

understand that not everyone in the United States agrees with the Bush plan for prolonged inaction.

To this end, members of my staff traveled to Montreal and met with representatives and negotiators from other countries. They also met with public interest groups, business groups, and others interested in taking positive action on climate change. They witnessed firsthand how the Bush administration worked very hard to dissuade other countries from agreeing to even discuss further commitments. This is not the position that our Nation should be taking. We should be leading the way on climate change, not burying our head in the sand.

From the outset, even before they left Washington, the administration's delegation insisted that any discussion of future commitments was "a non-starter" and that any discussion about future commitments prior to 2012, which marks the end of the first set of Kyoto commitments, was premature. They continued at the conference to make this point to all parties. And when the rest of the world decided to engage in actual negotiations about discussions of further commitments under both the Framework Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, the U.S. stated bluntly that such discussions were unacceptable and pointedly walked away from the negotiating table.

The good news is that the rest of the world stayed at that table and talked throughout the night and into the next morning, reaching agreement on a set of decisions for further discussions. And when those decisions were brought into the light of day, and it became apparent that the United States would have to state its opposition publicly, before all 189 countries, the U.S. was forced to agree to return to the negotiating table and to allow talks to continue next year.

This means that 157 countries have agreed to discuss additional commitments under the Kyoto Protocol, even without the U.S. as a party, and that 189 countries, including the U.S., have agreed to look at the issue of further steps under the Framework Convention. Despite arguments to the contrary, cooperative international agreements to reduce greenhouse gas emissions remain a reality, and slow, but significant, progress is taking place to strengthen those commitments.

The overwhelming majority of Americans support taking some form of action on climate change. A recent poll by the Program on International Policy Attitudes, sponsored by the Center for International and Security Studies at the University of Maryland, found that 86 percent of Americans think that President Bush should act to limit greenhouse gases in the U.S. if the G8 countries are willing to act to reduce such gases. All the G8 countries except the U.S. are signatories to the Kyoto treaty and therefore have already committed to such action.

In addition, the study found that 73 percent of Americans believe that the

U.S. should participate in the Kyoto treaty. Finally, the study found that 83 percent of Americans favor "legislation requiring large companies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 2000 levels by 2010 and to 1990 levels by 2020." Thus, in one way or another, more than 80 percent of Americans favor taking real action on climate change. The current administration is completely out of step with the American public on this issue.

States, regions and even localities are taking on climate change related commitments. Nine Northeastern and Mid-Atlantic States are working together through the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, RGGI, to develop a cap-and-trade system for carbon dioxide, CO<sub>2</sub>, emissions from power plants. On June 1, 2005, California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed an executive order setting greenhouse gas emissions targets for the State. The order directs State officials to develop plans that would reduce California's greenhouse gas emissions to 2000 emissions levels by 2010 and 1990 levels by 2020. The U.S. Conference of Mayors adopted an agreement, sponsored by Seattle Mayor Greg Nickels, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to levels that mirror the Kyoto Protocol limits. California has also adopted a greenhouse gas emission standard for automobiles, and a number of States, including Vermont, have followed suit and adopted the same standards. These actions confirm that there is widespread political desire and motivation to take action within the United States to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

I have sponsored legislation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from powerplants, which are a large source of carbon dioxide, a principal greenhouse gas. My bill, S. 150, the Clean Power Act, would reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2010. This would be a very important first step by the United States towards combating global warming that would show the rest of the world that we are serious about doing our part. Congress needs to act to provide a mandate and undisputed authority to this and future administration negotiators.

I am both discouraged and heartened by the outcome of the talks in Montreal. Those of us who care about stopping climate change did everything we could to help aid these talks, and despite the Bush administration resistance, the international dialogue on climate change will continue.

But a dialogue is not nearly enough, and the consequences of additional delay are dire. The U.S. has been and remains the largest emitter of greenhouse gases. It has a responsibility to its own people and to the people of the world to be a leader on this issue. Thus far, it has been anything but a leader and these talks highlighted that fact.

I look forward to the day when I can once again be proud of the United States role in these talks, when we can enter these negotiations having done

our part. I believe that is what we agreed to in 1992, when the Senate ratified the climate treaty and it is high time we live up to our obligation.

---

ANWR

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, over the past year, and on more occasions than I'd like to remember, I have talked about the abuse of process that proponents of drilling in the Arctic Refuge have resorted to in their attempts to pass an unpopular and misguided measure. Sadly, the Senate faces the very same issue today. Let me unequivocally state that talk of attaching an extraneous and obviously controversial provision regarding the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to the Department of Defense appropriations conference report—a provision that was not included in either the House or Senate version of the bill—is flat out irresponsible and should be rejected.

This last-ditch effort to attach the Arctic Refuge drilling provision to the Department of Defense appropriations bill—or any other bill that is a "must pass" before we adjourn for the year—really reflects poorly on this body. And, what does it mean for greater mischief down the line? That whenever we can't move an unpopular proposal through the regular legislative process, there's no need to worry: you just attach it to an important funding bill? Is this the precedent that we, members of both parties, want to set? I sincerely hope not.

Let me be very clear: I would prefer to be talking about setting a new path for our country's energy policy—a path that reduces our use of fossil fuels while favoring renewable sources of energy. Unfortunately, some of my colleagues are dead set on looking to the past, instead of to the future, for our sources of energy and are even willing to go so far as to use the bill that funds our men and women in uniform as a vehicle for their controversial measure. I am deeply disappointed by this latest move.

I strongly urge any of my colleagues who are currently trying to add language to the Defense appropriations bill, or any other bill we need to consider in the coming days, that would open up the Arctic Refuge to oil and gas development, to reconsider those efforts. Continuing down that path, the path of circumventing established legislative processes to move measures that can't pass on their own merits, is an irresponsible abuse of the rules under which we operate that should be rejected out of hand.

---

DR. CYNTHIA MAUNG

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I rise today to call attention to the heroic efforts of Dr. Cynthia Maung and her Mae Tao clinic to provide hope on the border of Thailand and Burma. Dr. Maung, herself a Burmese refugee, has dedicated her life to helping those fleeing political and economic turmoil in