

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):
2005-0336-F

FOIA Number:
2005-0336-F

FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an
administrative marker by the George Bush Presidential
Library Staff.**

Record Group/Collection: George H.W. Bush Presidential Records
Collection/Office of Origin: Science and Technology Policy, Office of (OSTP)
Series: Bromley, D. Allan, Files
Subseries: Global Climate Change Files

OA/ID Number: 62053
Folder ID Number: 62053-005

Folder Title:
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) - Presidential Address [1990]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
	0	0	0	0

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

(Lange/Cawley)
February 4, 1989
3:45 P.M.
[IPCC.DOC]

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1990
10:15 A.M.

Thank you, Dr. Bolin [Bo-leen]. Professor Obasi. Dr. Tolba. Delegates of the World Meteorological Organization, and the United Nations Environment Program. Let me commend **all** of you, for coming together to examine an issue of such great importance. The recommendations this distinguished organization makes can have a profound effect on the world's environmental and economic policy.

By being here today, I hope to underscore concern -- my country's, and my own -- about environmental stewardship; and to reaffirm our commitment to finding responsible solutions. It is both an honor and a pleasure to be the first American President to speak to this organization, as its work takes shape.

You are called upon to develop recommendations which strike a difficult yet critical international bargain: a convergence between global environmental policy, and global economic policy. A bargain where **both** perspectives benefit -- and **neither** is compromised.

As experts, you understand that economic growth and environmental integrity are **not** contradictory priorities. One reinforces and complements the other. Each, a partner. Both are crucial.

A sound environment is the basis for the continuity and quality of human life and enterprise. Clearly, strong economies allow nations to fulfill the obligations of environmental stewardship. Where there is economic strength, such protection is possible. But where there is poverty, the competition for resources gets tougher. Stewardship suffers.

For all of these reasons, I sincerely believe we must do everything in our power to promote global cooperation: For environmental protection **and** economic growth. For intelligent management of our natural resources **and** efficient use of our industrial capacity. And above all, for **sustainable** and **environmentally sensitive** development -- around the world.

The United States is strongly committed to the I.P.C.C. process of international cooperation on global climate change. We consider it vital, that the community of nations be drawn together -- in an orderly, disciplined, rational way -- to review the history of our global environment, to assess the potential for future climate change, and to develop effective programs.

The state of the science; the social and economic impacts; and the appropriate strategies -- all are crucial components to a global resolution. **The stakes here are very high; the consequences, very significant.**

The United States remains committed to aggressive and thoughtful action on environmental issues. Last week, in my State of the Union address, I spoke of stewardship: because I

believe it's something we owe ourselves, our children and their children.

So we are renewing the ethic of stewardship in our domestic programs. In our work to forge international agreements. In our assistance to developing and East Bloc nations. And here, by chairing the Response Strategies Working Group.

I have just submitted a budget to our Congress for fiscal 1991. It includes over \$2 billion in new spending to protect the environment. And, underscoring our commitment to your efforts, I am pleased to note that funding for the U.S. Global Change Research Program will increase by nearly 60 percent, to over one billion dollars.

That commitment, by far the largest ever made by any nation, reflects our determination to improve our understanding of the science of climate change.

We are working with our neighbors around the world to enhance global monitoring and data management, improve analysis, reduce the uncertainty of predictive models, and conduct regular reassessments of the state of the science.

Our program allows NASA, her sister agencies, and all our international partners, to move forward with the "Mission to Planet Earth." That will initiate the U.S. Earth Observing System, in cooperation with Europe and Japan, to advance the state of knowledge about the planet we share.

Furthermore, even as we wait for the benefits of this research, the United States has already taken many steps in our country that bring both **economic and environmental benefits**. Steps that make sense on their own merits in terms of responsibility and efficiency, which help reduce emissions of CFC's, carbon dioxide, and other pollutants now entering the atmosphere. **Let me outline them very briefly:**

We are pursuing new **technology development** that will increase the **efficiency** of our energy use, and thus reduce total emissions.

We're crafting a revised **Clean Air Act** with incentives for our private sector to find creative, market-driven solutions to enhance air quality.

We've launched a major **reforestation initiative** to plant a **billion** trees a year on private land across America.

And we're working out a comprehensive review and revision of our **National Energy Strategy**, with initiatives to increase energy efficiency and the use of renewable sources. These efforts, already underway, are the heart of a \$336 million Department of Energy program, and are expected to produce energy savings through the year 2000 of over \$30 **billion** -- while achieving significant pollution reduction. Quite a return on investment.

We're also working through diplomatic channels with our colleagues in other countries, and through innovative measures like debt-for-nature swaps, to do more than simply reduce global

deforestation. We hope to reverse it -- not unilaterally, but by working with our international neighbors.

