

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding that Senator BOXER and I have been given 30 minutes in morning business today. Is that true?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. REID. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

EARTH DAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is a lot going on in the world today. We have the conflict in Kosovo. We have, as the Senator from Oregon pointed out, the calamity that has taken place in the State of Colorado, dealing with the death of 16 children, or maybe even more.

In spite of these very dramatic events taking place around the world, I think it is appropriate that we pause and reflect on one of the most important days we have each year, and that is Earth Day, which is tomorrow.

As we know, tomorrow will be the culminating day of this week legislatively because of the events that will take place with the 50th anniversary of NATO. So tomorrow we will be unable to celebrate Earth Day here in the Senate. So Senator BOXER and I felt it was appropriate that we spend some time with some of our colleagues talking about Earth Day and the importance of Earth Day.

There are a number of ways we can celebrate Earth Day, but I think there is no way that is more appropriate than talking about one of the things which sets the United States apart from any other nation, and that is our great National Park System. We are the envy of the rest of the world. When people talk about successes in Government, I think they must reflect upon our National Park System.

We have 54 national parks in the United States. In addition to that, we have a number of other entities within our National Park System that are important. But today I want to talk about our national parks.

We are very fortunate in Nevada; we have one of the 54 national parks. It is a unique setting. The Great Basin National Park is the baby of our National Park System. There is only one national park that is newer than the Great Basin National Park. And we are so happy to have the Great Basin National Park. It was 60 years in its coming.

I can remember when I introduced legislation to have this beautiful facility become a national park. This chart shows part of our national park. It is Wheeler Peak, which is about 13,000 feet high. You can see the majesty of this great mountain.

When I introduced this legislation, President Reagan was President of the

United States. There were times that were very partisan then, as now, and the Secretary of Agriculture was asking the President to veto the creation of the national park.

I called in the Director of the National Park System, William Penn Mott, and I said, I am really worried that the President is going to veto the legislation creating this national park. He looked at me and said, There is no way President Reagan is going to veto this national park. He said, I have been with President Reagan; I worked with him when he was Governor of the State of California, and he has assigned me to be the superintendent of the parks for our country. He said, It was in the 1930s when I was a park ranger that I was called upon by Senator Key Pittman, a Senator from Nevada, to travel to Nevada to find a location for a national park. I went there, and I found that location. It is this exact spot that you have chosen to designate as a national park.

And he said, for political reasons, it has never come to reality. He said that possibility is now, and there is no way that President Reagan would veto the creation of this gem that we have in the State of Nevada.

He was right. The President gladly signed the bill, and we now have as part of our National Park System the Great Basin National Park. We could pick any one of the 54 units in our National Park System, and I am sure people from those States would be just as proud of that park as I am of the Great Basin National Park. This park has Wheeler Peak, which I show you here, but in addition to that, we have in the Great Basin National Park the only glacier in the State of Nevada.

In addition to that, you cannot see them here, but in this park we have bristlecone pine trees, the oldest living things in the world, more than 5,000 years old. We are going to celebrate a new millennium, 2,000 years. Well, 3,000 years before Christ was born, these trees started growing. That is an old tree, oldest living thing in the world located in this national park.

In addition to that, we have the Lehman Caves. The Lehman Caves are interesting because they were discovered unintentionally by a cowboy out doing whatever cowboys do. Suddenly he finds he and his horse have dropped into this subterranean cavern that became the Lehman Caves, which has been visited by hundreds of thousands of people over the years.

I am very proud of our National Park System. I am proud of the Great Basin National Park. Senator GRAHAM and I introduced legislation yesterday that will take \$500 million a year from a fund that is already created, not new taxes, and put it into the National Park System where we are \$4 billion in arrears just maintaining our national parks, maintaining the trails, the bath-

rooms, the information centers, the things that are so necessary to maintain this great program we have called our National Park System.

