

and to prevent United States persons from engaging in any commercial dealings with them, their front companies, and their agents. Executive Order 12978 demonstrates the United States commitment to end the damage that such traffickers wreak upon society in the United States and abroad.

The magnitude and the dimension of the problem in Colombia—perhaps the most pivotal country of all in terms of the world's cocaine trade—are extremely grave. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against significant foreign narcotics traffickers and their violent and corrupting activities as long as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
THE WHITE HOUSE, April 24, 1998.

SPECIAL ORDERS

INDUSTRIAL GROUP PLANS TO BATTLE CLIMATE TREATY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday the American public was presented with a front-page article in the New York Times outlining a plan by an industrial group to battle the climate change treaty. This is a treaty that was arrived at in Kyoto, Japan earlier this year, which brought together the international community in a plan to fight against an increase in greenhouse gases that threaten this world with climate change.

It was a plan that was negotiated between all of the nations in attendance. Many nations signed on and many other nations have yet to sign on. It is a plan that is necessary if in fact we are going to prevent the worst impacts of global climate change.

What the New York Times article tells us is that a group of corporations, mainly large international oil companies, have put together a plan to spend millions of dollars to try to convince the American public that the overwhelming scientific evidence regarding global climate change is somehow shaky and not to be trusted, and that therefore we should not go forward with actions in this and other countries, and with efforts to bring developing countries on board the Kyoto treaty, that we should walk away from that treaty; and that certainly we should not attend the meetings in Buenos Aires later this year where we will attempt to bring on large developing countries such as China, Mexico, Brazil and other such nations that are contributing huge amounts of greenhouse gases to the atmosphere of our world.

But rather than work on that progressive agenda, rather than work in an effort to try to see how we can stem

greenhouse gases, these oil companies would rather try to convince people that in fact the science is not very good. Now that is contrary to the science itself and is contrary to the vast number of scientists around the world who have joined this effort to look at the science, to look at the data and try to help us predict what in fact is taking place with respect to greenhouse gases and global climate change.

But rather than participate in the serious scientific discourse, this group of oil companies has decided that they would take millions of dollars and try to convince the average citizen, under the portion of their plan that says victory will be achieved when the average citizen recognizes the uncertainties in climate science. Recognition of the uncertainties becomes part of conventional wisdom. So when you think about global climate change, about the threat of climate change, about warming, the oil companies want you to think, "well, the science is not very good so probably nothing much is going to happen."

Then they would like to move on and have the media recognize the uncertainties of climate science, so when the media presents stories about global change, about what is happening in our world, they would then say, "Well, we really do not know if this science is very good." Then they take more of their money and they would try to make the media balance out, try to get stories into the media about how the science is not very good, and they would hope that the media would then accept, if they spend enough money to convince the media, that they would accept that it is conventional wisdom that the science is not very good.

Now mind you, this all comes at a time, it is not a question whether the science is very good or not—the science is getting better and better. But unfortunately, what the science tells us is that the problem of global warming is becoming more and more a realistic problem for the future of the world and that steps must be taken.

But that is not what these oil companies do. They want to change the mind set of the media, of the American public, of industry and certainly of the government. And what they really want to do is arrive at a point where the Kyoto treaty is dead, there will be no further action on that treaty, as they spell out in their strategies and their tactics, and to make sure that we do not go forward, we do not go forward in Buenos Aires to bring other nations on to that treaty.

How would they measure this? They are going to track the percentage of media articles that raise questions about climate science. They are going to register the number of Members that they have been able to contact and send materials to change their mind about the climate science, the number of communications on climate science received by Members of Congress. So they are going to spend a few hundred thousand dollars tracking their efforts to see whether or not it is working.

You know, we have seen this all before, my colleagues. We saw it when the tobacco companies got together to try to convince the American public that there was no link between tobacco and cancer, that there was no link between the usage of tobacco and the incredible rate of lung cancer in this country and of other cancers.

