

colleagues here in the Senate to understand. In fact, I know that you helped to lead a delegation to those proceedings in Kyoto. This treaty will require the United States to drastically reduce its greenhouse-gas emissions, presumably by rationing our energy consumption and assessing taxes on energy use and production.

The reduction of pollutants, of course, is a laudable goal. I wholeheartedly support efforts that will produce a cleaner environment. But what the administration fails to adequately appreciate is that protecting the environment is a global issue, one all nations must actively take part in if global environmental protection is truly to be attained. The administration would like the American people to believe that this debate is about who is for or against the environment; but, that is not the case. This debate is about whether or not this particular treaty is in the best interests of the American people and the global environment.

The underlying hypothesis used by proponents of the treaty is that greenhouse gases, which trap the sun's infrared rays and heat the earth's atmosphere, have become so abundant in the atmosphere that a "global warming" effect has commenced, and that the cause of this phenomenon is manmade. On the basis of this as-yet unproven connection between human activity and the climate, delegates at the climate change conference in Kyoto reached an agreement to curb greenhouse-gas emissions. The treaty, if ratified, would legally bind the U.S. to cut its overall emissions of six gases by seven percent below 1990 levels by 2012. However, 130 developing countries, such as Mexico, China, Korea, and India, would not be held liable to these same standards.

The evidence of global warming is inconclusive, at best. For the past 20 years, precisely the same 20 years during which carbon dioxide levels have increased the most, the earth has actually cooled. This cooling flies in the face of the theory that man-made emissions are causing a global warming effect. Models cannot accurately predict what the weather will be like next week, let alone what temperatures will prevail on Earth in the next century. The only consensus that has been reached within the scientific community—that future effects of fossil-fuel use are most likely to be gradual over many decades to come—gives good reason for the U.S. government not to rush to judgement.

Committing the U.S. to these targets will have severe economic effects on American families and workers. According to the Heritage Foundation, holding emissions to 1990 levels will raise energy prices between 50 and 200 percent; average households would pay \$1,620 in additional taxes a year; and the economy would contract by a total of \$3.3 trillion, all by the year 2020. I note that these figures are based on re-

ducing greenhouse-gas emissions to 1990 levels only; going seven percent below these levels, as agreed to by the Clinton administration, will result in more serious hardships for the American people. Furthermore, the AFL-CIO estimates that reducing emissions to 1990 levels will result in the loss of 1.25 to 1.5 million American jobs. And these jobs will not simply disappear; rather, industry will move overseas and reestablish itself in those countries that are not legally bound to gas-emissions targets. These combined effects would place the U.S. at a competitive disadvantage, while failing to address the global problem of soaring amounts of pollution produced by the developing nations of the world.

Meanwhile, the developing countries are projected to continue accelerating their use of fossil fuels during the next century. By 2015, China will surpass the U.S. in total carbon emissions. Without the full participation of the developing countries in any treaty of this kind, unilateral attempts by the developed nations to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions will not significantly slow the steady increase of carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere.

In sum, the United States should not be party to a global climate treaty that is not supported by a scientific consensus, that puts an unfair burden on American workers and consumers, and that asks us to turn back the clock on economic growth and our standard of living. More importantly, this treaty fails to effectively address the issue because it ignores the developing countries of the world. It simply does not make sense, either environmentally or economically, to focus on the nations that are already spending billions on pollution control and making substantial progress, while ignoring developing nations—countries where emissions could be curbed by employing the same basic technologies the United States has used so successfully to reduce its levels of pollution. U.S. companies, using the best available technology, are able to eliminate the bulk of pollution from their emissions. To achieve an additional increment of pollution reduction, developed nations like the U.S. would be required to expend inordinate sums of money in pursuit of only marginal improvements. The costs associated with attempting to squeeze out the last increments of pollution will heavily outweigh any benefits in the developed nations. However, in countries where pollution-control technology is not as advanced or widespread as it is here, a dollar spent on equipment will provide far greater reductions in overall pollution. Thus, the cost/benefit ratio favors pressing developing nations to catch up with us. The Global Climate Treaty does not do this.