Certainly as part of Earth Day, we must recognize the fact that part of celebrating Earth Day has to be our National Park System. One last thing, because I see my colleagues on the floor, we are so honored in the State of Nevada, Dale Antonich, who is the chief park ranger of the Lake Mead recreation area, which is part of our National Park System, was chosen as this year's recipient of the Harry Yount National Park Ranger Award for excellence in rangership. This is important because he has been chosen by his peers to be the top park ranger. This says a lot. We are very proud of Lake Mead. It receives about 12 million visitors a year. He is the chief ranger there. I am sure that people who come to the park, to Lake Mead, receive a good experience. I want to give this resident of Boulder City, NV, all the accolades that he deserves as being selected as the top park ranger in our country.

As I indicated, we have set aside 30 minutes. That is all the time we could get today to celebrate Earth Day. I did see in the Chamber my friend from California. I wonder if I could get the attention of my two colleagues. We have 30 minutes that we have set aside to talk about the parks. I am wondering if I could yield time to my friend from California. We are very proud of Nevada, but there is no State in the Union that has more natural beauty than California. I think Nevada has as much natural beauty, but there is no State that has any more natural beauty than the great State of California, which is the neighboring State of the State of Nevada.

I am very happy that the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, is here to talk about some of the beauties of the State of California. I am sure that is what she is going to do; is that not true?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I will speak about global warming.

Mr. REID. Global warming is perfect. That deals with Earth Day, and that is why we are here to talk. How much time does the Senator need?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Is it possible to have 10 to 15 minutes?

Mr. REID. I am sure we have 10 minutes. I yield the Senator from California 10 minutes to talk about global warming and the importance of Earth Day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair, and I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. President, I note that the Senator from Colorado is on the floor. I really want to extend to him and to all of the people of Colorado my deepest

sympathy and sorrow for the events yesterday. After I finish a brief global warming statement, I would like to make a more inclusive statement about the events that took place in Colorado, but I want him to know that my heart and thoughts are with him and the people of Colorado today.

Mr. President, as we prepare to celebrate Earth Day tomorrow, I wanted to speak for a few minutes about what I consider to be the single greatest environmental threat facing our planet: the threat of global warming.

The phenomenon of global climate change really hit home for me in January of 1997. That year, devastating floods killed seven people and caused nearly \$2 billion in damage in California. California is famous for its weather extremes, but the 1997 floods were unusual in terms of their ferocity, the loss of life they caused, and the tremendous property damage that occurred.

Even more striking, the 1997 flood was only one of four 100-year floods that occurred in California in the 1990s. Therefore, it certainly got my attention when I read that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency believes that major changes in the El Nino and La Nina ocean currents, which brought so much rain to California, may be linked to changes in the ocean's temperature.

Last fall, I received an in-depth briefing from Dr. John Holdren, the Teresa and John Heinz Professor of Environmental Policy and Director of the Science, Technology, and Public Policy Program at Harvard University. Dr. Holdren presented clear and compelling evidence to me that global warming is real. It is happening, and it will have significant impacts on human health, our environment, and our economy.

Despite the overwhelming scientific evidence, however, literally every week my office receives bulletins from groups that continue to dispute the reality of global warming. Today I would like to lay out the evidence that global warming is indeed occurring.

There is overwhelming scientific consensus about the following facts: The natural greenhouse effect (which is primarily a product of water vapor, carbon dioxide, and methane) makes the earth habitable, keeping the average surface temperature about 33 degrees Celsius warmer than it would otherwise be.

Large increases in greenhouse gas concentrations resulting from human activities produce significant further global warming, accompanied by other changes in climatic patterns.

Today's atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration is about 30 percent higher than pre-industrial levels. The methane concentration is over 100 percent higher. These levels are higher than at any time in the last 160,000 years.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, an assembly of 2,000 of

the world's leading experts on climate and related disciplines, has found that human activities are increasing the greenhouse effect, and therefore raising the temperature of the planet. It is important to note that the IPCC includes scientists from all member states of the World Meteorological Association and the United Nations.