The **economics** of our response strategies to climate change are getting intensive study in America. We are developing real data on the costs of various strategies, assessing new measures, and encouraging other nations to follow suit. And we look forward to sharing this knowledge and technical support with our international colleagues.

As we work to create **policy** and agreements on action, we want to encourage the most creative, effective approaches. Wherever possible, we believe that market mechanisms should be applied -- and that our policies must be consistent with economic growth and free market principles in **all** countries. Our development efforts and our dialogue can help us reach effective and acceptable solutions.

Last December at Malta, in my meeting with President Gorbachev, I proposed that the United States offer a venue for the first negotiating session for a framework convention, once the I.P.C.C. completes its work. I reiterate that invitation here, and look forward to your cooperation in that agenda.

We all know that human activities are changing the atmosphere in unexpected and unprecedented ways. Much remains to be done. Many questions remain to be answered. Together, we have a responsibility to ourselves and the generations to come, to fulfill our stewardship obligations. But that responsibility demands that we do it right.

We acknowledge a broad spectrum of views on these issues, but our respect for a diversity of perspective does not diminish our recognition of our obligation -- or soften our will to produce policies that **work**. Some may be tempted to exploit legitimate concerns for political positioning. Our responsibility is to maintain the quality of our approach, our commitment to sound science, and an open mind to policy options.

So the United States will continue its efforts to improve our understanding of climate change -- to seek hard data, accurate models, and new ways to improve the science -- and determine how best to meet these challenges. Where politics and opinion have outpaced the science, we are accelerating our support of the technology to bridge that gap. And we are committed to coming together periodically, for international assessments of where we stand.

Therefore, this spring, the United States will host a White House conference on science and economic research on the environment -- convening top officials from a representative group of nations, to bring together the three essential disciplines: science, economics, and ecology. They will share their knowledge, assumptions, and state-of-the-art research models, to outline our understanding and help focus our efforts. I look forward to participating in this seminar, and to learning from its deliberations.

Our goal continues to be matching policy commitments to emerging scientific knowledge -- and a reconciling of

environmental protection to the continued benefits of economic development. And as Secretary Baker observed a year ago, **whatever** global solutions to climate change are considered, they should be as specific and as cost-effective as they can possibly be.

If we hope to promote environmental protection **and** economic growth around the world, it will be important not to work in conflict, but with our industrial sectors. That will mean moving beyond the practice of command, control, and compliance -- toward a new kind of environmental cooperation -- and toward an emphasis on pollution **prevention**, rather than mere mitigation and litigation. Many of our industries, in fact, are already providing crucial research and solutions.

One corporation, for example, started an in-house program called Pollution Prevention Pays, that has saved the company well over half a **billion** dollars since 1975 -- and prevented 112,000 tons of air pollutants, 15,000 tons of water pollutants, and almost 400,000 tons of sludge and solid waste from being released into the environment. They've done it by rewarding employees for coming up with the ideas. And they have clearly demonstrated the benefits of doing it right.

Where developing nations are concerned, some argue we'll have to abandon the free-market principles of prosperous economies. In fact, we think it's all the more crucial in the developing countries, to harness incentives of the free enterprise system, in the **service** of the environment. \\

I believe we should make use of what we know. We know that the future of the earth must not be compromised. We bear a sacred trust in our tenancy here -- and a covenant with those most precious to us: our children, and theirs. We also understand the efficiency of incentives -- and that well-informed free markets yield the most creative solutions. We must now apply the wisdom of that system, the power of those forces, in **defense** of the environment we cherish.

Working together, with good faith and earnest dialogue, I believe we can reconcile vitality with environmental protection. Let me commend you on your outstanding work -- and wish you all deliberate speed in your efforts to address a very difficult, but very important, human concern.

Thank you -- and God bless you.

#



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20500

February 1, 1990

Michael R. Deland
Chairman

(202) 395-5080

MEMORANDUM TO: CHRISS WINSTON
FROM: MICHAEL DELAND 
SUBJECT: IPCC SPEECH -- MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1990

As we discussed, I have some policy-oriented concerns with the speech as currently drafted.

First, given that it is an IPCC meeting which the President is addressing, I think it essential that he reiterate the offer he announced in Malta with Gorbachev, namely to host the first negotiation session of the Framework Convention. Failure to make such mention would be read as a retreat by the President before the very group whose credibility we have a stake in bolstering.

Secondly, there is substantial confusion in the international community as to the purpose of the spring "White House Conference on Science and Economic Research on the Environment" which the President also announced at Malta. I think this would be an ideal opportunity to articulate the intended results of the conference.

Further, by not mentioning the "stabilization of greenhouse gases" goal as set forth at Noordwijk, we could be criticized as backing away from that position.

