be reflected in further consideration of foreign assistance legislation which recently passed the

House and now needs to be considered by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides the necessary funding, the necessary flexibility, and the necessary oversight to ensure that the American people get the diplomatic representation and public diplomacy that they deserve. The bill makes a number of important statements on foreign policy.

For example, we agreed on language on the situation in Tibet, calling upon the occupying Chinese to grant cultural and religious rights to the inhabitants of that land. We will be requiring that the administration provide information on the counterterrorism activities, if any, of major countries around the world, so that, for example, when we receive foreign visitors, we will have in readily available form information on that actions, or lack of actions, on this critical matter. We will be requiring that the offices of the Palestine Liberation Organization in New York and Washington be shut down. We will be tightening up on security in our embassies through a variety of legislative provisions. And most importantly, we will be authorizing spending for these important diplomatic security functions as well as for the conduct of foreign policy.

It is important to note that this bill limits funding to the November 20 budget summit agreement for foreign affairs.

This conference report, Mr. Speaker, will not completely satisfy every Member because no compromise will ever provide every Member, or either House, with everything they want. But we were able to reach compromises through hard bargaining. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this compromise by voting to pass this conference report.

I would like the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA], to engage in a colloquy with regard to funding for the Food and Agriculture Organization, the FAO.

Mr. Speaker, I note that in the conference report on the Department of State Authorization Act that the Food and Agriculture Organization [FAO] is not earmarked. I am concerned about this since the FAO is an important international organization and we in the Congress have supported its useful work in promoting improvements in agriculture and fisheries in many countries of the world. Because of currency fluctuations, my understanding is that FAO actually saved moneys in 1987 in the amount of \$9 million. Early reports from the Department of State on the general conference that just concluded in Rome indicate that the organization did not adopt budget reform procedure mandated by the 1985 Kassebaum-Solomon amendment to the Foreign Relations Authorization Act.

This would trigger a reduction from 25 to 20 percent of the U.S. contribution to FAO until it does adopt the budget reform mechanism under this Department of State Authorization Act; however, I hope that the Department would make an effort to provide funding for FAO to enable it to continue this work and that the United States and our allies would work together diplomatically to promote in FAO the adoption of the budget procedure. I fear that we may face a difficult situation here: if we don't fund FAO, it may not be interested in introducing a budget reform mechanism; if we do, it would have a greater interest in looking with favor on the introduction of a budget reform measure. I hope that early in the New Year, the gentleman from Florida will help us look into the FAO situation in the hope of finding ways to have it participate along with the other U.N. specialized agencies in the reform process.

□ 1330

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman's concern. I would like to make it clear that I will look into the situation.

I do feel that every organization within the U.N. needs to be a part of that reform process. I think we all agree that if there is no reform down the line, there will be more problems. I will urge them to adopt the provisions of Kassebaum-Solomon and all the reform provisions. I certainly understand the gentleman's concern.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks and his supportive statement.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have my differences with the State Department but I rise in support of the conference report because it takes an important step against the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO]. A few weeks ago I offered a motion to instruct conferees to accept a Senate provision that would close the PLO offices in Washington and the PLO's U.N. mission in New York. This provision prevailed in conference.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a storm of controversy about this provision, much of it based on misunderstandings. Recently the New York Times echoing the State Department, editorialized that signing the PLO provision into law would "mock the Constitution and treaties relating to the U.N."

This is complete and utter nonsense and it is time we set the record straight. First, the U.S. District Court ruled that the PLO's case that its first

amendment rights were violated was "utterly meritless." Let me repeat—"utterly meritless." That's about the strongest statement a court can make.

This is not a first amendment issue. No American is limited in any way from advocating the Palestinian cause—the bill only prevents people from acting as official paid agents of the PLO—a terrorist organization that kills Americans.

It is simply a lie that this bill violates the U.S. headquarters agreement. An internal State Department memorandum admits this, yet Members of Congress and the State Department continue to spread this misinformation.

The U.N. headquarters agreement does not even contain the words "observer mission." All observer missions exist under a clause pertaining to "invitees" that was never intended to cover permanent offices or missions. All U.N. observer missions remain in New York under the courtesy of the United States and have no—zero—rights in the headquarters agreement.

Moreover, under the national security clause attached by Congress to the U.N. headquarters agreement, the United States has the right to expel any aliens from its territory if necessary for U.S. security interests.