They spent millions of dollars to undermine the scientists who were saying there is a link, to undermine the evidence. They told us more and more every year, and when the science came against their wishes, they paid scientists to keep it down, to not tell the American public. Now for the first time what we see are thousands, millions of pages of documents with the tobacco companies engaged in an effort to keep from the American public science that would tell them that tobacco and cancer are linked.

Now we see an effort where some industries do not like the scientists, independent scientists. They do not like what they have come up with on global warming. So what they want to do is, they want to establish what they would consider an independent global climate science data center, and from this center would flow information to Members of Congress, to the public, to State legislatures, to the mayors, city council people. But this independent center reportedly would be initially staffed, this is according to the memo from the public relations firm advising the oil companies, it will be staffed initially with professionals on loan from the various oil companies and associations of the major interests in climate change.

□ 1415

So here we are going to have a bunch of people who work for oil companies as scientists who are now going to tell us what the independent science is on global warming, as opposed to the independent scientists who have been out there now for a number of years working for universities and foundations and others to try to find out what is happening. They want to create the impression that they have scientists who radically disagree with the prevailing science about the harms of greenhouse gases and the consequential global warming.

Mr. Speaker, we have to understand that there is something going on in business in America. Many of us in Congress have had complaints from our constituents about the impacts of HMOs and managed care. People come into our offices because they cannot get care for their spouse who is very ill, and they cannot get care for their children because somebody who is supposed to give a second opinion, some 800 number, they have to call where they talk to somebody, and they say, oh, no, we do not allow that care under your insurance plan.

So the Congress got together on a bipartisan basis and decided that what they would do is they would try to have a patients' bill of rights so that patients knew what kind of coverage they had, they would know what kind of care they had, so they had access to specialists, so they had a right to sue managed care plans if some bureaucrat in another city was making a decision against a doctor's recommendation and somebody was harmed.

On a bipartisan basis, in the Senate and the House, many State legislatures are doing this, and what do we see? We see corporations in America coming together, raising millions of dollars to try to tell the Congress, "This is not a problem. These complaints from your constituents are not real. We have it all under control." They had a corporate fly-in where they had people fly in from all over the country to tell them we do not need to change anything with managed health care, it is just fine.

So we see the tobacco companies, they set up their spin organizations; the health care corporations, they set up their spin organizations; and now the oil companies are going to set up their spin organizations to tell us that all of this we have heard about climate change, greenhouse gases, global warming is nothing for us to be concerned about. Well, the fact is it is something for us to be very concerned about.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that not all oil companies apparently have joined this organization. In the article it suggested Shell Oil USA has not joined this organization. They do not see the merit to it. In fact, Shell Oil USA is one of those oil companies that believes that a good part of its future is going to be about clean energy, about renewable energy, wind energy, solar energy. It has joined companies like British Petroleum that have made major investments in solar energy. Billions of dollars of markets in solar energy are now recognizable, and we see those companies taking a different tack.

But yet there are a few companies that have decided that the best they can do is to try to confuse the American public on global warming, try to lobby their Representatives in the Congress not to accept, not to accept what the scientists are telling us now is the future of this planet if global warming continues.

Mr. Speaker, I was in Kyoto this year with the Chairman of the Science Committee, and I witnessed the U.S. delegation's diligence in forging a treaty that both protects the U.S. interests and at the same time sets important goals for slowing global warming.

The world is looking to the U.S. for leadership on this issue, and while clearly the solution must include participation from developing nations, there is much the United States can do to reduce global greenhouse gases, emissions that cause immediate health effects on our children and the elderly,

contaminate our air, water and land, and cost taxpayers dearly to clean up.

The truth is the steps necessary to curb global warming present an enormous economic opportunity for the people of the United States. The scientific evidence about global warming compels strong action, not a head-in-the-sand approach that characterizes the organized opposition to the Kyoto Protocol and U.S. energy efficiency measures.

To hear some critics describe the Administration's actions to try to push forward with renewable energy and energy efficiency and clean sources of energy, one would think that protecting the environment is a crime against humanity, and that President Clinton should be tried at the Hague. They are accusing the President of trying to use Federal tax dollars to spur public and private investment in energy efficiency and renewable energy.