Finally, given the sophistication of the audience and that many have been devoting much of their professional lives to these issues, we need to be careful not to appear either arrogant or condescending.

I have attached hurried margin comments on particular wording. One phrase that leaps out is the characterization "environmental cold war" on page one. That strikes me as sending precisely the wrong signal since the U.S. and U.S.S.R., as well as many other nations, have been cooperating on environmental issues for a number of years.

I'll be in the office on Friday should you wish to discuss this further.

cc: ✓ Dr. Allan Bromley
Dr. Michael Boskin

February 1, 1990

FROM: Mike Deland

TO: Chriss Winston

RE: IPCC SPEECH

Here is a step-by-step walk-through of my handwritten notes in the margins of Monday's draft speech.

Page One:

Either delete "logical" and don't qualify "division" OR state it more clearly by substituting "illogical" -- that, in fact, is what we mean.

Delete "cold war." We have been working together for years on environmental issues with much success. It is an unnecessary and inaccurate negative assessment of the situation.

Page Two:

no comments

Page Three:

I don't believe there exists a scientific link between polar ice sheets and sea ice; one is on land, the other on ocean. One would be "walking on thin ice" to suggest that this comparison offers evidence either way on the global warming question.

The Blake quote is unnecessarily offensive. Those in the audience may not be "passionate" but they are dedicated. The quote is not worth the risk of insulting the group.

"Media-driven emotion" is a bit strong. Something along the lines of "The politics are outstripping the science" might be better.

Page Four:

The function of such models is to help us predict the future. The point to be made here is that while models can be useful in making prediction, they are limited in the degree of certainty they can provide.

The line about the U.S. "continues to lead the world" sounds arrogant coming from the President. It is something that I and others say on his behalf all the time.

The language at the bottom of the page about a "reasoned middle ground" is on target, but is begging for an example. This would be a good place to insert Secretary Baker's language on global climate change from his maiden speech one year ago.

Page Five:

Can we re-phrase "more than any other country" while still taking credit?

Page Six:

Delete "environmental cold war" for same reasons as on page one.

Page Seven:

"Pollution prevention" is a concept that the President supports and has spoken about before. It could be mentioned as a concrete example of the "new kind of environmental cooperation" that is mentioned here.

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 2/1/90 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 2/1/90 5:00 PM

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	☐	☒	MCCLURE	☒	☐
SUNUNU	☐	☒	NEWMAN	☐	☐
SCOWCROFT	☒	☐	PORTER	☒	☐
DARMAN	☒	☐	ROGICH	☒	☐
BATES	☒	☐	UNTERMAYER	☐	☐
CARD	☐	☒	ROGERS	☐	☒
CICCONI	☐	☒	WINSTON	☐	☒
DEMAREST	☒	☐	PINKERTON	☒	☐
FITZWATER	☐	☒	DELAND	☒	☐
GRAY	☒	☐	BROMLEY	☒	☐
HAGIN	☐	☐		☐	☐

REMARKS:

Please forward any comments directly to Chriss Winston, Rm. 122, x2930, no later than 5:00 PM TODAY, Tuesday, February 1, with a copy to my office. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

James W. Cicconi
 Assistant to the President
 and Deputy to the Chief of Staff
 Ext. 2702

1990 JAN 32 PM 12:04

(Lange/Cawley)
February 1, 1989
10:45 A.M.
[IPCC.DOC]

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1990
10:15 A.M.

Thank you, Dr. Bolin [Bo-leen]. Professor Obasi. Dr. Tolba. Delegates of the World Meteorological Congress, and the United Nations Environment Program. Let me thank and congratulate **all** of you, for taking on an issue of such great importance. The decisions this organization makes will have a profound effect on the world's environmental and economic policy.

In the post-war era, we've produced the most technologically advanced creations of man. We've also gained new understanding -- though still incomplete -- of the most ecologically fragile creations of nature.

But unfortunately, somewhere along the way, we picked up a bias, that has harmed both man and nature: a mistaken belief that there is a divergence of interests -- a logical division -- between the natural world and we who inhabit it. *illogical*

Nothing could be further from the truth -- or more central to the work of this Panel. You are called upon to strike an unprecedented international bargain: a convergence between global environmental policy, and global economic policy, where both sides benefit -- and **neither** is compromised.

You are called upon to end the environmental cold war.

*Not col
have been
working togeth
for years.*

This will be possible only if we understand that economic growth and environmental integrity are **not** contradictory priorities. One reinforces and complements the other.

A sound environment is the basis for the continuity and quality of human life and enterprise. And strong economies allow nations to fulfill the obligations of environmental stewardship. Where there is economic strength, such stewardship is considered a necessity. But where there is poverty, it is too often a luxury.