The PLO is the world's richest and one of the world's most brutal terrorist organizations. It has killed many Americans, Israelis, and moderate Arabs around the world.

This is not just a feel good measure. Legitimacy is a terrorist organization's greatest asset. The U.S. Congress can and should strike a blow at the heart of the PLO's legitimacy by kicking the PLO out of the United States. We can begin, here and now, to banish the PLO from the world's capitols and international bodies.

The idea that the PLO, an organization who's charter demands the elimination of Israel, a member of the United Nations, is somehow protected by the U.N.'s charter or by international law, is absolutely ludicrous.

I support the anti-PLO provision and the conference report.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this State Department authorization, and I am proud to say that I have five amendments which I have added to this bill. This always comes as a great surprise to that self-appointed god of the Congressional Quarterly, Alan Ehrenhalt, who decides what Members are worth around here. In Ehrenhalt's information I also have seven Dornan amendments to the foreign assistance act, but today I would like to proudly discuss my five amendments to State authorization briefly. The first amendment demands that the Soviet Union free emigration for Soviet Jews. This

is hard-hitting language directed at human right violations in the Soviet Union. Mr. Gorbachev, the General Secretary, showed quite vividly how the Soviets hate to hear this discussed, but that is just too bad. This country believes in human rights.

Another amendment also condemns the U.S.S.R. for its systematic interference with international mail. For the first time it directs our Government to negotiate with their Soviet counterparts about it. The idea is to put some teeth into our protection of the international mail. Unfortunately, the Soviets just arbitrarily dump mail addressed to Soviet Pentecostals, Soviet Jews and refuseniks in general. The interception of mail in the U.S.S.R. is an ugly interference with one of the Helsinki baskets. The claim, of course, by the Soviets is that they do respect the international mail.

My third amendment condemns the Romanian Government for the very first time for its systematic destruction of the culture of the Hungarian people who live inside that part of Romania generally called Transylvania. My amendment also underscored the right of Hungarians in Transylvania to self-determination.

My fourth amendment is one which did not have a sponsor on the Senate side. I will certainly not make that mistake next time. The Senate, in conference, took the teeth out of this amendment, which directed the United Nations to at least make a study of why the Soviet Union has three votes in the United Nations while every one of the other 167 nations only 1 vote. Why does the Soviet Union have a separate vote for Byelorussia, sometimes called White Russia and the Ukraine. They have three votes. That was what President Roosevelt gave Uncle Jce Stalin as a little inducement to get him into the United Nations. I think it is time to get rid of those bonus votes and that is what my amendment attempts to do.

My fifth amendment is designed to tell the Soviet Union that we believe in the right of self-determination for the separate nations of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Tragically, these captive nations were swallowed up by the U.S.S.R. nearly 50 years ago.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER].

(Mr. SENSENBRENNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, title XI of the conference report to H.R. 1777 includes provisions on global climate protection. I rise today in support of this legislation.

The history of international cooperation in the study of the global environment has a rich tradition. As early as the 19th century, weather observing stations were coordinated inter-

nationally to better understand and predict weather patterns. Subsequently, the First and Second International Polar Years gathered scientists from over 40 nations to study and publish on such topics as atmospheric ozone, Earth currents, astronomy and biology.

Mr. Speaker, today, we witness the continuation of this international tradition. In hearings before the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology earlier this year, we heard testimony on the many domestic and international activities already being undertaken to study the phenomenon of global change. Along with advances in the scientific understanding of the processes which affect the Earth system, we also have new technologies to examine and document these phenomenon.

On an international level, the International Council of Scientific Unions has served to define issues of relevance to the global change program and to coordinate the efforts of national programs around the world. The European Space Agency, the Japanese Institute of Space and Astronautical Science, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA] have proposed to undertake the International Solar-Terrestrial Program. Finally, the Man and the Biosphere Program [MAB] continues to work with issues of land management and ecosystem conservation in the tropics. This list is not all inclusive, Mr. Speaker, but merely highlights the truly international character of this attempt by man to better understand his global environment.

On a domestic level, Mr. Speaker, the list of ongoing agency activity is equally impressive. In fact, the President's Office of Science and Technology Policy [OSTP] reviewed Federal agency roles and missions in relation to the Global Change Program. The Office of Science and Technology Policy's Committee on Earth Sciences remains charged with developing long-range plans for Federal R&D in Earth sciences and man's impact on global environment.