We are seeing more and more countries, more and more companies looking at renewable energy sources as a path to the future. America ought to participate in that. We have the technology, we have the know-how, we have the products. We ought to recognize the economic opportunity that that provides.

In fact, the global market for energy efficiency products and services is \$80 billion per year and is expected to reach \$125 billion a year by the year 2015. Several studies estimated that job growth from energy efficiency and technology innovation will exceed 800,000 new jobs over the next 15 years.

I do not know where these critics live, but they do not live in the district that I represent.

Earlier this year, in fact, 71 percent of my constituents recently answered a questionnaire that they thought the U.S. should take strong steps against global warming, even if it cost taxpayers more in the beginning to do so. The same is true across the country. In January, Ohio State University conducted a national survey on the American opinion on global warming, finding that 77 percent of Americans believe that global warming has been happening, and 67 percent believe that steps should be taken to combat global warming, and that reducing air pollution is an effective way to do so. Eighty-eight percent thought the U.S. Government should limit air pollution for businesses, and 77 percent thought they were willing to pay more for electricity, gas and oil to reduce the amount of air pollution.

It is that poll that is driving the oil companies crazy. It is that poll that is causing the oil companies to consider spending \$5 million to change Americans' opinion about the urgency of global warming. It is that consortium that is coming together that recognizes that the American people understand what is going on, and now they want to change their mind.

It is too bad, because most of the last couple of decades, this country has

been built on greater and greater efficiencies. We see it in the computer industry, in telecommunications, in marketing, in transportation. We see it throughout the entire global economy. But somehow, when we get to energy, the coal companies and the oil companies, they do not want us to be efficient. They want us to burn more oil and more coal; it is just that simple, folks. If we can do it more efficiently and we can save the environment and we can save dollars in the cost of that electricity, and if we can provide jobs and new economic opportunities in the export of American products, they do not want us to hear about it, they do not want us to believe it. They want us just to go on burning the coal and burning the oil in the same old fashion we have been doing for the last 50 years.

The problem is if we all do that, and if the developing countries—China, Mexico, India, Indonesia, Brazil—who are increasing their use of oil and coal as their economies grow, if they just do it the same way we did it over the last 50 years, we will choke this planet to death. We will destroy the environment for our children and our grandchildren, and we will threaten the economic well-being of a good portion of the world.

That is what the American people understand. That is what is reflected in the polling data. They trust the independent scientists. They are not going to trust a bunch of scientists on the oil company payrolls to tell them that they are wrong about the science, that it is really shaky.

But we have to be diligent in this matter. We have to be aware of what is happening, because as we start to see attacks on the scientists who have studied global warming, attacks on this administration that is trying to bring developing countries on board a treaty to reduce those greenhouse gases—and hopefully at the end of this year in Buenos Aires some developing countries will sign on—as they are trying to do that, they are going to come under attack. They are going to come under attack by a consortium put together by oil companies and coal companies to say that we are all wrong, that global warming is not a problem.

Well, I think by now we have seen enough evidence to suggest that global warming is a problem.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that people would be alert to what is taking place and to what is proposed by these oil and coal companies to try and put their spin on the hard evidence that has been derived by independent scientists from many, many countries, from many, many disciplines, over many years, being very conservative about the changes that they have seen. But as scientists drill the ice cores, as they look at what has happened in the past, Nature magazine just reported that the Northern Hemisphere mean annual temperatures for 3 of the past 8 years were warmer than any year since

AD 1400. We have to understand the kind of changes that means for the American economy and for the environment of the world.

So I would hope that Members of Congress would not give credibility to this effort by the oil companies to put their spin on what is very good, even if incomplete evidence about the problems raised by the continuing burning of fossil fuels and creation of greenhouse gases.

I commend to my colleagues the article and memo, which I have enclosed here.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 26, 1998]

INDUSTRIAL GROUP PLANS TO BATTLE CLIMATE TREATY

DRAFT PROPOSAL SEEKS TO DEPICT GLOBAL WARMING THEORY AS A CASE OF BAD SCIENCE

(By John H. Cushman Jr.)