For that reason, I believe we must usher in a new era of global cooperation: for environmental protection **and** economic growth. For intelligent management of industrial **and** natural resources. Above all, for **sustainable** development -- around the world.

The United States believes the I.P.C.C. is the best forum to develop policy on global climate change. We're committed to international cooperation on this issue. And we consider it vital, that the community of nations is drawn together -- in an ordered, rational way -- to assess the potential for climate change.

The state of the science; the social and economic impacts; and the right response strategies: all are crucial components to a global resolution. **The stakes here are very high.**

There is no question that human activities are changing the atmosphere in unexpected and unprecedented ways. Since the mid-

1800s, the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has gone up by 25 percent.

What we **don't** yet understand is the extent of the alterations we've brought about -- and how they're linked to a significant, imminent climate change.

Last fall, many clear thinkers -- among them, world leaders were citing a significant thinning of sea ice at the poles as evidence that global warming had arrived. Recent observations show that the polar ice sheets are not melting, they're **growing** in size.

I'm not prepared -- academically, or otherwise -- to draw conclusions. But I have noticed something about the scientists drawing the conclusions.

Those who see climate change as a clear and present danger represent one distinct minority. Those who discount it completely, represent another minority. But many scientists -- if not most -- are **not** ready to claim that the extent of global climate change can now be reliably detected -- or predicted. That may be to their credit.

When he was observing the fervor of the French Revolution, the English poet William Blake wrote, "The best lack all conviction, while the worst are filled with passionate intensity." (Here, too, we are called upon for action based on observation -- not media-driven emotion, or the politics of apocalypse. The decisions being made are too important to be **compromised intellectually** -- or **polarized politically**.)

different
quite
needed
audience
may not
be "passionate"
but it is
dedicated
don't
want to offend

a bit strong
"politics"
an "science" might
be better
out shipping

scam like?

Questions remain: about the reflective effects of cloud cover, the cooling effects and CO2 absorption of oceans, and other sinks and feedback mechanisms we don't yet understand. Those questions, among others, suggest that we should attend to what is known about climate change -- and work to know more.

Current computer models are marvels of mathematics. Still, they cannot yet be said to represent reality -- and cannot be expected to predict the future. Above all, responsible policy cannot rest on the shifting sands of hypothesis and a chaos of conjecture.

models are designed to predict - some accuracy do

In the search for answers, the United States continues to lead the world. We're seeking hard data and new ways to improve the science. Because what science now knows with confidence, policy-makers can't use. And what policy-makers need to make decisions, science doesn't yet know.

Sounds arrogant
but I see something
25 y or
his behalf
all the
time

In spite of this uncertainty, some suggest we should act now, on the chance that significant climate change becomes certain. Others point to the opposite edge of that sword: any meaningful preemptive policies would bring only the certainty of prohibitive expense; conflict with Third World development; and declining standards of living, worldwide.

I believe we can do better. There is a reasoned middle ground, that matches policy to emerging scientific knowledge -- and reconciles environmental protection to economic development.

With every word, with every decision made here, we're also making a commitment that is profoundly personal. I think all of

Sec. Baker language from
his maiden speech
one yr. ago?

us understand, deep inside, how the actions we take now speak to the future.

Last week, in my State of the Union address, I spoke of stewardship. I believe it's something we owe our children and grandchildren -- because the earth we stand upon is only borrowed, never owned.

So the United States remains committed to a leadership role on environmental issues. In our domestic programs. Our work to forge international agreements. Our assistance to developing and East Bloc nations. And here, by leading the Response Strategies Working Group.

Overall, we're already doing more than any other country to understand and address global warming -- in terms of financial and human resources, **by more than a factor of ten.**

I just proposed a budget to our Congress for fiscal 1991 that devotes a total of over [\$70] billion to environment-related work. Funding for the U.S. Global Change Research Program will increase by nearly 60 percent, to over \$1 billion.

That will allow NASA to move forward with its "Mission to Planet Earth" -- and will fund the launch of the first U.S. Earth Observing System, to advance the state of knowledge about the planet we share.

We've already taken many steps that bring major benefits in their own right. Steps that make sense on their own merits, and that will **also** help reduce emissions of carbon dioxide and other

*we are!
Can we
phase it
difficultly
still take
credit
?*

gases now building up in the atmosphere. **Let me outline them very briefly:**

We want to stabilize -- and reduce wherever we can -- both our energy consumption **and** our total emissions. So we're pursuing new **technology development**. Creating a revised **Clean Air Act** with incentives for industry to find creative, market-driven solutions. Working out a comprehensive review and revision of our **National Energy Strategy**. And launching a major **reforestation initiative** to plant a **billion** trees a year on private land across America.