To quote the IPCC:

The atmospheric concentrations of the greenhouse gases, and among them, carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide, have grown significantly since pre-industrial times . . . These trends can be attributed largely to human activities, mostly fossil fuel use, land-use change and agriculture. Concentrations of other anthropogenic greenhouse gases have also increased. An increase of greenhouse gas concentrations leads on average to an additional warming of the atmosphere and the Earth's surface. Many greenhouse gases remain in the atmosphere—and affect climate—for a long time.

The IPCC estimates that carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere have risen from 280 parts per million before the Industrial Revolution, to 360 parts per million today. By the end of the next century, the carbon dioxide level will be somewhere between 480 and 800 parts per million.

According to the IPCC, this change is "unlikely to be entirely natural in origin. The balance of evidence, from changes in global mean surface air temperature and from changes in geographical, seasonal, and vertical patterns of atmospheric temperature, suggest a discernible human influence on global climate."

Already, these increased greenhouse gas emissions are changing the earth's climate. Here are the facts:

The average temperature of the earth has risen 1.3 degrees in the last 100 years.

Ten of the warmest years on record have occurred in the last 12 years. 1998 was the hottest year on record.

The last 50 years appear to have been the warmest half century in 6,000 years, according to evidence from ice core samples.

Scientific evidence convincingly shows increased rates of evaporation and rainfall, glacier retreat, sea ice shrinkage, and rising sea levels.

The IPCC estimates that by 2100, the earth's temperature will have risen by two to six degrees. This rate of warming, if it were to occur, would be the fastest warming rate in the last 10,000 years.

Even if an overwhelming body of scientific evidence regarding global warming did not exist, the weather map alone would tell us something is wrong. According to the National Climatic Data Center, weather extremes are becoming more and more frequent: hurricanes, tornadoes, blizzards, flooding, droughts. So far this century, extreme weather events have increased by 20 percent. Annual precipitation is up 6 percent since 1900, and total winter precipitation is up 8 percent.

Just look at the period from November 1997 through July 1998, when a series of extreme weather events hit this nation. Northern California had its wettest May ever in 1998, with precipitation in at least one area hitting 800 percent of normal. Meanwhile, Texas suffered under a devastating drought, with San Antonio getting only 8 percent of its normal rainfall in May. In Florida last summer, the U.S. Forest Service estimated that 80 percent of the State was at a drought level equivalent to a desert. Ohio, the Upper Midwest, and New England had no shortage of rain, however; floods in those areas claimed 13 lives.

While individually none of these events can be linked directly to global warming, collectively they show a troubling pattern consistent with what the best science tells us global warming will look like.

Things could get worse. According to the IPCC, one third to one half of all mountain glacier mass could disappear in the next century. Melting glaciers, combined with melting of the antarctic ice shelves, could raise sea level by as much as three feet in the next 100 years. This could cause severe flooding in the San Francisco Bay Area, New Orleans, the Everglades, and the Chesapeake Bay.

The weather changes caused by global warming also could wreak havoc upon the environment and human health. The University of California estimates that global warming could render 20 to 50 percent of the State's natural areas unsuitable for the current species who live there. Major vegetation changes are occurring over one-eighth of the planet. The effects of global warming on human health, including outbreaks of tropical diseases such as malaria and yellow fever, are so significant that I plan to discuss those separately in a floor statement soon.

Global warming is not a problem that we can afford to ignore or dismiss. The scientific evidence is overwhelming and persuasive, and we need to take steps now to reduce global warming. That is why I am circulating a letter, along with Senators GORTON and BRYAN, that encourages the President to work with Congress to implement improved Corporate Average Fuel Efficiency Standards. Cars and light trucks, including sport utility vehicles, are responsible for 20 percent of all carbon emissions in the United States, and emit more carbon than all sources in Great Britain combined.

By raising fuel efficiency standards, we can reduce carbon dioxide emissions by over 240 million tons per year. This will help curb global warming, improve air quality, save consumers at the gas pump, and reduce our reliance on imported oil.

