

PRESIDENT BUSH'S NEW  
APPROACH TO CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, this afternoon President Bush outlined a new approach to climate change for this Nation, and I believe for the world.

The President has thoughtfully tackled the emotionally charged issue of climate change and focused us in a pragmatic way. I believe this is a demonstration of leadership.

He has thoroughly considered the existing scientific evidence, which remains inconclusive, and determined that a slow and cautious approach to stabilizing greenhouse gas emissions is the most prudent policy.

I and many of my colleagues in the Senate have worked hard for years on this challenging issue and wholeheartedly concur with the President's decision.

The President's determination to aggressively pursue answers to many critical scientific questions and his concern about the effects of action on American jobs and our economy are well balanced.

The proposed actions in the President's plan will be effective in giving us the change we need. The voluntary nature of these proposals provides needed flexibility to achieve substantial reductions in emissions.

The President has outlined a strategy that incorporates incentives and opportunity for creative ways to achieve those reductions.

The President's plan also thoughtfully addresses the critical need to actively engage developing countries.

I have stated in the past that American policy should recognize the legitimate needs of our bilateral trading partners to use their resources and meet the needs of their people.

For too long the climate policy debate has been fixated on assigning blame and inflicting pain. The President clearly recognizes that this is harmful and counterproductive.

His plan will make our best technology available to developing countries and will refocus American research activities on developing country needs as well as our own.

During this Congress and the last I, along with many of my colleagues, worked diligently to construct a framework for national consensus on this issue. The legislation that I and several of my colleagues introduced was organized around the central notion of "risk management."

The President's approach is fully consistent with that notion.

It develops a "long-term" strategy; It quantifies risk by improving scientific research programs;

It develops tools to improve energy efficiency and find ways to sequester carbon by funding a comprehensive R&D program;

It removes disincentives by removing barriers to deployment of energy technology; and

It encourages a global solution by aggressively pursuing international technology transfer programs.

The benefits of the President's approach are broad-based, as they must always be.

It employs a least-cost path to emissions goals by using energy technology and incentives;

It yields real emissions reductions by improving the emission reduction registry currently monitored by the DOE;

It strengthens the hands of U.S. negotiators by implementing significant domestic action;

It is more than just CO<sub>2</sub>—it encourages reductions of emissions of methane and other more powerful greenhouse gases;

It focuses on more than just the electric power sector by including the agriculture, forestry, transportation industries;

It sends the right market signals by focusing on innovation, investment in new technology—not prescriptive regulation; and

It maintains policy flexibility—our future policy response can respond to changing knowledge on technology, understanding of climate impacts and risk.

President Bush, I believe, has offered us leadership, and I thank him for it, by setting for our Nation a safe, prudent, and responsible path toward resolving this issue.

I hope all of my colleagues in the Senate, especially those who have shown great concern about climate change, join with me and seize the opportunity that our President has given us to move constructively, without rancor, to offer up the best technology, the best science, and to bring our country together—not to divide our country—and to continue to progressively achieve, in a recognizable and measurable way, reduction in greenhouse gases as we have done over the last decade, and to do so without damaging our economy.

I believe that is what President Bush has laid before this Nation today, and the world: A pragmatic and realistic challenge of leadership as it relates to addressing the question of climate change in an understandable fashion and a manageable approach.

I yield the floor.

#### ENERGY POLICY

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that the President announced his plan related to global warming. The plan appears to endorse some of the energy efficiency and clean energy incentives that were reported out of the Senate Finance Committee last evening. Obviously, I think all of us welcome White House support for those initiatives.

I hope we can get the same level of support from the White House for the other critical elements in the energy bill that relate to this important issue of global warming.

Unfortunately, the rest of the plan that the administration unveiled today

appears to be little more than business as usual. The President's statement earlier today referenced the voluntary reporting program for greenhouse gas emissions which was established by Congress in 1992 as part of the Energy Policy Act.

The intent of that program at that time was to encourage the energy sector to begin to pay attention to greenhouse gas emissions. It was not to drive serious reductions in emissions. It was a decade ago when that legislation was passed, and we know much more now about global warming and the threat that it could pose to us.

According to a year 2000 report by the Energy Information Administration entitled "Emissions of Greenhouse Gases in the United States," U.S. energy intensity—that is the energy consumed per each dollar of gross domestic product, and that is sort of the measure the President referred to—fell by an average of 1.6 percent per year from 1990 to the year 2000.

At the same time that energy intensity was falling, the carbon intensity of energy use has remained fairly constant. It is the use of less energy per unit of economic output that has kept emissions from growing at the same rate as the economy is growing, and the rate of carbon emissions per unit of energy is not decreasing—or is decreasing very little, certainly not enough.

Our economy has become increasingly oriented toward the service sector, toward intellectual, high technology sectors. We are less focused on heavy industry and manufacturing, and we are using less energy per dollar of gross domestic product, which is to be expected as our economy has evolved.

Yet as the population has grown and affluence has increased, we are using more and more energy without reducing the emissions per unit of energy consumed.

Clearly, climate change is an energy issue. We need to address it as part of this energy policy debate that we are going to have when the Congress returns after next week.

The United States committed under the framework convention on climate change that was ratified in the Senate that we would take action to reduce emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000. Under the plan announced today, the U.S. emissions will be 30 percent above 1990 levels by the year 2012. Continued reliance on these voluntary actions, which is what the President is urging, without an overall policy framework, without specific goals, will not lead to any serious reductions in domestic emissions of greenhouse gases.

I have to ask why we would sell our technological and entrepreneurial ingenuity so short. The American people believe climate change is a critical issue. They also believe we can innovate our way to solutions to these problems. With the administration approach to addressing climate change, I fear we are communicating to the