

costs of nuclear plants in electric restructuring, so nuclear use is likely to fall.

Nuclear is the largest carbon-free generator of power. The President didn't even mention it in his plan.

Let us go to our next contributor—10 percent of our energy comes from hydroelectric. Yet, there are considerations in the administration to tear down dams. An example that has been discussed is the Glen Canyon Dam. If we tear down Glen Canyon, we would drain Lake Powell—252 square miles. That is a lake that provides the water for Los Angeles, Phoenix, and Las Vegas. It would eliminate sources of carbon-free electricity for 4 million consumers in the Southwest. We would scuttle a \$500 million tourist industry.

What about gas that supplies 10 percent of our power? Gas also emits carbons, but not as much. Demand would increase, prices would increase, and shortages might result.

Some people say we will pick up the slack with wind and solar. I like wind and solar, but you can't always count on it. It is kind of interesting to see the Sierra's Club announcement the other day opposing wind farms. They refer to them as "Cuisinarts for birds." So they are opposed to that.

So the point is, Mr. President, how do you get there from here if the administration does not consider nuclear or hydroelectric? In his speech, the President specifically excludes hydro from renewable energy.

What about the rest of the world? Let me tell you what one of our witnesses said at a hearing yesterday. Mr. Bill Martin, former Deputy Secretary of Energy, said the world is likely to increase its dependence on coal primarily due to energy demand in China. This dependence is likely to result in the doubling of sulfur dioxides in Asia and at least a 30-percent increase in global CO₂, in 1990 levels, by the year 2000. To reach a sustainable energy with respect to carbon, the world will have to triple natural gas production, increase coal efficiencies through clean coal technology, triple renewables, triple nuclear power to a worldwide total of 1,000 gigawatts and increase energy efficiency by at least 25 percent.

Mr. President, these are the real terms and conditions in the world that we are living in. Nuclear energy, renewables and energy efficiency emerge as the only viable source to date that are emissions-free and offer some energy independence to nations which adopt them.

The point I want to make here, Mr. President, is that nuclear and hydro, a big part of the solution, are not addressed in the administration's proposal on how to reduce emissions to the 1990 level by the year 2008 to 2012.

The witnesses at the hearings we held yesterday said you cannot get there from here. You cannot physically do it unless you triple nuclear and the renewables, including hydro.

Let me conclude with one other thing. The President says we can do

this without a carbon tax. The Department of Energy says you need a carbon permit price of \$50/ton. There is no difference. There are no free rides. Somebody has to pay it. If it is a carbon tax, it is \$50 a ton, and it goes to the consumer. If we set up some kind of a market in emissions, somebody like the Board of Trade starts trading permits, they are estimated to equate to \$50 a ton. Somebody is going to have to pay for that, and that is the U.S. consumer.

Let me conclude with just one observation as we address China, as we address the question of whether we should sell nuclear reactors and technology to China.

China has the availability of nuclear power reactors from France. They have it from other nations. Canada is selling; Russia is selling. And certainly they are a nuclear power.

Do we want China to burn more coal? We already have a prohibition against assisting China in the development of the world's largest hydroelectric project. It is called the Three Gorges Dam. The Eximbank will not assist.

Let me tell you how big Three Gorges is. That plant would produce 18,000 megawatts, equal to 36 500-megawatt coal plants. So that is how China will address some of its energy demands from carbon-free hydropower. But we are prohibited from participating. And we are prohibited from participating in their nuclear power program.

So I think, Mr. President, we have to be realistic. As the administration comes down with its plan, again, I suggest to you that the President has glossed over the issue of the developing countries' participation.

I suggest and remind my colleagues of the Byrd-Hagel vote that was 95 to 0. It said developing nations must have targets and timetables in the same timeframe as the United States. And the Berlin Mandate says, no new commitments for developing nations.

So I conclude by saying the President only says "meaningful commitments for developing nations." And I say "meaningful" means what?

Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Thursday, October 23, 1997, the Federal debt stood at \$5,424,897,442,383.46. (Five trillion, four hundred twenty-four billion, eight hundred ninety-seven million, four hundred forty-two thousand, three hundred eighty-three dollars and forty-six cents)

One year ago, October 23, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,229,624,000,000. (Five trillion, two hundred twenty-nine billion, six hundred twenty-four million)

Five years ago, October 23, 1992, the Federal debt stood at \$4,061,912,000,000. (Four trillion, sixty-one billion, nine hundred twelve million)

Ten years ago, October 23, 1987, the Federal debt stood at \$2,384,077,000,000

(Two trillion, three hundred eighty-four billion, seventy-seven million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$3 trillion—\$3,040,820,442,383.46 (Three trillion, forty billion, eight hundred twenty million, four hundred forty-two thousand, three hundred eighty-three dollars and forty-six cents) during the past 10 years.

AN EMMY FOR KEVIN WALLEVAND: LAND MINE DOCUMENTARY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President. A bright young reporter, Kevin Wallevand, who covers news in Fargo, ND for WDAY television, has made my State, and me, awfully proud. Kevin's documentary, "The Quilt: Hope from the Heartland," has been awarded an Emmy, television's highest award.

In North Dakota, we have always known that Kevin is a talented reporter, writer, and producer. Now, his documentary about the dark side of human nature that allows exploding land mines to do the work of war; and the bright side of human kind, the compassion people show toward one another in the aftermath of war's tragedies, has earned him national acclaim.

