

Sallie Baliunas of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for astrophysics questioned the link between human activities and climate change.

Before the Environment and Public Works Committee, Dr. Richard S. Lindzen, the Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Meteorology at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, pointed out problems with the General Circulation Models that are the basis for the predictions of warming.

My Committee also heard from Dr. V. Ram Ramanathan of the Scripps Institute of Oceanography, about the role of water vapor as a confounding factor in these models.

In the Environment and Public Works Committee, Dr. John R. Christy of the Earth System Science Laboratory at the University of Alabama in Huntsville discussed the satellite temperature records that conflict with ground-based data.

Before the Foreign Relations Committee, Dr. Patrick Michaels, professor of Environmental Sciences at the University of Virginia, directly challenged the links between human activities and observed warming.

These are all respected scientists. They are not crackpots, nay-sayers, or as some press accounts have branded them, a "small and noisy band of skeptics."

Instead, they are scientists, doing what scientists do. Consistent with the scientific method, they are challenging the findings of other scientists, in an open, intellectually honest manner, using all the data and analysis that they can bring to bear.

That is how the system is supposed to work.

Unfortunately, the proponents of the view that we must take extreme actions now to address climate change have been attacking the credibility and the reputations of some scientists who do not share their view.

Instead of attacking their science, they attack the scientist.

They claim that scientists who disagree with the so-called consensus view of climate change are part of some kind of anti-science conspiracy, funded by big oil and big coal to deliberately mislead the American public.

That sounds silly, doesn't it?

Yet, on the Diane Rehm radio program which aired locally on WAMU-FM on July 21, a prominent guest made some pretty remarkable assertions. Let me quote from the transcript of this radio interview:

... it's an unhappy fact that the oil companies and the coal companies in the United States have joined in a conspiracy to hire pseudo scientists to deny the facts ... the energy companies need to be called to account because what they are doing is un-American in the most basic sense. They are compromising our future by misrepresenting the facts by suborning scientists onto their payrolls and attempting to mislead the American people.

A "conspiracy," Mr. President.

"Pseudo scientists."

"A deliberate attempt to mislead the American people."

"Un-American."

These are serious charges.

Who was the guest who was making these charges of a conspiracy designed to deliberately mislead the American people?

Was this guest calling Dr. Lindzen a pseudo scientist? Or Dr. Baliunas? Or any of the others I mentioned?

Are they part of this conspiracy?

Sadly, a member of the President's Cabinet—the Secretary of the Interior—was responsible for these remarks.

Here is a political appointee who appears to be making judgments about the scientific integrity of others.

Those were unfortunate remarks, Mr. President. And they are the sort of remarks I hope that the Senate will avoid as we continue the debate on climate change.

Let us keep to the high road.

Let us appreciate the fact that scientists, and indeed, all Americans, are free to disagree and to challenge the views of others in honest, public debate.

There will be disagreements. Just as I challenged the scientific understanding of Senator KERRY on several issues earlier in my remarks, others will surely challenge my understanding of the science at some point in the debate.

And in the process, we will all learn. That is the way it should be.

But there will be some, Mr. President, who will attack the scientist instead of the science.

There will be some who say that you must agree with me, or you must be part of some conspiracy that is trying to mislead the American people.

That, to use Secretary Babbitt's words, strikes me as un-American.

Let's not fear a healthy scientific debate. Instead, let's depend on it.●

#### HONG KONG

● Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, 1 month ago, Hong Kong reverted to the control of the People's Republic of China, ending over 150 years of colonial rule. This was a historic and unprecedented event in Chinese history. I was honored to serve as the chairman of the official Senate delegation that attended the handover ceremonies along with several of our colleagues from the House of Representatives, led by Congressman CHRIS COX.

I hope that when I return to Hong Kong next year, and the year after, and the year after, I will witness the same optimism that I observed during the transition from British to Chinese rule. The people of Hong Kong should be congratulated for their determination to keep Hong Kong the pearl of the Orient.

