

NATALIE ROSS. Recently, as you can tell by today, we had many people who brought up many concerns about how advertisers influence us, and many different things—we were reminded of the tragedy up in Newport, which, unfortunately, claimed two of my very close friends.

I feel there is a message that we're sending to our youth that is not totally appropriate. It has been engraved in our brains for the longest time not to drink and drive, but I think that message is totally appropriate for adults who are of age, because they have the right to drink. But I think we are only fighting the battle halfway when we tell students not to drink and drive; I feel the message should be not to drink at all.

Many times students say, it is okay, you know, somebody will bail me out. For example, we had a community forum in St. Albans, and we have many parents who said, Sure, on prom night, I will sit at City Hall and wait for all the teenagers who are drinking, that are too, in their minds, drunk to drive home, and I will go and get them. But I feel they are sending the wrong message, because that is just saying: We will come and get you if you mess up. And I feel that there are too many times that people get off the hook too easily. And I'm not exactly sure what the answer is, but I just wanted to come today and express my concern about this.

STATEMENT BY NORA CONLON, MEGAN REARDON, BLAIR MARVIN, SHAWN BEIGEN, KATE HENRY AND PHILLIP MOORE REGARDING THE U.N. AND THE U.S.

NORA CONLON. A great deal of how successful the United Nations is depends on the attitudes of its member states. Americans have usually supported full U.S. cooperation with the U.N., but the level of support declined markedly beginning in the early 1970s, and remained relatively low during the 1980s. The U.S.'s stance during that period toward the United Nations was that of a reluctant participant.

The 1990s have witnessed a strong revival of American support for full U.S. cooperation with the United Nations. This is because President Clinton's administration has expressed a great interest in the U.N., more so than its predecessors. The U.N. support that exists now from Americans is roughly equal to the strong support that existed in the 1960s. While American public support for the U.N. may be high, nevertheless the United States Government's opinion of the U.N.'s effectiveness is low.

This chart illustrates U.S. cooperation with the United Nations. The question asked was whether or not poll respondents agreed with the statement: Should the United States cooperate fully with the United Nations? The red line represents the percentage of those who are in support of full cooperation, while the black line represents those who oppose full cooperation with the United Nations. You can see that American support for the United Nations has increased considerably, and yet the U.S. Government has taken a far different stance towards the U.N.

KATE HENEY. The tension is between the U.S. and the U.N. is financial. By a contradiction of terms, the U.S. is both the greatest contributor and debtor of the 185 member countries of the U.N. The United States is responsible for 25 percent of U.N. expenditures, but despite a \$60 billion surplus in our own budget, we are \$1.3 billion behind in our payments to the peacekeeping budget of the U.N.

Legislative efforts have been made to pay up—and, actually, I have a question for you, Congressman, concerning this. On March 26th, the State Department authorization bill approved by voice vote an \$819 million

U.N. debt payment. This has been stalled since 1997, because the House of Representatives tried to include a provision holding that none of the money was to fund any family planning organization that performed abortions. President Clinton vows to veto any bill containing the abortion provision.

I believe that they have lost sight of the humanitarian issues and that the payment of international peacekeeping dues should not be prevented by conflicts within our own government. I was wondering what your position was on this.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS. I will answer that question in a minute, Okay? I am happy to answer that, but let's let everybody make their statement.

BLAIR MARVIN. One of the reasons why the U.S. is withholding a payment of its debt is that our government has developed its own agenda for U.N. reform. The United States emphasis on reform is intended to stabilize the U.N. financially, making the organization more efficient. We wanted it to be more focused on key priorities and more accountable for its members.

Progress has begun in areas of greater budget discipline. The two key requirements in this is the lowering of the U.S.'s assessed share of the U.N. budget from 25 percent to 20 percent over a three-year period, along with the creation of a contested arrears account for debts disputed by the U.S.

One other area of reform is the U.S. commitment to the expansion the U.N. Security Council, which will strengthen its effectiveness and this will enhance representation throughout the world without detracting from its working efficiency. The U.S. wishes to grant permanent seats to Japan and accept three other seats from the developing nations from the regions of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

PHILLIP MOORE. The U.N. is a valuable asset for the U.S. foreign policy. On numerous occasions, the U.N. has given the United States a chance to gain international backing for issues important to American national interests—for instance, the Persian Gulf War. The U.N. Security Council provided for several measures which gave support for a multinational coalition force, which helped regain control of Kuwait from Iraq and also provided President Clinton with the authorization to form a multinational force to help reinstall the democratic government on Haiti.

