

HONORING THE DETROIT RED WINGS

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in saluting the 1997 Stanley Cup Champion Detroit Red Wings. After 42 years of frustration and near misses, on Saturday night a week ago the Red Wings completed a 4-0 sweep of the powerful Philadelphia Flyers and brought the most coveted trophy in professional sports back to the city known by hockey fans across North America as "Hockeytown."

My wife, Barbara, and I had one of the most thrilling experiences of our lives when we were able to attend the game. Our daughter, Erica, came with in a whisker of coming to Detroit from New York but ended up glued to her TV instead, with our daughter, Laura, 800 miles away. With our daughter, Kate, watching in Ann Arbor, the family was together, electronically watching history in the making. The outpouring of positive emotion after the game was almost as memorable as the game itself! The long drought was finally over and Detroit's fans poured forth into the streets all across Michigan to whoop it up.

The Detroit Red Wings are one of the most successful teams in hockey history. An "Original Six" franchise, today's team is rooted in the tradition of hockey legends like Sid Abel, Ted Lindsay, Terry Sawchuck, and the greatest player ever to lace up skates, Gordie Howe. Their numbers have been retired and hang on banners from the rafters of Joe Louis Arena, reminding today's players and fans of glory years past.

The 1996-97 Red Wings won the Stanley Cup because of an organizationwide commitment to excellence. That commitment begins at the top with team owners Mike and Marian Ilitch, and is matched only by their dedication to the city of Detroit. When Mike and Marian purchased the team 15 years ago, the Wings regularly missed the playoffs and gave away a car at each home game to put fans in the seats. Their perseverance, dedication to winning and commitment to the city of Detroit have paid off with their Stanley Cup triumph.

The Red Wings' tremendous victory was truly a team effort, but a few individuals deserve a special mention. Coach Scotty Bowman won his seventh Stanley Cup, and became the first coach in NHL history to win the cup with three teams. Mike Vernon, the Red Wings' veteran goalie, earned the Conn Smythe trophy as the most valuable player in the playoffs with his stellar netminding. But this victory may mean the most to Red Wings Captain Steve Yzerman, one of the classiest professional athletes one could ever meet. Steve was drafted 14 years ago and was named team captain 11 years ago, making him the longest serving captain with the same team in the NHL. He has carried his team, and the often weighty hopes of Red Wings

fans, on his shoulders with dignity and grace. My congratulations go to Mike and Marian Ilitch, Scotty Bowman, Mike Vernon, Steve Yzerman, Jimmy Devellano; and players Doug Brown, Mathieu Dandenault, Kris Draper, Sergei Fedorov, Viacheslav Fetisov, Kevin Hodson, Tomas Holmstrom, Mike Knuble, Joey Kocur, Vladimir Konstantinov, Vyacheslav Kozlov, Martin LaPointe, Igor Larionov, Nicklas Lidstrom, Kirk Maltby, Darren McCarty, Larry Murphy, Chris Osgood, Jamie Pushor, Bob Rouse, Tomas Sandstrom, Brendan Shanahan, Tim Taylor and Aaron Ward.

I would like to extend my congratulations as well to the Philadelphia Flyers for a well-played series. Their strength and power gave the Red Wings a tough battle.

Last Friday, after a week of celebration which saw 1 million people fill Hart Plaza and Woodward Avenue for the Red Wings' victory parade, Hockeytown met with tragedy as three members of the team were involved in a limousine accident. Two of the Wings' famous "Russian Five," Vladimir Konstantinov and Slava Fetisov, as well as the team's masseur, Sergei Mnatsakanov, were seriously injured. Today, Vladimir and Sergei are each in a coma with critical head injuries. Slava, thankfully, is listed in good condition with chest injuries. Vladimir, a finalist for the Norris Trophy as the National Hockey League's top defenseman, and Slava, a 39-year-old known to his teammates as "Papa Bear," are fan favorites around the league. Hockey fans in the Detroit area and across North America are praying for the full recovery of all three men.

Mr. President, the Detroit Red Wings showed people around the world what it takes to be a champion. I know my colleagues will join me in extending the congratulations of the entire U.S. Senate to the 1997 Stanley Cup Champion Detroit Red Wings and also send our hopes and prayers for the full recovery of all those injured last Friday night.●

CORRECTIONS TO STATEMENT OF MANAGERS ACCOMPANYING CONFERENCE REPORT ON FISCAL YEAR 1998 BUDGET RESOLUTION

• Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask that the following errata sheet correcting minor errors that occurred in the printing of the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point. Further, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to the printing error in the table which shows the section 302 allocation (5-year total) for the Committee on Governmental Affairs on page 148. In order to avoid the costs of a Star Print, the correct number is included on the errata sheet and that is the level which will be used for the purpose of determining Budget Act violations.