WASHINGTON, April 25—Industry opponents of a treaty to fight global warming have drafted an ambitious proposal to spend millions of dollars to convince the public that the environmental accord is based on shaky science.

Among their ideas is a campaign to recruit a cadre of scientists who share the industry's views of climate science and to train them in public relations so they can help convince journalists, politicians and the public that the risk of global warming is too uncertain to justify controls on greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide that trap the sun's heat near Earth.

An informal group of people working for big oil companies, trade associations and conservative policy research organizations that oppose the treaty have been meeting recently at the Washington office of the American Petroleum Institute to put the plan together.

Joe Walker, a public relations representative of the petroleum institute who is leading the project, said in an interview that the plan had been under consideration for about two months and was "very, very tentative." Mr. Walker said no industry executives had yet been approached to pay for it.

But an eight-page memorandum that he wrote shows in detail how some industry lobbyists are going about opposing the climate treaty.

It is a daunting public relations task. Whenever the treaty's advocates, including the Clinton Administration, discuss global warming, they present the science as essentially settled and unchallengeable, and they compare dissenting scientists to discredited apologists for the tobacco companies. That view has become widely accepted among reporters and the public.

Although mainstream scientists do identify considerable uncertainties in their climate predictions, which are based on computer models, they are increasingly confident that global warming is a serious problem and often say that the uncertainties do not justify inaction.

Based on the latest science, most of the world's nations agreed in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 that industrial nations should cut emissions of greenhouse gases, and the treaty was modified last year to require further reductions in emissions to levels well below those of 1990, over the next 10 to 15 years. But the United States Senate has not yet agreed to that treaty provision, which could require deep reductions in American consumption of fossil fuels.

Documents describing the proposal to undermine the mainstream view were given to The New York Times by the National Environmental Trust, whose work in support of

the global-warming treaty is financed by philanthropic organizations, including the Pew Charitable Trusts, the biggest of the nation's pro-environmental grant makers.

Phil Clapp, the president of the environmental trust, said he obtained the papers from an industry official. Exposing the plan at this stage, Mr. Clapp said, would probably ruin the effort to raise money to carry out the plan.

Industry representatives confirmed that the documents were authentic, but emphasized that the plans had not been formally approved by participating organizations. The document listed representatives of the Exxon Corporation, the Chevron Corporation and the Southern Company as being involved. Representatives of Chevron and Southern acknowledged attending meetings on the project; the Exxon representative could not be reached for comment.

The draft plan calls for recruiting scientists to argue against the Administration, and suggests that they include "individuals who do not have a long history of visibility and/or participation in the climate change debate."

But among the plan's advocates are groups already linked to the best-known critics of global-warming science.

They include the Science and Environment Policy Project, founded by Fred Singer, a physicist noted for opposing the mainstream view of climate science. Frederick Seitz, another prominent skeptic on global warming, is involved with two other groups mentioned in the plan: the George C. Marshall Institute, where Dr. Seitz is chairman, and the Advancement of Sound Science Coalition, where he is on the science advisory board.

On Monday, the National Academy of Sciences disassociated itself from the most recent effort to drum up support among skeptical scientists. That effort came in the form of a statement and petition on global warming circulated by Dr. Seitz, a physicist who was president of the academy in the 1960's.

The petition, attacking the scientific conclusions underlying the treaty on climate change, was accompanied by an article that was formatted to resemble one that might have been published in the academy's prestigious peer-reviewed journal. It was not.

The draft plan, recently discussed at the oil industry offices, calls for giving such dissenters on climate science "the logistical and moral support they have been lacking."

It also calls for spending \$5 million over two years to "maximize the impact of scientific views consistent with ours on Congress, the media and other key audiences."

It would measure progress by counting, among other things, the percentage of news articles that raise questions about climate science and the number of radio talk show appearances by scientists questioning the prevailing views.

The document says that industry's polling, conducted by Charlton Research, has found that while Americans see climate change as a serious threat, "public opinion is open to change on climate science."