We're also working through diplomatic channels, and through innovative measures like debt-for-nature swaps, to do more than simply reduce global deforestation. **We hope to reverse it.**

The **economics** of our response strategies to climate change are getting intensive study. We intend to develop real data on the costs of various response strategies, assess new measures, and challenge other nations to follow suit. And we will offer technical support to those who need it.

As we work to create **policy** to manage CO2 and other emissions, we want to encourage the most innovative responses. Wherever possible, we believe that market mechanisms should be applied -- and that policy must be consistent with economic growth and free market principles in **all** countries. But we will break the hold of the environmental cold war only through dialogue -- through a shared commitment to consensus.

— Change share

If we hope to promote environmental protection **and** economic growth around the world, it will be important to work with, not against industry. That will mean moving beyond the tradition of command, control, and compliance -- toward a new kind of environmental cooperation. ^{ie - Pollution prevention} Many industries, in fact, are already providing crucial research and solutions. And a few are already ahead of us.

One power-plant management firm, just across the river in Virginia, donated \$2 million in 1988 for tree planting in Guatemala -- to compensate for a coal-fired plant it was building in Connecticut. And the company expects to couple tree-planting programs with **all** of the new power plants now on its drawing boards.

Where developing nations are concerned, some suggest we'll have to abandon the laissez-faire, free-market principles that allowed the industrial world to prosper. In fact, we think it's all the more crucial, in the developing countries, to apply the principles of the free market in the **service** of the environment.

To the extent we can accelerate the **advancement** of these nations, it will take **less** energy for them to produce wealth: in modern industrial countries, energy use per unit of G.N.P. has **declined** over time -- steadily, and dramatically.

So we need to work with the developing nations: Applying the power of the marketplace, considering technology transfer, and encouraging industry to assist developing nations in making quantum leaps in technologies. That will allow developing

nations to grow more quickly and easily -- and may help them avoid making the environmental mistakes we older nations have made.

As I said a moment ago, I believe we should make use of what we know. We know that the future of the earth **cannot** be compromised. We bear a sacred trust in our tenancy here -- and a covenant with those most precious to us: our children, and theirs.

We also know of the efficiency of economic incentive -- and that free markets yield the most creative solutions. We must now apply the wisdom of the market, in **defense** of the environment we share. **It is time to heal this false schism. It is time to put an end to the environmental cold war.**

Working together, with good faith and earnest dialogue, I believe it can be done. But more important: We know it **must** be done.

Thank you -- and God bless you.

#

JAN 18 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. D. Allan Bromley
Assistant to the President

FROM: Admiral James D. Watkins *J. D. Watkins*
Secretary of Energy

William K. Reilly *W. K. Reilly*
Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency

SUBJECT: Presidential Speech to the IPCC

The meeting of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change during the first week of February offers the President an important opportunity to reaffirm his leadership on international environmental issues. Attached is the outline of a speech that he might give (Tab A).

We believe that it is a positive statement of: (1) his concern for the environment in general and about global warming in particular, (2) his commitment to lead international efforts in these areas, (3) the significant U.S. efforts to fulfill this commitment and (4) U.S. support for the IPCC as the proper forum for addressing the climate change issue. We also believe that the statement is fully consistent with existing Administration policy.

Also attached is an issue paper outlining options for carrying forward and expanding in the IPCC the cost and economic impact analysis of measures to limit greenhouse gas emissions (TAB B). Although not linked to the speech, the issue needs to be carefully considered. Such work must be continued in the IPCC or the international debate will continue to be based more on bold rhetoric than solid information.

We have shared this outline with the State Department and believe it is, in essence, supported by them. We would like to explore these ideas with you and our colleagues in the rest of the Administration. To this end, we would appreciate your circulating these documents in preparation for a discussion which you might lead. We would welcome your advice on how to move the inter-agency review process forward expeditiously given that the date of the speech is fast approaching.

Attachments

cc: Frederick M. Bernthal, Assistant Secretary,
Oceans & International Environmental & Scientific Affairs Bureau,
Department of State

Proposal for Presidential Speech
before the
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Control (IPCC)

1. General statement of commitment to and concern for the global environment and economic development.
 - Reiterate determination that the President will take active role in addressing concern about global climate change.
 - Reiterate Secretary Baker's approach (spelled out in January 1989).
 - Reiterate Noordwijk commitment to greenhouse gas stabilization as soon as possible, consistent with the requirement for global economic growth that can enhance the quality of life for people everywhere.
 - Stress strong U.S. commitment to environment; e.g., domestic programs, leadership in forging international agreements on environment, assistance to and cooperative efforts with developing countries and current or former centrally planned economies.
2. U.S. Supports the IPCC Process
 - Stress need for international cooperation.
 - Congratulations to IPCC sponsors, the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and to Dr. Bolin of Sweden, IPCC Chairman.
 - Establishment of the IPCC has filled the need for an orderly, intergovernmental process to assess scientific understanding, evaluate potential impacts and develop appropriate response options.
 - Welcome IPCC reports due in August.
 - U.S. is committed to playing a leadership role through our chairmanship of the Response Strategies Working Group (RWSG) and supporting IPCC as best forum for global climate change policy development.
 - Support for UK proposal at UN to continue IPCC.