The peacekeeping missions of the U.N. are also vital to American interests. Often, peacekeeping missions keep regional conflicts from growing into a wider crisis which may involve U.S. military intervention. For instance, on the island of Cyprus. The two NATO nations of Greece and Turkey have a conflict over the island of Cyprus. However, U.N. forces have kept the issue from growing into open conflict. And since the two nations are members of NATO, that could be a serious problem for the alliance. Humanitarian aid of the U.N. also benefits America as well, because it is in no one's interest to allow members of other countries to go on suffering.

By not paying our dues to the U.N., we are weakening our ability to play a larger role in the international community and ultimately hurt our own national interest and well-being.

MEGAN REARDON. We would like to leave you with a few suggestions on the U.N., because it is a tough topic. We propose you support the U.N. agencies on human rights and economic and social development; and pay our dues, which is an important one; support expansion of the Security Council with Germany and Japan; and support and gain support for collective peacekeeping.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS. Thank you. Excellent.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. DAVID MCINTOSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4194) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes:

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, today, the House needs to retain the legislative restriction on new regulations in the VA-HUD bill to ensure that the Clinton-Gore Administration does not implement the Kyoto Protocol through the backdoor prior to Senate ratification of the treaty.

Retaining this language will ensure that the Administration will not circumvent through regulation the Senate's constitutional responsibility of advice and consent with respect to treaties.

In Kyoto, Vice President Al Gore already ignored the U.S. Senate's bi-partisan, unanimous resolution (the 95-0 Byrd-Hagel resolution) not to negotiate a treaty which either exempts developing countries or hurts the American economy.

In a series of hearings entitled "The Kyoto Protocol: Is the Clinton-Gore Administration Selling Out Americans?," my Subcommittee has heard from democratic and Republican State and local elected officials, businesses, labor, and consumers, that the Kyoto Protocol is a bad deal for America and will have dire consequences on Americans, including:

Huge job losses, up to 1.5 million according to the AFL-CIO and more according to other studies; Cecil Roberts, the President of the United Mine Workers, testified that the Administration should not proceed prior to Senate ratification; Ande Abbot representing the Boilermakers union, part of the AFL-CIO, agreed—no implementation prior to ratification.

Huge increase in the cost of living for American families (\$2700 more per household for energy and other products);

Greatly diminished U.S. trade competitiveness;

Recently, a union machinist from my district testified before my Subcommittee that the Kyoto Protocol "is bad news for the American worker" and "we want jobs, not assistance."

Al Gore's Kyoto Protocol is a fundamentally flawed treaty, with unrealistic targets and timetables.

It commits the U.S. to reduce greenhouse gas emission by 7% below 1990 levels within the 2008-2012 period.

In real terms, this treaty mandates an unprecedented 41% reduction of fossil fuels use from business-as-usual.

Al Gore's Kyoto Protocol is unfair and unworkable.

It does not allow developing countries (like China, India, and Brazil), which will be emitting a majority of the world's greenhouse gas

emissions by 2015, to opt in to the targets and timetables.

It allows the developing countries, which constitute a majority and which have no obligations to reduce emissions, to define the rules, procedures, and enforcement mechanisms of the treaty.

CEA Chair Janet Yellen testified that the economic impact would be "modest" if the U.S. was able to satisfy 85% of its Kyoto obligations by purchasing emission reduction credits from other countries. Other countries have refused to agree to such a trading system.

Amazingly, the White House has been unwilling to disclose to Congress information and analyses to justify the president's request for a huge increase in funding (+\$6.3 billion) for its climate change agenda and to support fully its policy positions about this major initiative; as a consequence, Chairman Burton has so far issued three subpoenas to obtain key documents and may be forced to issue more subpoenas and/or to go the next step by pursuing one or more contempt resolutions.

While Al Gore, in a recent press conference, claimed that Congress is imposing a gag order on global warming, it is the Administration that is imposing a gag order by withholding documents that would supposedly help to explain and justify its budget request. What is the Administration hiding and why are they hiding it?

Let's send a message to Al Gore that Congress is entitled to the information and documents we have requested since March and that the Clinton-Gore Administration cannot undermine Congress' Constitutional role through back-door implementation of the Kyoto Protocol prior to Senate ratification.

VOTE "NO" ON THE GREENWOOD AMENDMENT

A "NO" VOTE ON THE GREENWOOD AMENDMENT IS A NO VOTE ON THE KYOTO TREATY UNTIL IT IS RATIFIED BY THE SENATE

Let's make sure that the Clinton-Gore administration does not make an end-run around our constitutional process to implement the Kyoto Protocol.