Faced with certain defeat on this issue, the administration has resorted to a level of fear mongering which I think has been unmatched since the 1970s, when some of the same scientists who are promoting global warming

warned at that time that we were about to enter upon the next ice age. I find it hard to believe that in a mere 20 years, our climate has moved from one extreme to the other. In a December Wall Street Journal article, Arthur Robinson and Zachary Robinson of the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine point out that "there is not a shred of persuasive evidence that humans are responsible for increasing global temperatures." But the administration, in an effort to rally support, issues apocalyptic warnings that, if global warming is not headed off, we will experience floods, droughts, rising sea levels, and the spread of infectious diseases. The global warming hypothesis should not be taken as fact; Americans should not be scared into accepting unsubstantiated scenarios as the truth.

The Senate fulfilled the first half of its "advise and consent" role this summer by passing the Byrd-Hagel resolution 95 to 0. That bipartisan advice instructed the administration not to sign a treaty that did not include the developing countries of the world in the same emission-control requirements, or a treaty that would cause great economic harm to America. The treaty to which the administration has agreed meets neither of these guidelines. Therefore, because the administration was unwilling to consider the Senate's advice, I do not believe the Senate will give its consent—nor should it.

#### THE HONORABLE TERRY SANFORD

AUGUST 20, 1917-APRIL 18, 1998

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I was regrettably late in learning about the inevitable death of former U.S. Senator Terry Sanford this past Saturday, April 18. I say inevitable because it was. All of us, especially Terry himself, knew what was coming when last December the fatal inoperable cancer was discovered.

Terry faced up to the reality of it all with his typical courage. He told reporters at the time that he would continue to be active as long as he could, and take every day as it came. Then he plunged into a whirlwind fund-raising schedule on behalf of a project near and dear to his heart.

It was impossible not to like and admire Terry Sanford. He was never one of my supporters, nor was I ever one of his. But we were friends and there was never a hint of discord during his six years in the Senate—or before, for that matter, or since.

As Senators who were here during Senator Sanford's six years will testify, Terry was a respected colleague. For my part, I always had the feeling that he had been vastly more comfortable being Governor. He could push a button then and things happened. Not so with the Senate. We sort of canceled each other's vote in the Senate much of the time he was here but there never was an instance when we didn't work together for the betterment of North

Carolina. And there was never the slightest hostility.

In short, Mr. President, I liked Terry Sanford. He has undeniably left his mark upon the destiny of the state he loved—and certainly upon Duke University which was the multi-million dollar beneficiary of his skillful fund-raising ability.

He lived life to the fullest; he was a man who loved his family and his country. If he ever wasted a moment, I am not aware of it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that The Washington Post report of Senator Sanford's death, published April 19, 1998, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 19, 1998]

TERRY SANFORD, EX-U.S. SENATOR AND N.C. GOVERNOR, DIES  
(By Martin Weil)

Terry Sanford, 80, a former governor of North Carolina and president of Duke University, whose career as a widely admired and respected Democratic political leader culminated with a term in the U.S. Senate, died of cancer yesterday at his home in Durham, N.C.

An amiable man, loyal to his party but known also for independent thinking, Gov. Sanford became known early in his career for an ability—based on both personality and principle—to achieve substantial political success in a political environment often thought uncongenial to the moderate or progressive views he espoused.

This, and his high profile leadership at Duke, attracted the interest and support of many Democrats both inside and outside his native North Carolina, who saw him as representing their party's possibilities of survival in the South, at a time when a Republican tide was sweeping through what had once been a solidly Democratic region. Ranked in a Harvard University study as one of the 20th-century's most creative governors because of his achievements in the statehouse from 1961 to 1965, Gov. Sanford made forays onto the national stage in the 1970s; in 1972 and in 1976, he sought unsuccessfully his party's presidential nomination.

Gov. Sanford's inoperable cancer was diagnosed in December. He underwent a second round of chemotherapy last week before being discharged on Wednesday from the Duke University Medical Center.

Heart valve surgery during his campaign for reelection to the Senate made his health a campaign issue at that time, and was believed to have contributed to his defeat. Indeed, his election to the Senate in 1986 was seen as a kind of last hurrah for a 69-year-old whose electoral career had seemed to peak years before.

In the Senate, he had made a mark for the forcefulness of his opposition to the Supreme Court nomination of Robert H. Bork. He was also remembered for taking a strong stand in opposition to the nation's embarking on the Persian Gulf War.

It was Gov. Sanford's reputation as a moderate among his fellow Senate Democrats that led them to choose him in 1988 to respond to a speech by President Reagan attacking the campaign against the Bork nomination.