The material follows:

CORRECTIONS

In the report:

On page 57, for the 1998 Budget Resolution Conference Agreement Function Totals, the off-budget budget authority for Undistributed Offsetting Receipts for the year 2000 should read "-9.1".

On page 58, for the 1998 Budget Resolution Conference Agreement Function Totals, the off-budget outlays for Undistributed Offsetting Receipts for the year 2000 should read "-9.1".

On page 58, for the 1998 Budget Resolution Conference Agreement Function Totals, total budget authority for Undistributed Offsetting Receipts for the year 2001 should read "-50.1".

On page 58, for the 1998 Budget Resolution Conference Agreement Function Totals, total outlays for Undistributed Offsetting Receipts for the year 2001 should read "-50.1".

On page 107, under section 203 of the Senate amendment, the following text: "The agreement creates an allowance of \$9.2 billion in budget authority with an associated, but unspecified, amount of outlays to be released by the Budget committees when the Appropriations committees report bills that provide for renewal of Section 8 housing assistance contracts that expire in 1998. The conference agreement assumes that the amount of the allowance to be released (estimated to be \$3.436 billion for outlays) will not be reduced to the extent that the appropriations and authorizing committees produce Section 8 savings that were proposed in the President's 1998 budget." should be placed on page 108 under section 203 of the Conference agreement.

On page 148, for the Senate Committee Budget Authority and Outlay Allocations Pursuant to Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act 5-Year Total: 1998-2002, entitlements funded in annual appropriations, the outlays for Governmental Affairs should read "33".●

VICTIMS' RIGHTS CLARIFICATION ACT OF 1997

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague Senator NICKLES for introducing the Victims' Rights Clarification Act of 1997. I believe this important legislation will help victims of crime exercise their deserved rights.

The 104th Congress did much to ensure that victims are no longer casualties of a skewed justice system where their voices are often ignored. This year, we are picking up where we left off in standing up for the innocent. I am proud to join several of my colleagues in cosponsoring this legislation.

The purpose of the Victims' Rights Clarification Act of 1997 is really quite simple. This act will guarantee that victims of crime may be present at public court proceedings, barring their presence will not be a detriment to his or her testimony. Frankly, I am disheartened it takes an act of Congress to reaffirm this right. But, I am pleased we are making progress in correcting these deficiencies in America's legal system.

The devastation of lives in the Oklahoma City bombing and the senseless acts of violence occurring in our neighborhoods every day gives this Chamber

cause to enact policies empowering victims. In my estimation, the accused should see their victim's face in a court of law and know they scarred a life forever. I believe this legislation drafted on a bipartisan basis will entitle victims of crime their overdue rights and merits widespread support.

GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

• Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today as a supporter and cosponsor of Senator BYRD's sense-of-the-Senate resolution, Senate Resolution 98, regarding ratification of any international agreement on greenhouse gas emissions under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Back in 1992, the United States and the rest of the world agreed to work, on a voluntary basis, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions which scientists believed could affect climate and sea levels over the next century. Unfortunately, this agreement, aimed at returning greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels, has failed.

Now, the administration is negotiating an agreement aimed at meeting this 1990 level. Instead of requiring countries, all countries—developed, developing, and underdeveloped—to agree on voluntary efforts, these negotiations are focused on making the 1990 level mandatory for only developed countries. In short, it will increase the burden of compliance on the United States and other developed countries, while doing nothing to ensure that developing countries meet these targets.

Yes, the United States and other developed countries are responsible for the bulk of these emissions but that will not always be the case. Many developing countries, such as China, Mexico, India, and Brazil, are on course to surpass United States emissions. It makes no sense to give these countries a pass. I am not saying the United States should not do its fair share, we should. My concern is that the agreement is shortsighted. Failing to include these developing countries does nothing to head off the emission problems which they will soon face.

In addition, I have a long record of defending the American worker and American industry from unfair business and trade practices overseas—many of which occur in these developing countries. My fear is that failing to include developing nations in this agreement will undermine America's ability to compete internationally and will only work to force American industry overseas to these developing areas. America has the strongest economy in the world. I want to ensure it remains that way. Placing the burden of reducing greenhouse gas emissions only on developed countries and ignoring developing countries will do nothing to secure economic stability.

In short, this resolution calls for the United States to refuse to sign any agreement unless the developing countries are included in a legally binding

regime of emission control measures. It is an effort to ensure that all countries are placed on a level playing field.

With regard to my record on environmental issues, there have been some who have asked if my support of Senate Resolution 98 undermines my long record of supporting efforts to clean and protect our environment. Let me say now, it does not. In my opinion, this resolution will strengthen efforts to reduce worldwide greenhouse gas emissions by ensuring that all countries meet the same standards.