Their recommendations include: NASA should be responsible for Earth science missions from space; NOAA is to be responsible for maintaining data sets on Earth's geosphere-biosphere systems and weather, climate, and oceanographic data; and the National Science Foundation is responsible for basic research in all areas of Earth science.

This list also, Mr. Speaker, is not exhaustive, however, it is the intent of the conference committee to recognize the important contributions these agencies and others are doing in the area of global climate change and the legislation before Congress today does not seek to alter their respective missions.

The conference report states that the President, which is intended to mean the President's Office through the Science Adviser and the Office of Science and Technology Policy, will work with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to develop and propose to Congress a coordinated national policy on global climate change. The conference report further authorizes the Secretary of State to coordinate aspects of U.S. policy through international organizations. A report will then be submitted to Congress which will supplement other ongoing studies and reports on global change for purpose of providing their recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, the history of international scientific cooperation on this subject is encouraging. As a conferee to the provisions of H.R.

1777 which address global climate protection, I support the development of a coordinated national policy so this country can continue its effective participation with other nations to address this important issue.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walker.]

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill left the House of Representatives, it contained an amendment which banned the use of U.S. passports for the purpose of helping Nicaraguan military operations or military operations of Communist guerrilla groups in Central America. As this bill comes back from conference, it contains no such language. I am told that it was a rather strange process that developed to assure that that language would not be included in this bill, so I am going to relate the story as I heard it, and if anybody has any reason to doubt anything I say, I would appreciate being corrected on the situation.

I am told that that particular amendment was eliminated, first of all, on a straight party line vote in conference, that the Democrats all voted in favor of American passports being used to help Nicaraguan military operations and Communist military groups, and that the Republicans all voted against that proposition.

I think it is important to understand that on this issue the two parties were divided. But the Democrats also in their straight party line vote decided not to support the position of this House by which this House had gone on record in taking that position, and the Democrats specifically decided the position of this House should not be defended and should not prevail in the conference.

□ 1340

Now, I have also been informed that there was a reason why the Democrats took that straight party line position beyond the fact that there seems to be a constant desire around this body to help the Sandinistas down there. We seem to be able to put all kinds of limitations on freedom fighters in Central America or on El Salvador or on some of our friends, but when it comes to the Communist guerrilla groups or the Sandinistas, we seem to be able then to slide by and help them; but I am also told that the majority staff was actually told that if my language, my amendment on this was included in the conference report being brought to this floor, that that bill would never reach this floor, that the Democratic leadership on that side was bound and determined that we were not going to have any kind of language brought to this floor that included my amendment.

Now, I will tell you that I find that to be rather disturbing. It seems to be that the House position was clear. It deserved to be defended. If certain

leaders in this House do not like what the House decides by majority vote, I do not think they have the right to pressure that committee in ways to keep legislation off this floor simply to get certain language out. That is not the democratic process. It once again goes back to the kind of tyranny that seems to prevail in this place with regard to issues I think of real importance. I find it disturbing. I do not think it is the right way to proceed.

I feel very strongly that it shows how far we will go in this Congress to protect the Communist military in Nicaragua, but it also says a lot about this House, that despite the positions taken by the majority, the majority will get thwarted when it comes to defending the very extreme left wing positions of the Democratic leadership.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman complaining about the democratic processes on a bill that came to us under suspension? The rules had to be suspended because the bill exceeds the scope of our rules.

The majority Democrats would waive the Constitution if they could. There never have been any rules around here that the majority has not been willing to waive whenever it suits the convenience or whimsy of the leadership.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I thank the gentleman for pointing that out. There is also another disturbing aspect of what we have happening here. It is very hard to reflect on some of the things that have gone wrong, such as this process, when in fact the rules are being thrown out, that we are determining these things under very questionable processes. I find this disturbing. I would hope the Members would vote against the conference report.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time.

I am not on this committee. Therefore, I think from the beginning I would like to express my appreciation to the members of the committee for their patience with me with this respect to one provision in this bill. I became concerned about our Embassy agreements long before the sensational incidents of the Embassy security in Moscow broke in the news. I had a bill drafted. I had legislation that I wanted to move forward regarding the Embassy agreements, particularly with respect to disallowing the Soviets from occupying Mount Alto.