During our visit, our delegation was fortunate to meet with the new chief executive, C.H. Tung, as well as his Chief Secretary, the highly respected civil servant, Anson Chan. This duo has been referred to as the dream team and the name is well deserved. It is my

opinion that if C.H. Tung and Anson Chan work together they will lead Hong Kong to a brighter future. But they will face severe trials. The "one country, two systems" approach of the late Chairman Deng is untested, and I predict that there will be hurdles to its implementation, especially in the area of personal and political autonomy.

The purpose of the Senate Delegation to Hong Kong was to demonstrate our continued commitment to support the people of Hong Kong and to protect United States interests. And Congress will continue to monitor events in Hong Kong.

The key events that I think will determine whether this experiment will work are the following:

Whether the elections C.H. Tung has called for May of 1998 are free and fair and allow broad participation.

Whether the Court of Final Appeal functions as the final word, or whether the PRC People's Congress uses the fig leaf of "national security" to step in and usurp Hong Kong's legal system.

How the PRC Government handles Martin Lee, and other democrats. Thus far, democratic protests have continued without intervention.

What happens to the first paper to publish a Pro-Taiwan or Pro-Tibet editorial.

Whether Chief Secretary Anson Chan stays in her post after 1998, and whether there is an exodus of other civil servants.

But I also urge restraint by my colleagues. We should not assume the worst for Hong Kong. Specifically, we should not alter trade laws that assume that Hong Kong cannot enforce her borders and her laws. If Hong Kong cannot live up to her commitments in this regard, then the United States should act, but we should not act prematurely.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I would like to extend my commitment to the people of Hong Kong to support their efforts. I hope on my next trip to Hong Kong I can say that Hong Kong remains the vibrant, successful, energetic engine of Asia.●

#### NIH RESEARCH ON CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT: CURRENT STATUS AND FUTURE PLANS

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise today to bring to your attention an important report on child abuse and neglect. This report, released in April of this year, examines current research being conducted or supported by the National Institutes of Health [NIH] into the area of child abuse and neglect. The report proposes groundbreaking recommendations for improving the coordination of child maltreatment research across the NIH, with other divisions within the Department of Health and Human Services, and with other federal agencies. In addition, the report addresses the current gaps in research, identified in the National Research Council's 1993 report,

"Understanding Child Abuse and Neglect." The April, 1997, report by NIH emphasizes the need to provide more attention to training new research in the field and disseminating research results to the agencies and practitioners who are working on the frontlines.

We are all concerned about the prevalence of child abuse and neglect. According to a 1995 state-by-state survey conducted by the National Committee to Prevent Child Abuse, over 3.1 million children were reported to be abused or neglected. Child abuse fatalities have increased by 39 percent from 1985 to 1995. The Department of Health and Human Services Third National Incidence Study of Child Abuse and Neglect, released in September, 1996, estimated that the number of child abuse and neglect cases in this country doubled between 1986 and 1993.

One critical and necessary step to stop child maltreatment is to support research that will enhance our understanding of the underlying causes of child abuse and neglect. This research also will improve our ability to identify and define abuse and neglect, and discover which intervention techniques are most successful in preventing and treating child maltreatment.

The proposals for future NIH activities contained in the report give new meaning to the concept of knowledge translation and research application. The most important characteristic of the proposals are the efforts to move scientific knowledge from the research lab and demonstration site into professional practice. Parents, child welfare agencies, and practitioners will all benefit from this information and technology transfer. In the exchange, NIH researchers will benefit from the lessons learned by practitioners and be better able to target their research. Everyone will benefit from the increased coordination that is integral to the NIH effort. But most important, fewer children will suffer from abuse and neglect, once marriage between the research and practice is accomplished. This is a goal upon which we can all agree.

I want to commend Dr. Harold Varmus, Director of NIH, for his leadership in this critical area. Under the direction of Dr. Varmus, Dr. Peter Jensen, Chief-Child and Adolescent Disorders Branch, at the National Institutes of Mental Health established a trans-NIH Working Group on child abuse and neglect. I would also like to thank the organizations which brought this issue to my attention and encouraged the formation of the Working Group—the National Association of Social Workers, National Child Abuse Coalition, Institute for the Advancement of Social Work Research, and the American Psychological Society.