Stronger fuel efficiency standards alone will not solve the global warming

problem, but they are a very good place to start. I am pleased to say that a bipartisan group of 22 Senators have already signed the letter to the President, and I am hopeful that more will sign soon.

I also urge all of my colleagues—especially those who may remain skeptical about the existence of global warming—to attend a briefing that I am hosting on May 11 with scientists from the University of California, including Nobel Laureate Sherwood Rowland. These scientists will discuss recent satellite measurements concerning global climate change; disturbing new evidence that climate change may be occurring more abruptly than scientists had earlier forecast; and possible solutions to the problem.

Global warming is an extremely complicated issue, and I understand that a number of policy alternatives are currently on the table—from the Kyoto Protocol supported by President Clinton, to the “Credit for Early Action” bill sponsored by Senator CHAFEE, to the bill currently being drafted by Senator MURKOWSKI. I do not presume to stand here today with a master plan for how to stop global warming.

But I do feel strongly that global warming’s existence cannot be disputed. It is real. It could cause the greatest environmental crisis of our time. I hope that we can at least recognize the threat, and begin working together to address it.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Colorado, Senator CAMPBELL, be recognized on his own time, and that his speech not appear as part of the 30 minutes dedicated to Senators BOXER and REID, and that his speech appear separate in the RECORD. After that, I tell the Chair that the final approximately 10 minutes that is left for Senators BOXER and REID would be given to the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. LAUTENBERG.

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

The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, our mission this morning is to discuss the environment, and to celebrate the birth of Earth Day, which takes place tomorrow. I will use my time for that purpose.

But I want to take just a minute, because I, like everyone else in this country, am heartbroken by what we saw take place yesterday. In my conversation with the Senator from Colorado, I expressed my sympathies. But I want to point out something. Those children were killed by deranged young people of their own class. But they used guns, and they used weapons that are, frankly, I think out of control in our society. This isn’t just happening in Colo-

rado. It is a terrible happening in Colorado. But look at the other days. It happened in Utah. It has happened in Arkansas, Mississippi, Kentucky, Oregon, and Illinois. Just search your mind and you can find almost every State having had a problem. It is a plague in our society. It is a blight across our country.

There is a bit of a paradox as we talk about Earth Day and the positive aspects of what Earth Day can mean so that children can bathe in the waters, fish in the streams, play on the Earth, and breathe the air—all positive things looking toward an improvement in their health—just under the shadow of the murderous rampage that took place yesterday.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Lisa Haage, a detailee in my office, be granted the privilege of the floor for the duration of the 106th Congress.

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

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues to discuss the Democratic environmental agenda on the eve of Earth Day.

We have an ambitious agenda to protect open spaces, reduce sprawl and relieve congestion.

While Congressional Democrats have an excellent agenda for the future, we also have a proud history of accomplishment since the first Earth Day in 1970. Our nation’s major environmental laws were written and passed under Democratic leadership.

Democrats passed the first Clean Water Act. Democrats wrote the first Superfund law. Democrats authored the Clean Air Act.

And the Clinton Administration has an impressive record of enforcing these laws. The EPA has an outstanding record of cleaning up toxic waste sites under the Superfund program.

For example, by the end of this Fiscal Year, September 30, 95 percent of all Superfund sites will have remedies selected and cleanups beginning or underway.

Overall, the Clinton Administration has cleaned up more Superfund sites in the past two years than in the first 12 years of program.

Administrator Browner has also had success protecting our nation’s drinking water, reducing smog so that children breathe healthier air, and cleaning up our lakes and rivers for swimming and fishing.

Mr. President, today, I would specifically like to talk about my brownfields bill and its promise to reduce sprawl and protect our environment.

My common sense brownfields bill, S. 20, will help accomplish all of these goals.

My bill will help turn a contaminated, abandoned parcel of land into a new school, a new business or a new

playing field. And the benefits will multiply from there. Cleaning up brownfields protects open spaces by keeping commercial development inside our cities, where it creates jobs and can lower property taxes.