Supporters of the plan want to raise money quickly to spend much of it between now and the November negotiating session in Buenos Aires, where important details of the international treaty are to be decided.

A proposed media-relations budget of \$600,000, not counting any money for advertising, would be directed at science writers, editors, columnists and television network correspondents, using as many as 20 "respected climate scientists" recruited expressly "to inject credible science and scientific accountability into the global climate debate, thereby raising questions about and undercutting the 'prevailing scientific wisdom.'"

Among the tasks, the petroleum institute's memorandum said, would be to "identify, recruit and train a team of five independent scientists to participate in media outreach."

What the industry group wanted to provide, the memorandum said, was "a one-stop resource on climate science for members of Congress, the media, industry and all others concerned."

The industry group said it wanted to develop "a sound scientific alternative" to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, a large group of scientists advising the United Nations that has published the most authoritative scientific assessments of global warming. That panel has predicted that the next century will bring widespread climatic disruptions if actions are not taken to reverse the accumulation of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

The draft plan suggests that despite industry efforts to convince the public that the climate treaty would be costly to carry out and unfair to the United States, the treaty remains popular partly because environmentalists are winning the debate on the science.

"Indeed, the public has been highly receptive to the Clinton Administration's plans," the memorandum said. "There has been little, if any, public resistance or pressure applied to Congress to reject the treaty, except by those 'inside the Beltway' with vested interests."

To: Global Climate Science Team
Subject: Draft Global Climate Science Communications Plan

As promised, attached is the draft Global Climate Science Communications Plan that we developed during our workshop last Friday. Thanks especially to those of you who participated in the workshop, and in particular to John Adams for his very helpful thoughts following up our meeting, and Alan Caudill for turning around the notes from our workshop so quickly.

Please review the plan and get back to me with your comments as soon as possible.

As those of you who were at the workshop know, we have scheduled a follow-up team meeting to review the plan in person on Friday, April 17, from 1 to 3 p.m. at the API headquarters. After that, we hope to have a "plan champion" help us move it forward to potential funding sources, perhaps starting with the global climate "Coordinating Council." That will be an item for discussion on April 17.

Again, thanks for your hard work on this project. Please e-mail, call or fax me with your comments. Thanks.

Regards,

JOE WALKER.

APRIL 3, 1998.

GLOBAL CLIMATE SCIENCE COMMUNICATIONS ACTION PLAN

Situation analysis

In December 1997, the Clinton Administration agreed in Kyoto, Japan, to a treaty to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to prevent what it purports to be changes in the global climate caused by the continuing release of such emissions. The so-called greenhouse gases have many sources. For example, water vapor is a greenhouse gas. But the Clinton Administration's action, if eventually approved by the U.S. Senate, will mainly affect emissions from fossil fuel (gasoline, coal, natural gas, etc.) combustion.

As the climate change debate has evolved, those who oppose action have argued mainly that signing such a treaty will place the U.S. at a competitive disadvantage with most other nations, and will be extremely expensive to implement. Much of the cost will be

borne by American consumers who will pay higher prices for most energy and transportation.

The climate change theory being advanced by the treaty supporters is based primarily on forecasting models with a very high degree of uncertainty. In fact, it not known for sure whether (a) climate change actually is occurring or (b) if it is, whether humans really have any influence on it.

Despite these weaknesses in scientific understanding, those who oppose the treaty have done little to build a case against precipitous action on climate change based on the scientific uncertainty. As a result, the Clinton Administration and environmental groups essentially have had the field to themselves. They have conducted an effective public relations program to convince the American public that the climate is changing, we humans are at fault, and we must do something about it before calamity strikes.

The environmental groups know they have been successful. Commenting after the Kyoto negotiations about recent media coverage of climate change, Tom Wathen, executive vice president of the National Environmental Trust, wrote:

"... As important as the extent of the coverage was the tone and tenor of it. In a change from just six months ago, most media stories no longer presented global warming as just a theory over which reasonable scientists could differ. Most stories described predictions of global warming as the position of the overwhelming number of mainstream scientists. That the environmental community had, to a great extent, settled the scientific issue with the U.S. media is the other great success that began perhaps several months earlier but became apparent during Kyoto."