Kevin Wallevand has produced a moving story about a rural community where women create by hand a beautiful, colorful quilt in the hope that it will warm and cheer someone less fortunate than themselves. The resulting quilt begins its travels near the North Dakota border on the Buffalo River, and ends its journey along a river in Angola, Africa where a homeless family—bodies ravaged by exploding land mines—clutches the quilt for warmth and safety.

Sadly, we learn that the family's story is not an isolated one. Kevin takes us into the hospital beds of other villagers who have fallen victim to landmines—who are displaced and anticipating the help and the arrival of thousands of quilts, blankets and other donated items from American volunteers.

Hundreds of churches, like the one in Kevin's story, and other humanitarian groups have taken it upon themselves to give a little comfort and a little hope to landmine victims. Now we, as a country, owe it to them to prevent this instrument of war, which targets innocent people long after the peace agreement has been signed, from ever being used again.

Like Kevin, I have seen first hand the tragic human costs of landmines. While serving in the House of Representatives, I visited a clinic in Central America where landmine victims who had lost hope, along with a leg or an arm, were fitted for artificial limbs. I witnessed how important it was to support this program which could turn their lives around. When I returned, I worked to get funding so that other landmine victims might be able to get prosthetic limbs and I'm proud to say I helped get it done. Kevin must have

the same kind of satisfaction—because by showing others the horrors of this war against the innocent, he has struck a blow against the worldwide scourge of land mines. But more must be done.

I commend Kevin Wallevand, and the others who worked on this story at WDAY, for bringing this tragedy to the attention of others. Landmines are a worldwide problem, but with a very simple solution. We must rid the world of landmines and promise future generations that this weapon of destruction will never be used again for warfare. In sharing this Emmy winning story, Kevin's work heightens our awareness of the problem and brings us a step closer to that ultimate goal. Congratulations to Kevin Wallevand. You make North Dakotans very proud.

RURAL SATELLITE SUBSCRIBERS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to raise an issue that my colleagues may have heard about, the recent decision by an arbitration panel convened under the auspices of the Copyright Office in the Library of Congress regarding the rates satellite carriers will pay under the satellite copyright compulsory license. The panel, in attempting to set a fair market value of the retransmission of broadcast signals, has decided to raise those rates and has made the new rate effective July 1, 1997. The arbitration panel's decision is currently on appeal to the Librarian of Congress who is empowered to review the decision. The standard of review is limited to one of arbitrariness or contrariness to law. The Librarian's decision will be announced next Tuesday, October 28. At that point, the Librarian's decision is subject to appeal to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. The decision to raise the rates and especially its retroactive effective date has raised objections by the satellite carriers. Obviously, copyright owners disagree with the satellite carriers. My colleagues may be contacted by one side or the other of this dispute in the coming weeks or months.

My colleagues should know that as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, the committee of jurisdiction over copyright matters generally, and the Satellite Home Viewers Act in particular, I have begun a review of the satellite and cable licenses. Earlier this year I asked the Copyright Office to conduct in depth public hearings and make a comprehensive report to the Judiciary Committee on the licenses, together with recommendations for reforms. The Judiciary Committee is now reviewing these recommendations.

As we make our review of the compulsory licenses, I believe we need to keep in mind the needs of rural families. The Satellite Home Viewers Act was originally intended in 1988 to ensure that households that could not get television in any other way, such as traditional broadcast or cable, would

be able to get television signals via satellite.

The market has changed substantially since 1988, and those changes have led to many of the controversies that currently surround the act. Many are looking to satellite carriers to compete directly with cable companies for viewership. But as we consider reforms to make the license work better in the current marketplace, we need to consider carefully the impact on the original beneficiaries, rural folks who are otherwise beyond the reach of traditional television signals.

I come from a state that has a fine broadcast industry that invests its energy and capital in trying to reach as many viewers as it can in our mountainous State of Utah. But there are some Utahans, or others in similar rural States, who appear to be simply beyond the reach of broadcast transmitters and translators, despite the best efforts of our broadcasters. As the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I hope to find a fair way of helping the greatest number of Utahans have the greatest amount of choice in television entertainment. Obviously this means balancing a number of interests, since consumer choice will be curtailed if any segment of the industry is disadvantaged too much to support the other segments. We need to try to get a system that will be consumer-friendly, fair to creators and copyright holders to encourage them to continue to produce quality entertainment, and that makes for a competitive environment that will lower prices and increase choices. As we do this, we need to remember the original purpose of the satellite license, which is to make television available to those who cannot otherwise get it.

I believe many of my colleagues on the committee and in the Senate share my views, particularly my good friend, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, Senator LEAHY. Mr. President, I would ask the distinguished ranking member if he shares my concerns about rural satellite viewers, as well as the other affected interests in this industry?

Mr. LEAHY. I thank Senator HATCH for his comments. I am also very concerned about rural areas in my home State of Vermont and about the needs of rural satellite viewers throughout the country.

Mr. HATCH. I thank my colleague. Mr. President, I would ask my colleague from Vermont if he will work with me and the other members of the Judiciary Committee to help ensure that we keep the needs of rural satellite viewers in mind as we consider reforms to the compulsory licenses?

Mr. LEAHY. I look forward to working with you and the rest of the committee on these important issues.

Mr. HATCH. I thank my colleague, and I invite my colleagues in the Senate to work with me and with the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee as we review the compulsory li-

censes to ensure the best situation for all our constituents.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting a withdrawal and sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:25 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2646. An act 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.

A message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2107) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 2646. An act 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.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 1313. A bill to provide market transition assistance to quota owners, tobacco producers, and communities that are dependent on tobacco production, to phase out Federal programs that support tobacco production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Mr. FAIRCLOTH):

S. 1314. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that married couples may file a combined return under which