"We are tired of having our integrity impugned," Gov. Sanford said in what was viewed as an eloquent defense of the Senate's right to withhold its consent from presi-

dential nominations. "We are tired of having our sincerity questioned. We are tired of having our intelligence insulted."

The speech, coming from a man who could not be readily characterized as an extremist, was viewed as a landmark in the campaign that led to the rejection of the nomination.

Even after his 1992 defeat at the hands of Republican Lauch Faircloth, Gov. Sanford, a paratrooper in World War II, had continued a life of vigorous activity.

He had been president of Duke from 1969 to 1985, a tenure of unusual duration in one of the most turbulent periods for American higher education. After his defeat, he taught classes there in government and public policy, wrote books, held the rank of senior partner in a law firm, and served as a director of charitable, legal and educational organizations.

Gov. Sanford was born Aug. 20, 1917, in Laurinburg, N.C. where his father was a merchant and his mother taught in the public schools. Dishwashing helped him pay his way through the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill, from which he graduated in 1939. He served in 1941-42 as an FBI agent.

Shortly after the United States entered World War II, he went into the Army; he became a paratrooper, and was involved in five major campaigns in Europe, including the Battle of the Bulge, rising from private to first lieutenant. He held the Combat Infantryman's Badge, the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart. A back injury that plagued him for the rest of his life stemmed from his paratrooper service.

After the war, he graduated from law school at Chapel Hill, served as assistant director of the university's Institute of Government and began the private practice of law in Fayetteville. He served in the state senate in 1953 to 1955.

During his years as governor, he focused on improving public education. He advocated legislation to raise teacher salaries and create a community college system and was known then as one of the nation's "education governors."

He financed many of his improvements with a sales tax on food that he justified in a speech as a "small measure of sacrifice . . . that would swing open the doors to our children . . . and provide the opportunities that will put this state in the front ranks of our community of states."

He was credited with starting an antipoverty program, with helping to defuse tensions over race by setting up Good Neighbor Councils and with calling for employment without regard to race, creed or color. It was Gov. Sanford who was credited with launching North Carolina's State Board of Science and Technology to help convert scientific advances into new techniques for the state's industries.

North Carolina Gov. James B. Hunt Jr. said Gov. Sanford's optimism and commitment to excellence in public education "have changed us forever."

Hunt said that in 1960 he "plugged into the campaign to elect him governor and to me he was the best one ever."

In his first month as Duke president, he showed the flexibility that enabled him to survive and harness the currents of protest that unseated many of his colleagues.

Students blocked traffic in a protest of the shootings of students at Kent State University in Ohio during a Vietnam War protest. Gov. Sanford seized a bullhorn, endorsed the students' anger, but advised: "Don't fight us. Let us all fight Washington together."

Later, the students threatened to take over the school's main administration building. "Great," he said. "Take me with you . . . I've been trying to occupy it for a month."

After stepping down in 1985 from the presidency at Duke, Gov. Sanford was elected to the U.S. Senate.

Survivors include Sanford's wife of 52 years, Margaret; his son, Terry Sanford Jr.; his daughter, Betsee; two grandchildren; and two sisters.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EDUCATION SAVINGS ACT FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2646, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2646) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-free expenditures from education individual retirement accounts for elementary and secondary school expenses, to increase the maximum annual amount of contributions to such accounts, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Delaware, Mr. ROTH, is recognized.

Mr. ROTH. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I am pleased that we have entered into a unanimous consent agreement with respect to H.R. 2646, the Parent and Student Savings Account Plus Act. It is good to see us moving at last toward passage of this significant bill. The importance of giving American families the resources and means they need to educate their children must be above politics.

As I have said before, this bill empowers families—not the federal bureaucracy. It gives resources to the children, not to a monolithic establishment that has grown overbearing and antiquated on a diet of government subsidies.

This bill is a much needed change in the way Washington looks at the education of children. It returns parental involvement to where it should be—at the very foundation of their children's education. It lets them use their money to educate their children, allowing them to put their own money into their own Parent and Student Savings Accounts."

This bill acknowledges that the best thing taxpayers can do with their hard-earned money is to earmark it for the education of their children.

It allows them to increase their contributions from \$500 per year to \$2,000 per year. It allows for withdrawals to be used for elementary and secondary education expenses. And it covers public and private schools.