3. Past and Ongoing U.S. Contributions and Views on Key Issues of Convention and Emissions Limiting Agreements

-- Science

- o U.S. budget is the largest in the world and is rising, nearly \$500 million in FY 1990 and to increase to almost \$1 billion in FY 1991.
- o Importance of all countries, no matter what their level of development or economic system, contributing to understanding of the science. This cooperation needs to take several forms:
 - cooperation in assessment of state of the science; and
 - cooperation in monitoring and analysis of climate change.
- o Periodic international reassessment of the science at fixed intervals to aid in our decision making.

-- Technology Development

- o U.S. has active technology development programs to improve the efficiency of both supply and demand side technologies, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
 - More efficient fossil fuel generation technologies.
 - Renewable and energy efficiency technology initiative.
 - Conservation technology: end-use efficiency.
 - Nuclear: new generation with enhanced safety features under development.
- o Any framework convention should provide for regular assessments of the state of technology development to determine the availability and cost of technologies.

- U.S. is sensitive to the need for technology transfer to other countries.
 - o Clean coal, renewable, conservation, end-use services for technology transfer, and nuclear.
 - o A.I.D. appropriation bill.
 - o EPA/Peace Corps agreement.
 - o Change in World Bank policy.
 - o EPA's IETTAB and DOE's CORECT program to examine technology transfer.
 - o Policy aid package.
- Economics
 - o Follow-up on Administration commitment to develop real data on costs of various response strategies and assess new response measures.
 - o Challenge others to do the same.
 - o Offer technical support to those who need it.
- Policy
 - o President should encourage consideration of truly innovative responses including:
 - comprehensive approach: all major greenhouse gases are included; and
 - trading of emission permits.
 - o President should define general criteria for future agreements to limit greenhouse gas emissions:
 - market mechanisms such as "integrated resource" planning and consistency with economic growth in all countries; and

- need to work with industry to ensure that response actions do not adversely affect economic growth around the world.
- U.S. Clean Air Act Legislation
 - o Encourages emissions trading.
 - o Use of efficiency energy supplies; e.g., new clean coal technology and conservation technologies.
- National Energy Strategy
 - o Comprehensive blueprint for addressing future energy needs with consideration to climate change and other environmental issues.
 - o As first step, take those steps which contribute to other goals, but also reduce greenhouse gas emissions; e.g., clean coal technology, DOE conservation programs.
- Energy efficiency programs: lighting, appliance efficiency standards, model building codes, industrial process improvement, encouraging utilities to provide the service of electricity demand reduction, transportation research and development, etc.
- Alternative energy sources are being developed.
 - o Renewables: hydro, solar, biomass, geothermal.
 - o Nuclear: new reactor design.
- Reforestation: Trees for U.S.
- Phase-out of CFCs by 2000 providing safe substitutes are available.
 - o U.S. contribution to: development of safe substitutes, assessments of needs by other countries.
- 4. Reiterate Malta Offer to Host Convention Negotiations when IPCC is Ready
 - Express commitment to finding global solutions.

- Demonstrate U.S. willingness to facilitate the process.
- To further the debate, U.S. will host international environmental meeting composed of senior science, economics and environmental officials from all nations.

Issue: How to carry forward and expand in the IPCC the cost and economic impact analysis of measures to limit greenhouse gas emissions?

Discussion: The IPCC's Response Strategies Working Group (RSWG) must conclude its work in the next couple of months for its report to be written on schedule. Consequently much of the cost and economic analysis that is beginning to emerge will not be included in the report. Without an ongoing analytical effort, the international discussion of emission targets and timetables will be dominated by the countries who are prepared to make substantial political commitments without much information on how they will fulfill those commitments.

To move the debate over commitments to limit greenhouse gas emissions away from bold rhetoric to a realistic assessment of what is possible over different timeframes, the IPCC's work on cost and economic impact analysis must be continued and expanded. Furthermore, because targets and timetables, especially for CO₂ are likely to be a major focus of attention at the fourth IPCC plenary next August and at the Second World Climate Conference (SWCC) next October-November, a means must be found for an ongoing effort over the next 5-7 months.