With more reuse and redevelopment in our cities, there will be less pressure to develop farmland and parkland outside our cities.

How do we make this happen? By making grant money available for States and cities to start the redevelopment of brownfields, and using their own zoning codes and no Federal regulations with that so that they can make sure people who are interested in buying and developing these sites aren’t sued for the contamination that was never their fault.

Brownfields need not be a blight on our communities but an opportunity for smart growth.

Mr. President, fortunately, brownfields is not a partisan issue. In fact, many Republican Senators have supported the thrust of my legislation. This means, on this Earth Day, we have a chance to do something that will protect our environment and open spaces, and leave a better world for our children and grandchildren.

We should not miss the opportunity to do so.

Mr. President, we have pending before us the reauthorization of Superfund. It is now 2 years since the Superfund bill expired, and we still continue to operate. But we don’t derive any of the revenues that were supposed to be part of the bill. We can’t get a Superfund bill that is decent that doesn’t protect the polluters, which is what Superfund was all about. It says, let the responsible parties pay for their damage. It has worked pretty well.

I was at a site in New Jersey that was the No. 1 Superfund site in the country. A company there agreed, finally, to pay \$100 million toward the restoration of this site. I was there on Saturday to commemorate this new development. It was a spectacular day. I was there with the Little League. They even let me throw out the first pitch. That is the only first pitch I have thrown out. I haven’t been invited by the Yankees, or otherwise. But to be able to throw out a pitch to the Little League, to see a softball field next to that, a hardball, a regular baseball field next to that, a soccer field next to that, all developed out of what was a horrible toxic waste site. The lake is clean. Before, there were signs for the children to avoid getting too near the lake because there was poisonous material in there. No fish could live—nothing.

When he celebrated the cleanup of that lake 2 years ago, the mayor of Pitman, NJ, a fellow named Bruce Ware, stood next to me, and he said, “I am going to fulfill a promise that I made years ago that if this lake ever got

cleaned up I am going in it." With that, he turned, fully dressed, with his tie and his jacket and his suit, and he jumped in the lake. He was so ecstatic about the fact that this community was going to be rid of this blighted parcel of land—about 100 acres, a big piece of land.

It is fantastic. I believe it will result in not only more revenues for the community but also a lifting of the spirit in that community.

That is what we ought to be doing. We ought not tinker with Superfund, to reduce it, to emasculate it such that it has no power and no strength.

I hope we are going to be able to do that in the next few days. I hope the American people will insist that as we attempt to clean up our land and avoid the sprawl that we are living with that we will pay attention to what we have as a society in terms of an obligation to future generations.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair for the opportunity to have the floor.

I yield the floor.

TRAGEDY IN LITTLETON, COLORADO

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I want to say a few words about the tragedy in Colorado. I want to express my sincere sympathies for the families and victims of yesterday's events.

Once again, we have witnessed a deadly school shooting in America's heartland. Yesterday's events, although greater in magnitude than other shootings in recent years, have, it seems, become part of a growing trend in this country, and particularly among young people, and that is to solve everyday problems with deadly violence.

Now, some of us have heard firsthand the gruesome effects of gun violence. But we can't imagine what the classmates and families of those Colorado children must be going through today. The senseless loss, the graphic memories, the fear of violence, the lack of explanation.

Who among us can imagine how we would feel if two dozen of our friends and classmates were gunned down in a matter of minutes? Who among us knows what we would say to our own children if something like this happened at their school? And who among us wants to imagine what it would be like to receive that phone call telling us that our child is no more.

Mr. President, this is a time for grieving, but it is also a time for sincere reflection on the direction of this country and the nature of child on child violence. Sadly, this nation has experienced an ever increasing number of these incidents in the last two years. We saw it happen in Pearl, Mississippi where two students were killed. We saw it happen in West Paducah, Kentucky where three students were killed. We

saw it in Jonesboro, Arkansas where five were killed and in Springfield, Oregon where two were killed.