The Working Group has developed a bold plan for advancing research on child abuse and neglect, as evidenced by the April, 1997 report. This plan will make the optimal use of federal dollars though better coordination of NIH re-

search activities and dissemination of research results to those who can make a difference in children's lives.●

#### NATIONAL EDUCATION CENTER FOR WOMEN IN BUSINESS

● Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I would like to engage the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations in a brief colloquy concerning funding for the National Education Center for Women in Business at Seton Hill College.

Mr. President, in the decade between 1982 and 1992, women-owned businesses grew substantially, increasing by over 55 percent between 1987 and 1992 alone. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's women business owners helped make this happen, as my state ranks sixth in the nation in the number of firms owned by women. These firms contributed over 290,000 jobs to my state's economy. The Center conducts collaborative research, provides educational programs and curriculum development, and serves as an information clearinghouse for women entrepreneurs. I have heard only good things about the Center's work in the promotion of women business ownership, both in the Commonwealth and across the nation.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I must echo the comments of my colleague from Pennsylvania with respect to the National Education Center for Women in Business, which provides invaluable services to women from all over this country to encourage the establishment and growth of businesses. The Center's programs are truly in the national interest and as a member of the Appropriations Committee I have been pleased to work with my colleague, Senator SANTORUM, and Congressman MASCARA in support of the Center and its funding needs. The federal funds we have sought are necessary to bring the Center to a position of self-sufficiency where it can operate solely with private funds in the future.

Mr. SANTORUM. The Center has received funds in five previous Commerce-State-Justice appropriations bills through the Small Business Administration's Office of Women's Business Ownership and, as originally envisioned, it was to receive \$5 million in federal funds over five years. The fiscal year 1997 appropriations bill for the SBA included \$500,000 for the Center, which leaves \$500,000 in federal funds that are needed to complete the total \$5 million federal contribution to the establishment of the Center. I understand that the Small Business Administration would generally continue the program through the next cycle, even though it is not specifically listed in the bill, as the Center has been successful in its mission on behalf of women in business. Would the distinguished Chairman of the Subcommittee be willing to work with Senator SPECTER and me to examine options for allocating funds for the National Education Center for Women in Business?

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I thank the Senators from Pennsylvania for highlighting the work of this program and its funding history. Since the Small Business Administration funded the program in fiscal year 1997, I assume they will wish to continue funding in fiscal year 1998 for the Center. The absence of report language should not prevent the agency from providing funding in the next fiscal year.●

#### CHRIS YODER

● Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I want to take a moment of the Senate's time to speak today about a man whose life has been dedicated to public service—in particular, service to America's veterans: Chris Yoder.

Many of my colleagues know Chris. He has spent his entire career working for veterans. And now, Chris has decided to leave the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs [VA]. However, his life-long commitment to veterans will continue as he moves to the Commission on Service Members and Veterans' Transition Assistance.

I have known Chris for many years, and I have come to rely on him for his expertise.

He served in Vietnam and after he returned home, he began his career with the Veterans' Administration in 1972. He joined the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs in 1985 when I served as the Committee Chairman. Chris immediately demonstrated a remarkable recall and uncanny knowledge of veterans' issues. In 1991, Chris joined Tony Principi when Tony went to work for the Bush Administration as Deputy Secretary for the Department of Veterans' Affairs. In 1993, when I served as Vice Chairman of the Committee, Chris returned.

Over the years, I have asked Chris to examine a number of veterans' programs and I have always expected Chris to ask tough questions about these programs. We spend billions of dollars on veterans' health care and benefits, and members of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee constantly struggle to ensure that the money is spent efficiently and in an equitable manner.

Is the veterans' health care program based on the most modern medical delivery systems, or are we sticking with an aging infrastructure that is consuming dollars that need to be redirected to meet the real needs of veterans? That's the type of issue that Chris has had to tackle.

Last Congress, we passed Veterans' Health Care Eligibility Reform. If you think the tax code is complicated, you should have seen the VA's health care eligibility criteria before our reforms. It confused veterans, it confused Congress, and it even confused VA doctors and administrators.

Chris took it upon himself to play the leading role in crafting a reform proposal that simplified the criteria without sacrificing the quality and access to care for our Nation's veterans.