

need to put a highly qualified teacher in every classroom in each school in which 50 percent or more of the children are from low income families, over the next 4 years;

(2) provide 125,000 new teachers with mentors and year-long supervised internships; and

(3) provide high quality pedagogical training for every teacher in every school.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out title II Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—

(1) \$3,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

(2) \$4,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;

(3) \$4,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2005;

(4) \$5,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2006;

(5) \$5,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2007;

(6) \$6,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2008.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, is morning business the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct, with a 10-minute limitation.

Mr. DODD. I gather our colleague and friend from West Virginia may be here shortly, as he is inclined to do on Fridays for periods of enlightenment. I encourage Members to listen carefully to the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia. He always has the most interesting discussions on history and poetry and important national holidays and days of recognition. It is worthy of the Senate's attention for those who may be following the debate through the channels of public communication.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for as long as is necessary, and it will not be all that long, but long enough.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FUTURE COURSE OF THE INTERNATIONAL CLIMATE CHANGE NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, earlier this week, Vice President CHENEY gave us a brief glimpse of the administration's soon-to-be-released energy plan that suggests that we need to take action to avert an impending energy crisis. He suggested that the plan will push for increasing fuel supplies from domestic sources. Still, the Vice President did

not explain how domestic climate change programs will be reflected in the energy plan, nor did he discuss press reports that the administration is developing a plan to deal with the international aspects of climate change.

I would like to focus on the latter, and discuss recent decisions by the administration regarding the international negotiations. Climate change cannot be discussed in complete isolation from the soon-to-be released energy plan, since the issue of climate change must be addressed both domestically and internationally.

I wish to note, at the outset, that I applaud the administration's support for clean coal technologies and the administration's recognition that coal is one of our country's most important sources of energy. I recognize and strongly support this policy by the executive branch. A bill I have introduced this session, S. 60, the National Electricity and Environmental Technology Act, addresses the challenges faced by coal, and I would welcome the administration's active support to utilize coal in a cleaner, more efficient way.

I also believe, however, that it would be a mistake to focus too heavily just on increasing fuel supplies from domestic sources. If that is where the administration is headed, it is not on exactly the right path. In order to solve the challenge of climate change, we must develop new domestic sources such as coal, using clean coal technologies, while also engaging in bold initiatives to develop new technologies in the area of energy conservation, energy efficiency, and renewable energy.

I am concerned, based upon preliminary reports, that the administration's plan may not reflect such a balanced and farsighted perspective. Let me begin by noting the obvious—the primary, manmade cause of global warming is the burning of the very fossil fuels that power virtually the entire world.

Here is part of the power just above us as we look up to the ceiling of the Senate Chamber and see these lights. What is required, then, is the equivalent of an industrial revolution. We must develop new and cleaner technologies to burn fossil fuels as well as new methods to capture and sequester greenhouse gases, and we must develop renewable technology that is practical and cost-effective. Rarely has mankind been confronted with such a challenge—a challenge to improve how we power our economy. This is the greatest nation in the world when the issue is one of applying our engineering talents to push beyond the next incremental improvement, and, instead, visualize and then achieve major leaps forward. We can do this, if only we apply ourselves. The scale and the scope of the problem are enormous, as is the leadership that will be required by the current administration, and, for that matter, the next dozen adminis-

trations, if we are to confront and overcome this awesome challenge in our children's time and in our grandchildren's lifetime.

But this takes visionary leadership. It would take extraordinary leadership. We need more than just small, incremental increases in our domestic oil supplies or in our existing research and development programs. This is an approach which only pays lip service to the challenge that we face. It is a huge challenge. I hope that the administration's plan will take a broader view.

We must also recognize that the European Union, China, and other developing nations are quick to point the finger at us, at the world's largest contributor to global warming. We must demonstrate our resolve, and begin to get our own house in order by launching such a research and development effort, as well as continuing and expanding our current efforts to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.

However, it should also be noted that China will soon surpass us as the largest emitter of greenhouse gases. The Chinese Government must stop blocking all forward movement on the question of developing country participation. The developing world is poorly served by the current level of Chinese intransigence. The poorest nations in the developing world—which will be those that are hardest hit by global warming during this century—must demand leadership from within their own ranks, and especially from China. The Chinese leadership must join us in honestly discussing solutions to the problem of climate change. The United States can develop and provide the technological breakthroughs that can be deployed by all nations, as we move forward together to solve this common, global problem.

However, I want to emphatically warn that new technologies and voluntary approaches will not by themselves solve this problem. We must also actively negotiate and ratify international agreements that include binding commitments for all of the largest emitters of greenhouse gases, if we are to have any hope of solving one of the world's—one of humanity's—greatest challenges.

This concern takes me back to the Senate's actions just 4 years ago. During the Senate floor debate over Senate Resolution 98 in July 1997, I expressed two fundamental beliefs that have guided my approach on the issue of climate change. First, while some scientific uncertainties remain, I believe that there is significant, mounting evidence that mankind is altering the world's climate. Second, the voluntary approach of the 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, commonly known as the Rio Convention, has failed, as almost all of the nations of the world, including the United States, have been unable to meet their obligations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels. With those points in mind, we must ask

what needs to be done in a binding fashion to begin to address this global issue—the preeminent environmental challenge of our time.

On July 25, 1997, the Senate passed, by a vote of 95-0, S. Res. 98 which stated that, first, developing nations, especially the largest emitters, must agree to binding emission reduction commitments at the same time as industrialized nations and, second, any international climate change agreement must not result in serious harm to the U.S. economy. That resolution served as guidance to U.S. negotiators as they prepared to hammer out the details of the Kyoto Protocol.

Senator HAGEL and I were the prime cosponsors of that resolution.

The adoption of that resolution was perhaps, a dose of reality—laying out, in advance of the completion of the Kyoto negotiations or the anticipated submission of a climate change treaty to the Senate, just what an administration—any administration—would need to win the Senate's advice and consent. Contrary to statements made by some in this administration, the Senate has never voted on the Kyoto Protocol, although the protocol, in its current form, does not meet the requirements of S. Res. 98.

Since that vote in July 1997, international climate change negotiations have covered a wide range of topics in an attempt to craft a balanced treaty. While there have been some important gains and there have been some unfortunate setbacks from the U.S. perspective, I am concerned that, in the Bush administration's zeal to reject Kyoto for its failure to comply with S. Res. 98, the baby is being thrown out with the bath water through a complete abandonment of the negotiating process. Such an abandonment would be very costly to U.S. leadership and credibility and could force the international community to go back to "square one" on certain critical issues such as carbon sequestration and market-based mechanisms—areas which I believe are critical to any future binding climate change treaty.

Still, an examination even of Kyoto's drawbacks can provide the basis for forward movement by the Bush administration.

Let me say that again. An examination, even of Kyoto's drawbacks, can provide the basis for forward movement by the Bush administration.

For example, U.S. negotiators should go back to the negotiating table with proposals that could be achieved internationally. In my opinion, an effective and binding international agreement must include several elements. First, the initial binding emission reduction targets and caps should be economically and environmentally achievable. Such an international agreement should specify increments by which the initial reduction could be ratcheted downward and made more stringent over time. This architecture could provide a realistic and obtainable target,

and it would give U.S. industry more time to prepare to meet such requirements. Additionally, the inclusion of incremental reductions would encourage the development of a range of cleaner, more efficient technologies to meet the long-term goal, namely, the stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere. Most important, these steps would give the United States a clearer path toward the goal of dealing seriously with a serious and growing problem.

Recently, we have heard talk by the Bush administration to the effect that the United States should promote voluntary initiatives to meet our international treaty commitments. Well, that sounds good, but it will not work. I note that, in 1993, the former administration undertook an extensive assessment to formulate the U.S. Climate Change Action Plan, which subsequently developed a wide range of voluntary programs and technology strategies to help the United States reduce domestic emissions to 1990 levels. While these remain laudable and important programs, they have not put us on a path toward significantly reducing greenhouse gas emissions. In fact, rather than accomplishing that goal, by the late 1990s, U.S. emissions were at least 11 percent above those 1990 levels. Clearly then, the next global climate change treaty will have to include binding emission limits by industrialized nations, as well as developing nations, specifically the biggest emitters in the developing world. I am talking about China, India, Mexico, Brazil, and others.

Additionally, as I explained at the time we were debating S. Res. 98, the initial commitment by developing countries could be modest, with the agreement specifying a more rigorous approach to growth and emissions over time. Recent press reports indicate that China, the big emitter, exceeding the emissions of the United States very soon, has already made progress in reducing the growth of its greenhouse gas emissions. That is good news. That is encouraging. A future binding climate change agreement could recognize these efforts and provide market-based mechanisms by which China could obtain technological assistance to expand upon its efforts over time.

An international treaty with binding commitments can and should provide for the continued growth of the world's developing nations. The economic growth of Mexico or China, for example, need not be choked off by unrealistically stringent, inflexible emission reduction targets. The initial commitment could be relatively modest, pacing upwards depending upon various factors, with a specific goal to be achieved within a fixed time period. If properly designed, a binding international treaty can accommodate economic growth and environmental improvement in the developing world. This approach provides the means by which China and other key developing

nations can grow in a more efficient, environmentally sound manner while also making commitments to reduce their fair share of this global climate change burden.

Using this approach, the Bush administration has a historic opportunity to shape, rather than cripple, the international climate change debate by negotiating an agreement that includes all of the largest emitters of greenhouse gases on a global basis.

It is a huge task no doubt, but it is a huge problem, and it confronts the world, not just the West but also the East. Such an agreement must also include market mechanisms that are unencumbered by layers of bureaucracy; strong provisions for domestic and international sinks, sequestration, and projects that prevent deforestation; and tough enforcement and compliance requirements.

But any such agreement must also be met by an honest effort on America's domestic front. I am, therefore, very concerned that the President's overall budget does not adequately provide the level of funding necessary to support programs and policies that would address U.S. energy and climate change challenges. So I urge the Bush Administration to include all relevant policy aspects in the energy needs assessment currently under review and to examine the total costs—both economic and environmental—in any national energy strategy. I hope the President will work with Congress on these critical issues to develop a constructive, long-term negotiating path for the future. America leads the world in so many important areas—addressing our global climate change challenges should be front and center.

TRADE POLICY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have serious concerns about certain trade policy issues that the Bush administration inherited from its predecessor, but which remain unresolved. I refer to the steel crisis, the failure to formulate a coherent trade policy with respect to China, and the failure to recognize that "fast-track" trade negotiating authority represents both an unwarranted diminution of the Constitutional authority of Congress and an invitation to our trade partners to accelerate their attack on the framework of fair trade.

As I have long maintained, U.S. trade policy cannot be complacent as America's manufacturing plants are moved to low-wage countries, a phenomenon that makes it increasingly difficult for American employers to stay competitive and, at the same time, pay good wages and provide good benefits to their workers. While American workers do benefit from lower prices for imported products, too many have been made worse off, on balance, by globalization. As the columnist Michael Kelly recently pointed out, "What the unionists know is that