There are three major options for proceeding. The first is to request individual countries such as the U.S., Japan and the FRG to conduct studies and continue to provide results to the IPCC even after the conclusion of the RSWG's report. A second is to instruct the RSWG's Energy and Industry Subgroup (EIS) led by Japan to continue its analyses beyond the Spring and prepare a supplemental report. The third is for the U.S. to offer to lead, under the auspices of the RSWG and perhaps in collaboration with EIS, a special effort and produce a supplemental report in time for the fourth IPCC plenary. The latter option might entail a significant commitment of resources but may be most likely to result in substantive output. The latter option also offers the possibility of bringing a number of developing countries more fully into the process, because of a cooperative project already underway in ten developing countries.

Position: The U.S. should promote an ongoing effort to analyze the costs and economic impacts of a variety of targets and timetables for limiting greenhouse gas emissions. This should include the production of a supplemental report for consideration by the fourth IPCC plenary. The U.S. should favor a leadership role for EIS but be prepared to offer to lead the effort if discussions at the February IPCC meeting suggest it would be necessary to ensure meaningful output.

Document No. 109727SS

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 2/1/90 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 2/1/90 5:00 PM

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	☐	☒	MCCLURE	☒	☐
SUNUNU	☐	☒	NEWMAN	☐	☐
SCOWCROFT	☒	☐	PORTER	☒	☐
DARMAN	☒	☐	ROGICH	☒	☐
BATES	☒	☐	UNTERMEYER	☐	☐
CARD	☐	☒	ROGERS	☐	☒
CICCONI	☐	☒	WINSTON	☐	☒
DEMAREST	☒	☐	PINKERTON	☒	☐
FITZWATER	☐	☒	DELAND	☒	☐
GRAY	☒	☐	BROMLEY	☒	☐
HAGIN	☐	☐		☐	☐

REMARKS:

Please forward any comments directly to Chriss Winston, Rm. 122, x2930, no later than 5:00 PM TODAY, Tuesday, February 1, with a copy to my office. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

Please see attached memo plus comments in file

D. Allan Bromley
Director, OSTP

James W. Cicconi
Assistant to the President
and Deputy to the Chief of Staff
Ext. 2702

**GENERAL POINTS
ON THE PRESIDENT'S IPCC REMARKS**

1. This is a unique opportunity for the President to establish clearly the continuity, direction and strength of the U.S. program relating to climate change. the Watkins-Reilly memo emphasized this; the DPC Working Group endorsed it, but this draft does not take adequate advantage of this opportunity for the President to reaffirm U.S. leadership in addressing climate change on the basis of sound science and sound economics, as well as concrete actions already taken.
2. The President should use the occasion of this talk to build upon his Malta announcement and discussion with President Gorbachev and now announce that he is inviting a small but representative cross-section of the world's most senior science, economics and environmental officials to participate in a seminar in Washington April 18-19, where he intends to participate personally in the discussions and educate himself on these matters. In hosting this seminar, it is his intention to improve the quality and understanding of the analytic tools and data required to address the problems of climate change; to sensitize the science, economics and environmental research communities to each other's activities, uncertainties and problem areas; and to at least begin developing an international research plan that would draw upon the experience, expertise and data of all the participating countries in addressing the gaps and uncertainties remaining in our understanding of the science and economics of global change.

It is his clear intent that this seminar break new ground in bringing the scientific and economic aspects of global change into close interaction and that the results of the seminar would feed into this IPCC process. We would hope to provide new information toward the formulation of sound policy in this area.

3. The President should use this occasion to reinforce his Malta invitation to host the first negotiating session on The Framework Convention. Not to do so would imply a desire to pull back from that invitation and leave the President open to a whole range of unfair charges.

D. ALLAN BROMLEY
2/1/90

1990 JAN 32 PM 12:04

(Lange/Cawley)
February 1, 1989
10:45 A.M.
[IPCC.DOC]

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1990
10:15 A.M.

Thank you, Dr. Bolin [Bo-leen]. Professor Obasi. Dr. Tolba. Delegates of the World Meteorological Congress, and the United Nations Environment Program. Let me thank and congratulate all of you, for taking on an issue of such great importance. The decisions this organization makes will have a profound effect on the world's environmental and economic policy.

In the post-war era, we've produced the most technologically advanced creations of man. We've also gained new understanding -- though still incomplete -- of the most ecologically fragile creations of nature.

But unfortunately, somewhere along the way, we picked up a bias, that has harmed both man and nature: a mistaken belief that there is a divergence of interests -- a logical division -- between the natural world and we who inhabit it.

Nothing could be further from the truth -- or more central to the work of this Panel. You are called upon to strike an unprecedented international bargain: a convergence between global environmental policy, and global economic policy, where both sides benefit -- and neither is compromised.

~~You are called upon to end the environmental cold war.~~

- There is no environmental cold war -
- internationally, not a good reference

2

This will be possible only if we understand that economic growth and environmental integrity are not contradictory priorities. One reinforces and complements the other.