Because the science underpinning the global climate change theory has not been challenged effectively in the media or through other vehicles reaching the American public, there is widespread ignorance, which works in favor of the Kyoto treaty and against the best interests of the United States. Indeed, the public has been highly receptive to the Clinton Administration's plans. There has been little, if any, public resistance or pressure applied to Congress to reject the treaty, except by those "inside the Beltway" with vested interests.

Moreover, from the political viewpoint, it is difficult for the United States to oppose the treaty solely on economic grounds, valid as the economic issues are. It makes it too easy for others to portray the United States as putting preservation of its own lifestyle above the greater concerns of mankind. This argument, in turn, forces our negotiators to make concessions that have not been well thought through, and in the end may do far more harm than good. This is the process that unfolded at Kyoto, and is very likely to be repeated in Buenos Aires in November 1998.

The advocates of global warming have been successful on the basis of skillfully misrepresenting the science and the extent of agreement on the science, while industry and its partners ceded the science and fought on the economic issues. Yet if we can show that science does not support the Kyoto treaty—which most true climate scientists believe to be the case—this puts the United States in a stronger moral position and frees its negotiators from the need to make concessions as a defense against perceived selfish economic concerns.

Upon this tableau, the Global Climate Science Communications Team (GCSCCT) developed an action plan to inform the American public that science does not support the precipitous actions Kyoto would dictate,

thereby providing a climate for the right policy decisions to be made. The team considered results from a new public opinion survey in developing the plan.

Charlton Research's survey of 1,100 "informed Americans" suggests that while Americans currently perceive climate change to be a great threat, public opinion is open to change on climate science. When informed that "some scientists believe there is not enough evidence to suggest that [what is called global climate change] is a long-term change due to human behavior and activities," 58 percent of those surveyed said they were more likely to oppose the Kyoto treaty. Moreover, half the respondents harbored doubts about climate science.

GCSCCT members who contributed to the development of the plan are A. John Adams, John Adams Associates; Candace Crandall, Science and Environmental Policy Project; David Rothbard, Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow; Jeffrey Salmon, The Marshall Institute; Lee Garrigan, Environmental Issues Council; Lynn Bouchev and Myron Ebell, Frontiers of Freedom; Peter Cleary, Americans for Tax Reform; Randy Randol, Exxon Corp.; Robert Gehri, The Southern Company; Sharon Kneiss, Chevron Corp.; Steve Milloy, The Advancement of Sound Science Coalition; and Joseph Walker, American Petroleum Institute.

The action plan is detailed on the following pages.

GLOBAL CLIMATE SCIENCE COMMUNICATIONS ACTION PLAN

Project goal

A majority of the American public including industry leadership, recognizes that significant uncertainties exist in climate science, and therefore raises questions among those (e.g. Congress) who chart the future U.S. course on global climate change.

Progress will be measured toward the goal. A measurement of the public's perspective on climate science will be taken before the plan is launched, and the same measurement will be taken at one or more as-yet-to-be-determined intervals as the plan is implemented.

Victory will be achieved when

Average citizens "understand" (recognize) uncertainties in climate science; recognition of uncertainties becomes part of the "conventional wisdom"; media "understands" (recognizes) uncertainties in climate science; media coverage reflects balance on climate science and recognition of the validity of viewpoints that challenge the current "conventional wisdom"; industry senior leadership understands uncertainties in climate science, making them stronger ambassadors to those who shape climate policy; and those promoting the Kyoto treaty on the basis of extant science appear to be out of touch with reality.

Current reality

Unless "climate change" becomes a non-issue, meaning that the Kyoto proposal is defeated and there are no further initiatives to thwart the threat of climate change, there may be no moment when we can declare victory for our efforts. It will be necessary to establish measurements for the science effort to track progress toward achieving the goal and strategic success.