In closing, I submit for the RECORD the authoritative and expert opinion of Dr. James B. Edwards, the former Secretary of Energy, and encourage my colleagues to read his opinions on this matter.

The material follows:

POURING GAS REDUCTIONS DOWN DRAIN

If a new climate treaty to include binding restrictions on the emission of greenhouse gases is a bad idea—and it is—then the immediate consequence of such a move is even worse: that a tax is imposed on U.S. industries that burn oil, gas and coal. The cost would ultimately fall on American consumers—without necessarily providing benefits to anyone if other countries continue to pollute.

The logical conclusion should be: Don't make the first blunder so you are not forced into making the even worse second blunder. But in just seven months an agreement on a new climate treaty could be a done deal. If government commitments made at the latest round of negotiations in Europe are any indication, there could be a treaty in place by December. There is just one problem: U.S. ratification is going to take a two-thirds vote of the Senate eventually.

In the view of climatologists as esteemed as Patrick Michaels of the University of Virginia, an expert on computer simulations of the climate, and the University of Alabama's John Christy, it will take decades before scientists gain a comprehensive understanding of how greenhouse gas emissions affect the earth's climate. One thing scientists do know is that the concentration of greenhouse gases is building up slowly—less than 0.5 percent annually for carbon dioxide—and that gives us time to implement effective mitigation measures.

Unfortunately, the proposed treaty places binding commitments on industrial nations but none on developing countries. Even such economic powerhouses as China, Korea, and Indonesia would be let off the hook, while the United States would be required to cut greenhouse-gas emissions 15 to 20 percent by 2010 or soon thereafter. Such self-imposed restrictions could backfire.

Simply put, the danger is that developing countries will have no incentive to reduce emissions. Their output would overwhelm reductions made by industrial nations—just the opposite of what a new treaty is supposed to achieve. In fact, developing countries, as a group, are expected to produce the majority of greenhouse emissions in future years.

According to a report by the U.S. Department of Energy, efforts to restrict fossil fuel emissions with a carbon tax would do serious damage to our economy. The hardest hit would be energy-intensive industries, especially petroleum refining, chemicals, automobile manufacturing, paper products, iron and steel, aluminum and cement. These large industries would be at a disadvantage in the world marketplace, and the cost in dollars, as well as in lost jobs, would be staggering.

The most responsible economic estimates of the cost to cap carbon dioxide emissions

at 1990 levels by the year 2010 or soon thereafter range from \$250 billion to \$300 billion per year—an amount that would reduce the U.S. gross domestic product by about 4 percent. For comparison, that's nearly equal to what was spent last year on Social Security.

This is not to suggest that the United States should do nothing about reducing greenhouse-gas emissions. When major industrialized countries meet in Denver in late June at the "Group of Seven" economic summit, climate change will be on the agenda. Efforts should be directed toward establishing a flexible route that could achieve the same long-term benefits but at far lower cost. For example, spreading the responsibility globally, possibly through an emissions trading system involving developing countries, would lower the cost substantially.

Under an emissions trading system, any country exceeding its allotment of greenhouse emissions, pays a regulatory fine. The significant differences between this plan and a carbon tax are that technological innovation, market mechanisms and total global emissions are the defining characteristics of this alternative approach to reducing greenhouse emissions.

Major efforts should be directed at exporting advanced power systems to developing countries such as China and India so that they can begin to stabilize their emissions, without depriving them of an opportunity for economic growth. After all, as its share of industrial output rises, China is expected to become the world's largest source of carbon dioxide, emitting nearly double the amount the United States emits and more than triple what Western Europe produces.

It's very simple: Before we hobble our economy and our society with costly new regulations and taxes we should ask ourselves whether the hoped-for benefits justify the cost to our economy and whether there is a better alternative. And environmentalists ought to keep another perspective mind: For any global emissions reduction program to succeed, all nations must participate.●

HANS A. BETHE

• Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, the great Nobel physicist, Hans A. Bethe, is the subject of the lead article in the "Science Times" section of the New York Times. One cannot help but marvel at the life Dr. Bethe, a national treasure, has led. In 1935, he fled Nazi Germany, settling at Cornell University in Ithaca, New York. Within three years, he developed an equation to explain solar fusion which won him a Nobel prize in 1967.

Hans Bethe led the Theoretical Division at Los Alamos; he was, one could say, present at the creation. He stood next to J. Robert Oppenheimer on July 16, 1945 in the New Mexico desert, a witness to the testing of the first atomic bomb. The scientists at the site knew that if the test worked it would end World War II, as it did within a month, and forever change the nature of warfare.

At the moment of that explosion, a new era began. It changed us. Changed the world, and changed all those present. Maurice M. Shapiro, now chief scientist emeritus of the Laboratory for Cosmic Physics at the Naval Research Station, in Washington, recalled the scene in the New Mexico desert in an interview two years ago: