

were poised to present our ideas the end of September, which is when the intifada erupted.

He knew we were poised to present the ideas. His own people were telling him they looked good. And we asked him to intervene to ensure there wouldn't be violence after the Sharon visit, the day after. He said he would. He didn't lift a finger.

On a final plan in December:

Now, eventually we were able to get back to a point where private channels between the two sides led each of them to again ask us to present the ideas. This was in early December. We brought the negotiators here.

The ideas were presented on December 23 by the President, and they basically said the following:

On borders, there would be about a 5 percent annexation in the West Bank for the Israelis and a 2 percent swap. So there would be a net 97 percent of the territory that would go to the Palestinians.

On Jerusalem, the Arab neighborhoods of East Jerusalem would become the capitol of the Palestinian state.

On the issue of refugees, there would be a right of return for the refugees to their own state, not to Israel, but there would also be a fund of \$30 billion internationally that would be put together for either compensation or to cover repatriation, resettlement, rehabilitation costs.

And when it came to security, there would be an international presence, in place of the Israelis, in the Jordan Valley.

These were ideas that were comprehensive, unprecedented, stretched very far, represented a culmination of an effort in our best judgment as to what each side could accept after thousands of hours of debate, discussion with each side.

Arafat came to the White House on January 2.

Mr. President, it was January 2, just before President Clinton left office.

Met with the president, and I was there—

"I" being Dennis Ross—

in the Oval Office. He said yes, and then he added reservations that basically meant he rejected every single one of the things he was supposed to give.

He [was] supposed to give, on Jerusalem, the idea that there would be for the Israelis sovereignty over the Western Wall, which would cover the areas that are of religious significance to Israel. He rejected that.

He rejected the idea on the refugees. He said we need a whole new formula, as if what we had presented was non-existent.

He rejected the basic ideas on security. He wouldn't even countenance the idea that the Israelis would be able to operate in Palestinian airspace.

This is commercial aviation.

You know when you fly into Israel today you go to Ben Gurion. You fly in over the West Bank because you can't—there's no space through otherwise. He rejected that.

So every single one of the ideas that was asked of him he rejected.

Dennis Ross then went on to say:

It's very clear to me that his negotiators understood this was the best they were ever going to get. They wanted him to accept it. He was not prepared to accept it.

Then on why Arafat said no. Dennis Ross said:

Because fundamentally I do not believe he can end the conflict. We had one critical clause in this agreement, and that clause was, this is the end of the conflict.

Arafat's whole life has been governed by struggle and a cause. Everything he has done

as leader of the Palestinians is to always leave his options open, never close a door. He was being asked here, you've got to close the door. For him to end the conflict is to end himself.

Now, he was asked the question on whether Arafat believed he could get more through violence. This is how Dennis Ross responded. And I quote:

It is possible he concluded that. It is possible he thought he could do and get more with the violence. There's no doubt in my mind that he thought the violence would create pressure on the Israelis and on us and maybe the rest of the world.

And I think there's one other factor. You have to understand that Barak was able to reposition Israel internationally. Israel was seen as having demonstrated unmistakably it wanted peace, and the reason it wasn't available, achievable was because Arafat wouldn't accept it.

Arafat needed to re-establish the Palestinians as a victim, and unfortunately they are a victim, and we see it now in a terrible way.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I certainly will.

Mr. REID. I did not see this interview on television over the weekend, so I appreciate very much the Senator from California bringing it to my attention and the attention of the Senate and the American people.

But it appears to me that what he has said—"he," meaning Dennis Ross—is that Yasser Arafat could not take yes for an answer. It appears that he and his people got everything they asked for, and that still was not good enough.

Is that how the Senator sees that?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I think that is exactly correct.

What Dennis Ross said, essentially, was the final negotiations, that had been gone over prior to this meeting in the White House, had been gone over with the negotiators—that the implication is, that there was an assent to it by the negotiators, and then when the meeting was held in the White House, Arafat said, yes, but then he presented so many reservations that that clearly countermanded the "yes."

So the implication that is drawn from that, I say to the Senator, is that you are absolutely right. When push came to shove, Yasser Arafat said no.

Mr. REID. Well, I appreciate very much the Senator from California bringing this to our attention. And I have a clear picture that what has taken place in the Middle East since August a year ago is the direct result of the inability of Yasser Arafat to accept what he had asked for in the first place; that is, all the violence, all the deaths, all the destruction, I personally place at his footsteps.

I want the Senator from California to know how I personally feel, that this man, to whom I tried to give every benefit of the doubt, has none of my doubt any more. I think Yasser Arafat is responsible for the problems in the Middle East totally.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I say to Senator REID, thank you very much. I appreciate those comments. I think there

are many in the Senate who share those comments. What is so significant to me because I know Dennis Ross—and Dennis Ross was really an excellent Middle East envoy, an excellent negotiator, fully knowledgeable about all of the points of convention—and I thought if anybody had a chance of achieving a settlement, it really was Dennis Ross and President Clinton. And, clearly, that did not happen. I think on this "FOX News Sunday," Dennis Ross clearly said why it did not happen.

So I appreciate those comments.

THE ARAFAT ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, on Thursday, Senator MCCONNELL and I introduced legislation that had findings as well as bill language containing some sanctions. The title of the legislation is the Arafat Accountability Act. I do not want to argue that now, but I do want to point out, in a column in this morning's New York Times, Mr. William Safire, under the title "Democrats vs. Israel," made a statement about this resolution, saying it has been blocked by Majority Leader TOM DASCHLE.

This is not true. Senator MCCONNELL and I presented the bill on Thursday. We indicated we were not pushing for its passage at the present time, that we wanted time to go out and achieve a number of cosponsors. That was the reason for any delay. So I would like the record to clearly reflect that.

EARTH DAY AND GLOBAL WARMING

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today is the 32nd anniversary of Earth Day. I think it is fitting, then, to say a few words about the world's No. 1 environmental problem; and that is clearly global warming. It is also fitting because last week the east coast of our country experienced its first April heat wave in more than a quarter of a century. Even more disturbing, in February, an iceberg, the size of Rhode Island, collapsed from the Antarctic ice shelf.

The Earth's average temperature has risen 1.3 degrees in the last 100 years. Computer models predict an increase of 2 to 6 degrees over the next century.

The 10 hottest years on record have all occurred since 1986. What does that mean? Today the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide—that is our No. 1 greenhouse gas—is 30 percent higher than preindustrial levels. This may seem to be a small change, but just a few upticks in temperature can produce catastrophic conditions in weather. So the window of time to do something to curb global warming is closing fast.

One of my disappointments with the energy bill is the fact that there is no substantive action taken to reduce our Nation's profligate carbon dioxide pollution.

California is in a unique and precarious position. With a population of 34 million people today and an expected population of 50 million by 2020, the State is particularly vulnerable to global climate change. Global warming could make California's water even more scarce, create further flooding, destroy certain agricultural crops, and lead to more frequent and intense Sierra forest fires. Because global warming will likely increase sea levels and since most of the population lives just a stone's throw from the coast, the result could be flooding for millions of Californians.

Actually, there has already been a significant rise in sea level along the U.S. coast of about a tenth of an inch per year, which translates into about 11 inches per century.

The global sea level is rising about three times faster over the past 100 years compared to the previous 3,000 years. The melting of polar ice and land-based glaciers is expected to contribute a projected one-half to 3-foot sea level rise for the 21st century. That is enormous. Just a 20-inch rise in sea level from climate change could inundate 3,200 to 7,300 square miles of dry land.

The Presiding Officer, coming from the State of Hawaii, knows how that could impact his State.

This could eliminate as much as 50 percent of North America's coastal wetlands. In northern California, increased winter flows into San Francisco Bay could increase the flooding risk and shift saltwater upstream from the bay. This is already happening. Saltwater levels are rising in the delta areas. This increased saltwater penetration into the delta, which is the source of two-thirds of the drinking water for the State, could affect water quality for millions of Californians.

The underlying cause of flooding is also very concerning. Mountain glaciers throughout the world seem to be receding. Glacier National Park may be glacier free by 2070, and the Sierra Nevada mountains may be glacier free soon after. The Greenland ice sheet has already lost roughly 40 percent of its thickness over the past four decades. And shrinking ice caps may very well alter ocean circulation and storm tracks.

Rising sea level is not our only concern. Precipitation, rain, has increased by 5 to 10 percent during the last century. Much of this was attributed to heavy and very heavy rainfall events which reaffirm the importance of developing ways of storing this water during wet periods and having it available during times of drought, because global warming means more turbulent weather patterns; it means more hurricanes, more tornadoes. When it rains, the drops of rain are bigger, the rainfall is more intense; ergo, the destruction is greater.

The report also pointed out that rising temperatures are likely to result in less snow and more rain, quicker melt-

ing of the existing snowpack, particularly at lower elevations, and a shift in runoff to earlier in the year.

While total runoff amounts haven't changed, the timing of that runoff is shifting to winter. In fact, the amount of runoff in the spring snowmelt period—that is, April through July—in northern California has actually dropped over the past century from 45 percent to 35 percent.

In normal winters, California's water gets stored in snowpacks until spring, and that is when the spring runoff fuels our reservoirs and is there for drinking as well as farming.

Drought conditions may worsen, thereby destroying water-dependent crops such as rice, cotton, and alfalfa. For many parts of the western United States, the shifting weather patterns brought on by global warming could mean a greater risk of damage, life-threatening floods. And, of course, southwestern States worry that a 10-percent drop in flows in the Colorado River could lead to a 30-percent drop in water storage behind the reservoirs along the Colorado, not to mention a 30-percent drop in hydroelectric generation on the Colorado itself. The stakes are very high.

Unfortunately, our country lags behind when it comes to providing the leadership necessary to stem this growing problem. Amazingly, some of us in Congress even question whether we have a problem in this regard. I believe if we don't act soon, our State, our Nation, and our planet will pay a heavy price.

What should we do? The first thing, and the largest way of reducing the No. 1 greenhouse gas, the No. 1 contributor to global warming, is to do something about carbon dioxide emissions in automobiles. That is fuel efficiency for automobiles.

We had this debate in the Senate earlier, and a bill presented by the Senator from Massachusetts to increase mileage standards to 35 miles per gallon went down to crashing defeat. There still is another item that I am giving serious consideration to presenting as an amendment, and that is closure of the SUV/light truck loopholes. If SUVs were simply required to meet the same fuel economy standards as automobiles, we would prevent the emission of more than 200 million tons of carbon dioxide each year. This is 3 percent of the country's entire CO₂ emissions. This in itself would be the largest single step we could take at this time to reduce global warming.

The big three auto manufacturers continue to fight for the status quo. They oppose all increases in fuel efficiency. Last year, Senator SNOWE and I and about 13 of our colleagues introduced the SUV/light truck loophole closing legislation. What we said we wanted to do was, over the next 10-year period, bring SUVs and light trucks to the same level as other passenger vehicles. A study has been done by the National Academy of Sciences. Senators

Slade Gorton, Dick Bryan, and I began this effort some 3 years ago. I believe the technology is available to make those changes. Instead, our automobile companies have chosen to make SUVs more like tanks than fuel-efficient vehicles.

Consequently, we continue to pump out large amounts of carbon dioxide. I believe increased fuel economy standards represent the logical first step in reducing mobile sources of carbon dioxide.

We also have to work to expand California's zero emission vehicle program and examine ways to promote cleaner and more efficient battery, electric, fuel cell, or hybrid vehicles. We should also look toward reducing urban sprawl and our dependence on gas-guzzling vehicles.

The second action we should take is to increase the use of renewable energy. Energy use by buildings and appliances accounts for a quarter of California's carbon dioxide emissions. We can solve this problem by providing necessary tax credits and other incentives for energy-efficient buildings and appliances.

By operating more efficiently, we not only reduce waste and pollution that contribute to global warming, we also save consumers and businesses money in the process.

Finally, I deeply believe that the President of the United States should submit the Kyoto Protocol on climate change to the Senate and that the Senate should take up the treaty and ratify it. This historic United Nations framework—established in 1997—aims to reduce greenhouse gases by setting emissions targets and timetables for industrialized nations.

To enter into force, the Kyoto Protocol must be ratified by at least 55 countries, accounting for at least 55 percent of the total 1990 carbon dioxide emissions of developed countries.

Even though we are only 4 percent of the world's population, we account for 20 percent of the world's energy use. No other country is nearly as profligate.

Opponents of the treaty say there is no reason for the United States to do anything to combat global warming unless developing countries, such as China and India, also participate. In my view, this is simply shortsighted. As the most economically advanced nation, what we do sets the standard for the rest of the world—like it or not. So if we want to reduce global warming, if we take this position, I believe other nations will follow.

President Clinton signed the treaty in 1998, but it was never submitted to the Senate, in part because the 67 votes needed to pass it were simply not there. If the United States will not ratify this treaty, at an absolute minimum, we need to come up with a way to substantially reduce our emissions on our own.

The bottom line is that this energy bill does not, in any way, shape, or form, actually reduce any of these emissions.

As the No. 1 contributor of greenhouse gases worldwide, I believe it is our responsibility to show leadership; and every day we wait, we lose an opportunity to reduce the threat of global warming. It is not too much to ask the world's economic and political superpower to provide the necessary leadership to address global warming and, one day, to celebrate an Earth Day in which the United States has truly taken the lead.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. 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. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that I may proceed as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair. (The remarks of Mr. LIEBERMAN pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 247 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

Mr. LIEBERMAN. 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. GRASSLEY. 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. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes as in morning business.

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

WHERE IS THE DEMOCRATIC BUDGET RESOLUTION?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, Monday was April 15. That is the day Americans file their income tax return with the IRS.