Myth	Reality
Good Deal: The Administration says that the Kyoto Protocol will be good for America.	Bad Deal: The Kyoto Protocol is a bad deal for America. It violates the Byrd-Hagel Resolution (which passed the Senate pre-Kyoto by a 95-0 vote) because it only places restrictions on developed nations (exempting all developing countries entirely) and because it could result in serious harm to the U.S. economy. And, it would result in no net environmental gains.
Achievable Target and Timetable: The Administration says that it negotiated realistic and achievable U.S. targets and timeframes in the Kyoto Treaty.	Unachievable Target and Timetable: This agreement requires the U.S. to reduce its emissions of greenhouse gases by 7% below 1990 levels between the years 2008-2012. Even if America stopped operating every car, truck, boat, train, and airplane in this country, the energy savings would not be enough to meet the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol. In fact, Under Secretary of State Stuart Eizenstat testified that Congress should fund the President's requested \$6.3 billion climate change budget increase in order to "place us further down the road so that we won't have to face the kind of drastic reductions that we would otherwise have to face."
Fair: The Administration says that it will obtain the "meaningful participation" of developing countries.	Grossly Unfair: The Kyoto Treaty exempts the vast majority of the international community from making reductions in their emissions of greenhouse gases. There are not even voluntary opt-in provisions for developing countries. At Kyoto, the China delegate announced his 3-no policy: No, we will not restrict our emissions; No, we will not promise to restrict our emissions in the future; No, we will not agree to a voluntarily opt-in clause in the treaty to reduce emissions. Recently in Bonn, Germany, the G-77 nations and China adamantly opposed even including an agenda item on voluntary commitments by developing countries for Buenos Aires in November 1998.

Myth Reality

International Emissions Trading No Panacea: The Administration says that the costs to American workers, consumers, and businesses will be "modest" because a significant portion of the U.S. emissions reductions requirements can be undertaken by other nations through international emissions trading. In fact, the Administration's estimates assume that the U.S. will satisfy 85% of its Kyoto obligation by purchasing credits from other countries which can reduce emissions more cheaply.	International Emissions Trading No Panacea: Developing countries and the European Union are firmly opposed to any unrestricted, global emissions trading system that allows any country to buy its way into compliance. Developing countries have stated that they will not commit to cap their emissions so that they can participate in emissions trading. In May 1998 President Clinton signed a G-8 National Communique committing the U.S. to "undertake domestically the steps necessary to reduce significantly greenhouse gas emissions," and, as the Kyoto Protocol says, to use trading simply to "supplement domestic actions."
Treaty Advances Technological Development: Based on a study performed by 5 Department of Energy national laboratories, the Administration claims that technologies can be developed and deployed between now and 2010 that could reduce emissions and energy consumption sufficient to meet our Kyoto Protocol target.	Treaty Threatens Technological Development: Even that 5-lab study indicates that it will require "luck" to achieve the necessary technological breakthroughs by 2010. At hearings before the Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs, Dr. John McTague, VP, Ford Motor Company, testified that, contrary to the Administration's rosy predictions, deployment of new technology through the joint government/industry Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles will not meet the U.S. Kyoto targets and timetable. He stated that the treaty's "rigid timetables threaten significant disruption to sound technological development." The treaty's short timeframe for compliance will divert limited resources into high-cost, less effective investments.
Full disclosure of information: The Administration claims that Council of Economic Advisers (CEA) Chair Janet Yellen's so-called "economic analysis" (without any backup tables) and its budget request provide sufficient information for Congress to act favorably. It has stated one conclusion after another about how the U.S. can meet its Kyoto Protocol commitment through technology development and international emissions trading.	Stonewalling on disclosure of information: The Administration has been unwilling to disclose to Congress information and analyses to justify its funding requests and its policy positions. As a result, the Government Reform and Oversight Committee was forced to issue 3 subpoenas in order to obtain documents and may even have to pursue contempt resolutions.