Strategies and tactics

I. National Media Relations Program: Develop and implement a national media relations program to inform the media about uncertainties in climate science; to generate national, regional and local media coverage on the scientific uncertainties, and thereby educate and inform the public, stimulating them to raise questions with policy makers.

Tactics: These tactics will be undertaken between now and the next climate meeting in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in November 1998, and will be continued thereafter, as appropriate. Activities will be launched as soon as the plan is approved, funding obtained, and the necessary resources (e.g., public relations counsel) arranged and deployed. In all cases, tactical implementation will be fully integrated with other elements of this action plan, most especially Strategy II (National Climate Science Data Center).

Identify, recruit and train a team of five independent scientists to participate in media outreach. These will be individuals who do not have a long history of visibility and/or participation in the climate change debate. Rather, this team will consist of new faces who will add their voices to those recognized scientists who already are vocal.

Develop a global climate science information kit for media including peer-reviewed papers that undercut the "conventional wisdom" on climate science. This kit also will include understandable communications, including simple fact sheets that present scientific uncertainties in language that the media and public can understand.

Conduct briefings by media-trained scientists for science writers in the top 20 media markets, using the information kits. Distribute the information kits to daily newspapers nationwide with offer of scientists to brief reporters at each paper. Develop, disseminate radio news releases scientists nationwide, and offer scientists to appear on radio talk shows across the country.

Produce, distribute a steady stream of climate science information via facsimile and e-mail to science writers around the country.

Produce, distribute via syndicate and directly to newspapers nationwide a steady stream of op-ed columns and letters to the editor authored by scientists.

Convince one of the major news national TV journalists (e.g., John Stossel) to produce a report examining the scientific underpinnings of the Kyoto treaty.

Organize, promote and conduct through grassroots organizations a series of campus/community workshops/debates on climate science in 10 most important states during the period mid-August through October, 1998.

Consider advertising the scientific uncertainties in select markets to support national, regional and local (e.g., workshops/debates), as appropriate.

National Media Program Budget—\$600,000 plus paid advertising

II. Global Climate Science Information Source: Develop and implement a program to inject credible science and scientific accountability into the global climate debate, thereby raising questions about and undercutting the "prevailing scientific wisdom." The strategy will have the added benefit of providing a platform for credible, constructive criticism of the opposition's position on the science.

Tactics: As with the National Media Relations Program, these activities will be undertaken between now and the next climate meeting in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in November 1998, and will continue thereafter. Initiatives will be launched as soon as the plan is approved, funding obtained, and the necessary resources arranged and deployed.

Establish a Global Climate Science Data Center. The GCSDC will be established in Washington as a non-profit educational foundation with an advisory board of respected climate scientists. It will be staffed initially with professionals on loan from various companies and associations with a major interest in the climate issue. These executives will bring with them knowledge and experience in the following areas: Overall history

of climate research and the IPCC process; congressional relations and knowledge of where individual Senators stand on the climate issue; knowledge of key climate scientists and where they stand; ability to identify and recruit as many as 20 respected climate scientists to serve on the science advisory board; knowledge and expertise in media relations and with established relationships with science and energy writers, columnists and editorial writers; expertise in grassroots organization; and campaign organization and administration.

The GCSDC will be led by a dynamic senior executive with a major personal commitment to the goals of the campaign and easy access to business leaders at the CEO level. The Center will be run on a day-to-day basis by an executive director with responsibility for ensuring targets are met. The Center will be funded at a level that will permit it to succeed, including funding for research contracts that may be deemed appropriate to fill gaps in climate science (e.g., a complete scientific critique of the IPCC research and its conclusions).

The GCSDC will become a one-stop resource on climate science for members of Congress, the media, industry and all others concerned. It will be in constant contact with the best climate scientists and ensure that their findings and views receive appropriate attention. It will provide them with the logistical and moral support they have been lacking. In short, it will be a sound scientific alternative to the IPCC. Its functions will include:

Providing as an easily accessible database (including a website) of all mainstream climate science information.

Identifying and establishing cooperative relationships with all major scientists whose research in this field supports our position.