We saw a five-year-old Memphis, Tennessee kindergartner last year bring a gun to school because the teacher had given him "timeout" the day before. Now Littleton, Colorado joins that tragic list.

We are still learning the specifics of this latest tragedy. But while this most recent incident may have been executed with more deadly results, it is all too familiar. We must struggle to learn why these incidents are happening with ever increasing frequency. Are children more troubled than they have been in the past? Do parents need to pay more attention to danger signals within their own homes? Do parents even have the ability to recognize danger signs? And do they know what to do when they see the signs of trouble?

I am certain that we will all continue to ask these questions in the coming days and weeks. I hope we don't stop asking until we find some answers.

One area in which I have been working for many years is the problem of gun access. I realize that bringing up gun control at this time might be viewed by some as trying to capitalize on yesterday's tragedy. I am sure the NRA will criticize those of us who connect this violence with the easy access of guns in America. But sadly, times of tragedy like this are often the only times people pay attention to the problems plaguing our society. If we do not speak up now, we may not prevent future Littletons from occurring.

Children have easy access to guns of every sort and every caliber—including assault weapons and high capacity clips that make it all too simple to strike fellow students down in mere seconds. Whereas in the past a grievance might be settled in a brief fistfight, today our children often turn to firearms.

Yesterday, two masked gunmen killed as many as 25 people with semi-automatic gunfire and explosive devices. Other students hid under desks and in rooms throughout the school, watching the gruesome scene develop on televisions within the classrooms, and in some cases calling the media to report crying, gunfire, and the sound of running feet from within the school walls. One student reported to police that he saw two of his classmates carrying shotguns, automatic weapons, and pipe bombs.

We may never be able to stop children from feeling alone and wanting to strike out. But we can certainly stop them from gaining the use of high capacity weapons with which to strike. And we should.

In 1994, we passed a ban on assault weapons and high capacity ammunition clips, with the intent to get these guns off the streets, out of the hands of

criminals, and away from our kids. But because of strong NRA opposition, we were forced to allow pre-existing guns and clips to remain on the shelves of stores across this country. And although the President has stopped the importation of most assault weapons to this country, millions of high capacity ammunition magazines continue to flow onto our shores and into the hands of criminals and, indeed, our children.

In fact, between March and August of last year alone, BATF approved more than 8 million large-capacity clips for importation into America. The clips approved during this one short period accounted for almost 128 million rounds of ammunition—and every round represents the potential for taking one human life.

Mr. President, 75, 90, and even 250-round clips have no sporting purpose. They are not used for self defense. They have only one use—the purposeful killing of other men, women and children.

I have introduced legislation, supported by the President, that will stop the flow of these clips into this country. I know that we cannot eliminate these clips from existence. But we must—we must—do our best to make it harder and harder for children to find these clips and to use these guns.

It is both illogical and irresponsible to permit foreign companies to sell items to the American public—particularly items that are so often used for deadly purposes—that U.S. companies are prohibited from selling. It is time to plug this loophole and close our borders to these tools of death and destruction. Our domestic manufacturers are complying with the law, and we must now force foreign manufacturers to comply as well.

In closing our borders to these high capacity clips, we will not put an end to all incidents of gun violence. But we will limit the destructive power of that violence. We will not stop every troubled child who decides to commit an act of violence from doing so, but we can limit the tools that a child can find to carry out that act.

Each of us has been touched in some way by the devastating effects of gun violence. Each of our states has faced unnecessary tragedy and senseless destruction as a result of the high-powered, high-capacity weapons falling into the hands of gangs, drive-by shooters, cop killers, grievance killers, and yes, even children. My own state of California has too often been the subject of national attention due to incidents of gun violence.

We must work to console the victims of this crime and the families of those who have been injured. My thoughts and prayers go out to those who have been affected by yesterday's events. We must now rededicate our efforts to prevent future tragedies from developing. I for one want to stop the easy access