IMPACT OF THE KYOTO PROTOCOL BY STATE

[Source: 1998 WEFA data]

State	Number of jobs lost by 2010 under Kyoto Protocol	Unemployment rate in 2010		State tax revenue \$ lost (in millions) by 2010 under Kyoto Protocol
		Without Kyoto Protocol	Under Kyoto Protocol	
Alabama	67,500	3.63	6.33	929
Alaska	4,300	7.20	8.51	239
Arizona	102,300	3.03	5.73	1,700
Arkansas	20,600	4.72	6.13	513
California	278,800	6.10	7.73	11,500
Colorado	47,400	3.75	5.32	2,000
Connecticut	28,100	5.48	6.97	1,800
Delaware	4,500	4.71	5.64	264
Florida	142,000	4.97	6.56	5,800
Georgia	80,000	3.92	5.48	2,700
Hawaii	9,700	6.55	8.15	329
Idaho	11,600	3.92	5.28	393
Illinois	190,700	3.38	6.06	5,200
Indiana	99,700	3.65	6.15	1,800
Iowa	21,600	5.07	6.29	785
Kansas	18,400	4.21	5.39	780
Kentucky	56,500	4.60	7.10	997
Louisiana	64,500	6.35	8.85	945
Maine	7,000	5.31	6.37	322
Maryland	33,300	4.71	5.92	2,000
Massachusetts	45,600	4.32	5.50	2,900
Michigan	96,500	3.80	5.54	3,400
Minnesota	46,900	3.45	4.93	1,800
Mississippi	28,600	5.86	7.94	1,623
Missouri	48,700	4.04	5.55	288
Montana	41,500	6.04	9.94	502
Nebraska	19,000	3.09	4.82	502
Nevada	27,300	4.64	6.48	1,000
New Hampshire	12,400	4.39	6.12	447
New Jersey	120,500	5.15	7.84	3,600
New Mexico	13,500	7.26	8.68	377
New York	140,000	6.24	7.76	7,100
North Carolina	107,200	3.95	6.14	2,500
North Dakota	3,600	2.78	3.66	173
Ohio	119,800	3.92	5.74	3,500
Oklahoma	26,600	3.83	5.41	753

IMPACT OF THE KYOTO PROTOCOL BY STATE—Continued

[Source: 1998 WEFA data]

State	Number of jobs lost by 2010 under Kyoto Protocol	Unemployment rate in 2010		State tax revenue \$ lost (in millions) by 2010 under Kyoto Protocol
		Without Kyoto Protocol	Under Kyoto Protocol	
Oregon	22,900	5.47	6.63	1,200
Pennsylvania	108,000	4.65	6.37	3,800
Rhode Island	3,400	4.57	5.27	260
South Carolina	32,500	5.48	6.99	815
South Dakota	7,200	3.23	4.81	191
Tennessee	39,500	5.41	6.61	1,500
Texas	124,600	5.21	6.32	6,000
Utah	12,700	3.09	3.89	713
Vermont	2,300	4.12	4.79	167
Virginia	34,600	4.23	5.06	2,300
Washington	47,700	5.35	6.76	2,400
West Virginia	19,400	4.87	7.09	319
Wisconsin	69,800	2.59	4.71	1,800
Wyoming	7,600	5.45	8.29	116
Total ¹	2,24	5.43	6.95	93.1

¹ The details do not add to totals because the totals, which are underestimated, are based on a national model.

² Million.

³ Billion.

PARTIES WITH BINDING COMMITMENTS UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

Country	Percentage commitment
Australia	108
Austria	92
Belgium	92
Bulgaria	92
Canada	94
Croatia	95
Czech Republic	92
Denmark	92
Estonia	92
European Community	92
Finland	92
France	92
Germany	92
Greece	92
Hungary	94
Iceland	110
Ireland	92
Italy	92
Japan	94
Latvia	92
Liechtenstein	92
Lithuania	92
Luxembourg	92
Monaco	92
Netherlands	92
New Zealand	100
Norway	101
Poland	94
Portugal	92
Romania	92
Russian Federation	100
Slovakia	92
Slovenia	92
Spain	92
Sweden	92
Switzerland	92
Ukraine	100
United States of America	93
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	92

PARTIES EXEMPT FROM BINDING COMMITMENTS UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

Albania, Algeria, Antigua & Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Buikina Faso, Burundi.
 Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Rep., Chad, Chile, China, Columbia, Comoros, Congo, Cook Island, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus.
 Democratic Republic of the Congo, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica.
 Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia.
 Fiji.
 Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras.
 India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel.
 Jamaica, Jordan.
 Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait.
 Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho.

Macedonia, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova (Republic of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar.

Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Niger, Nive.

Oman.

Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines.

Qatar.

Republic of Korea.

Saint Kitts & Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands,

South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic.

Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad & Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu.

Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan.

Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam.

Yemen.

Zambia, Zimbabwe.