Establishing cooperative relationships with other mainstream scientific organizations (e.g., meteorologists, geophysicists) to bring their perspectives to bear on the debate, as appropriate.

Developing opportunities to maximize the impact of scientific views consistent with ours with Congress, the media and other key audiences.

Monitoring and serving as an early warning system for scientific developments with the potential to impact on the climate science debate, pro and con.

Responding to claims from the scientific alarmists and media.

Providing grants for advocacy on climate science, as deemed appropriate.

Global Climate Science Data Center Budget—\$5,000,000 (spread over two years minimum)

III. National Direct Outreach and Education: Develop and implement a direct outreach program to inform and educate members of Congress, state officials, industry leadership, and school teachers/students about uncertainties in climate science. This strategy will enable Congress, state officials and industry leaders to be able to raise such serious questions about the Kyoto treaty's scientific underpinnings that American policy-makers not only will refuse to endorse it, they will seek to prevent progress toward implementation at the Buenos Aires meeting in November or through other ways. Informing teachers/students about uncertainties in climate science will begin to erect a barrier against further efforts to impose Kyoto-like measures in the future.

Tactics: Informing and educating members of Congress, state officials and industry leaders will be undertaken as soon as the plan is approved, funding is obtained, and the necessary resources are arrayed and will continue through Buenos Aires and for the fore-

seeable future. The teachers/students outreach program will be developed and launched in early 1999. In all cases, tactical implementation will be fully integrated with other elements of this action plan.

Develop and conduct through the Global Climate Science Data Center science briefings for Congress, governors, state legislators, and industry leaders by August 1998.

* * * * *

Organize under the GCSDC a "Science Education Task Group" that will serve as the point of outreach to the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) and other influential science education organizations. Work with NSTA to develop school materials that present a credible, balanced picture of climate science for use in classrooms nationwide.

Distribute educational materials directly to schools and through grassroots organizations of climate science partners (companies, organizations that participate in this effort).

National Direct Outreach Program Budget—\$300,000

IV. Funding/Fund Allocation: Develop and implement program to obtain funding, and to allocate funds to ensure that the program it is carried out effectively.

Tactics: This strategy will be implemented as soon as we have the go-ahead to proceed.

Potential funding source were identified as American Petroleum Institute (API) and its members; Business Round Table (BRT) and its members, Edison Electric Institute (EEI) and its members; Independent Petroleum Association of America (IPAA) and its members; and the National Mining Association (NMA) and its members.

Potential fund allocators were identified as the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC), Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow (CFACT), Competitive Enterprise Institute, Frontiers of Freedom and The Marshall Institute.

Total Funds Required to Implement Program through November 1998—\$2,000,000 (A significant portion of funding for the GCSDC will be deferred until 1999 and beyond)

Measurements

Various metrics will be used to track progress. These measurements will have to be determined in fleshing out the action plan and may include:

Baseline public/government official opinion surveys and periodic follow-up surveys on the percentage of Americans and government officials who recognize significant uncertainties in climate science.

Tracking the percent of media articles that raise questions about climate science.

Number of Members of Congress exposed to our materials on climate science.

Number of communications on climate science received by Members of Congress from their constituents.

* * * * *

Number of school teachers/students reached with our information on climate science.

Number of science writers briefed and who report upon climate science uncertainties.

Total audience exposed to newspaper, radio, television coverage of science uncertainties.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STOKES.
Ms. SLAUGHTER.
Mr. SCHUMER.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution to acknowledge the Historic Northern Ireland Peace Agreement; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 28, 1998, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8663. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Removal of Quarantined Area [Docket No. 97-056-9] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8664. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Removal of Quarantined Area [Docket No. 97-102-2] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8665. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Georgia [Docket No. 98-018-1] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8666. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Dairy Tariff-Rate Import Quota Licensing (7 CFR Part 6) received April 16, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8667. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Propiconazole; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300637; FRL-5783-5] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received April 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8668. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Fenoxaprop-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-300635; FRL-5782-1] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received April 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.