April 15 was also the deadline for Congress to complete its work on the budget resolution for the Federal government. But, the deadline has come and gone and we still don't have a budget.

It seems the Democratic leadership is reluctant to bring their proposed budget to the floor of the Senate for a vote. According to recent press reports, they don't know if they have the votes to pass their budget.

What is interesting about the Democratic leadership's inability to find enough votes to pass a budget is that the makeup of the Senate this year is exactly the same as last year. With

this same membership, Republicans last year produced a bipartisan budget supported by 65 Senators, including 15 Democrats.

After taking a closer look at their budget, I am not surprised they do not have the votes. The Democratic budget is a case study in contradictions.

They claim to support the war on terrorism, but they don't fund the Presidents' request for defense. They say the President's tax cut was too big, but they don't delay or repeal it. They claim to protect Social Security and Medicare, but they spend trust fund money on other programs for the rest of the decade. In short, the Democratic budget says one thing and does another.

Take a closer look at these contradictions.

First, according to the Democratic Budget Committee Report, "the budget resolution provides all of the resources requested by the President for the Department of Defense for the next 2 years. It includes a reserve fund that will provide all of the defense funding requested by the President in 2005 through 2012 if it becomes clear that the funds are needed."

In other words, the Democratic budget funds the President's request for 2 years and then cuts it by \$160 billion the next 8 years.

Their so called defense "reserve fund" is fraud. Unlike the other reserve funds in their budget—for Medicare, health care, and the Individuals with Disabilities Act—no money is actually being set aside for defense.

Admittedly, the war on terrorism may not cost as much as the President has requested, but instead of honestly setting aside the extra money until we know for sure, the Democratic budget spends the money on other programs.

According to the Democratic Budget Committee Report, "The President's budget does represent an appropriate response to the September 11 attacks—it provides the resources that will allow our armed forces, homeland security personnel, and citizens to respond to the challenge posed by terrorists. But—just as last year—the President's budget does not respond adequately to the other major challenges facing this nation."

In other words, the Democratic budget recognizes the potential need to fund the President's defense request, but insists other programs must come first. Compared to the President's budget, the Democratic budget spends \$160 billion less on defense and \$348 billion more on everything else.

The second contradiction in the Democratic budget is the issue of tax cuts.

The Democratic Budget Committee Report says, "Last year our national leaders were presented with a golden opportunity to set this Nation on a course to deal with the challenges facing it . . . But the President and Republicans in Congress instead pushed through a plan that had only one pri-

ority—tax cuts . . . Because of the huge tax cut, there were not enough resources left to address other challenges . . . The effects of this squandered opportunity are being felt this year."

So how does the Democratic budget propose to deal with this so called squandered opportunity. The Democratic Budget Committee Report states "the budget resolution assumes no repeal or delay of tax rate reductions that are scheduled to occur in future years under the law enacted last year."

So if last year's tax cut was such a "squandered opportunity," why doesn't the Democratic budget do something about it?

The reason is simple. They know the American people are overtaxed. They know twelve Democratic Senators vote for the tax cut signed into law by President Bush last year. They know their Senate colleagues will not vote to delay or repeal the tax cut.

But instead of admitting these facts, the Democratic leadership continues its partisan attacks on Republicans for "squandering" the surplus and "raiding" Social Security.

That brings us to the third and most outrageous contradiction of them all.

The Democratic Budget Committee Report states, "The budget resolution recognizes that it is crucial to return the budget to balance without Social Security as soon as possible . . ."

So how does the Democratic budget propose to do this? It contains a so called "circuit breaker" that would create a budget point-of-order against the consideration of next year's budget if it does not get to balance—excluding Social Security—by 2008.

In other words, the Democratic budget believes it is so "crucial" to balance the budget without Social Security that it proposes to wait until next year. Apparently, "as soon as possible" doesn't apply to this year.

During the Budget Committee markup, the chairman explained that he was not requiring a plan to protect Social Security this year because the economy was still weak and that it is unwise to engage in further deficit reduction during our recovery.

One might be tempted to accept this explanation. But consider what the chairman had to say when OMB Director Mitch Daniels testified before the Budget Committee.

The Budget Committee chairman stated, "I'd be quick to acknowledge I could live with [a deficit] in a year of economic downturn and at a time of war. But you're not forecasting economic downturn for even later this year—you're forecasting economic recovery. And for the rest of the decade, you're forecasting rather strong economic growth and yet year after year you propose taking money from Social Security, taking money from Medicare . . . How do you justify it?"

Blaming the economy for their failure to make any effort to protect Social Security is especially ironic given the Budget Committee chairman's view of how the economy works.