A sound environment is the basis for the continuity and quality of human life and enterprise. And strong economies allow nations to fulfill the obligations of environmental stewardship. Where there is economic strength, such stewardship is considered a necessity. But where there is poverty, it is too often a luxury.

For that reason, I believe we must usher in a new era of global cooperation: for environmental protection and economic growth. For intelligent management of industrial and natural resources. Above all, for sustainable development -- around the world.

The United States believes the I.P.C.C. is the best forum to develop policy on global climate change. We're committed to international cooperation on this issue. And we consider it vital, that the community of nations is drawn together -- in an ordered, rational way -- to assess the potential for climate change.

The state of the science; the social and economic impacts; and the right response strategies: all are crucial components to a global resolution. The stakes here are very high.

There is no question that human activities are changing the atmosphere in unexpected and unprecedented ways. Since the mid-

*This is not a new idea
it is exactly what the
RSW 6 (IWC)
is doing -
also Brundtland
+ others*

already here

3

1800s, the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has gone up by 25 percent.

What we don't yet understand is the extent of the alterations we've brought about -- and how they're linked to a significant, imminent climate change.

Last fall, many clear thinkers -- among them, world leaders -- were citing a significant thinning of sea ice at the poles as evidence that global warming had arrived. Recent observations show that the polar ice sheets are not melting, they're growing in size.

While both statements are true, they are a very different phenomena. Linking them this way is

I'm not prepared -- academically, or otherwise -- to draw conclusions. But I have noticed something about the scientists drawing the conclusions.

Those who see climate change as a clear and present danger represent one distinct minority. Those who discount it completely, represent another minority. But many scientists -- if not most -- are not ready to claim that the extent of global climate change can now be reliably detected -- or predicted. That may be to their credit.

When he was observing the fervor of the French Revolution, the English poet William Blake wrote, "The best lack all conviction, while the worst are filled with passionate intensity."

Here, too, we are called upon for action based on observation -- not media-driven emotion, or the politics of apocalypse. The decisions being made are too important to be compromised intellectually -- or polarized politically.

* The people at this conference are there because they care about the issue -- many have devoted their careers to the issue. That does not make them "the worst."

see ice # polar ice sheets

not quite correct + can be misleading

kind of insulting, see below

not appropriate

Why say any of this? Remember, this is a meeting of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

4

Questions remain: about the reflective effects of cloud cover, the cooling effects and CO2 absorption of oceans, and other sinks and feedback mechanisms we don't yet understand. Those questions, among others, suggest that we should attend to what is known about climate change -- and work to know more.

Current computer models are marvels of mathematics. Still, they cannot yet be said to represent reality -- and cannot be expected to predict the future. Above all, responsible policy cannot rest on the shifting sands of hypothesis and a chaos of conjecture.

In the search for answers, the United States continues to lead the world. We're seeking hard data and new ways to improve the science. Because what science now knows with confidence, policy-makers can't use. And what policy-makers need to make decisions, science doesn't yet know.

In spite of this uncertainty, some suggest we should act now, on the chance that significant climate change becomes certain. Others point to the opposite edge of that sword: any meaningful preemptive policies would bring only the certainty of prohibitive expense; conflict with Third World development; and declining standards of living, worldwide.

I believe we can do better. There is a reasoned middle ground, that matches policy to emerging scientific knowledge -- and reconciles environmental protection to economic development.

With every word, with every decision made here, we're also making a commitment that is profoundly personal. I think all of

this group knows this

rephrase

why say this to this group?

5

us understand, deep inside, how the actions we take now speak to the future.

nice
Last week, in my State of the Union address, I spoke of stewardship. I believe it's something we owe our children and grandchildren -- because the earth we stand upon is only borrowed, never owned.

So the United States remains committed to ~~a leadership role~~ ^{aggressive and thoughtful (intelligent) action} on environmental issues. In our domestic programs. Our work to forge international agreements. Our (assistance) to developing and East Bloc nations. And here, by leading the Response Strategies Working Group.

Overall, we're already doing more than any other country to understand and address global warming -- in terms of financial and human resources, ~~by more than a factor of ten.~~

I just proposed a budget to our Congress for fiscal 1991 that devotes a total of over [\$70] billion to environment-related work. Funding for the U.S. Global Change Research Program will increase by nearly 60 percent, to over \$1 billion.

That will allow NASA to move forward with its "Mission to Planet Earth" -- ^{together with our international partners} ~~and~~ will fund the launch of the first U.S. Earth Observing System, to advance the state of knowledge about the planet we share.

in our own country,
We've already taken many steps that bring major benefits in their own right. Steps that make sense on their own merits, and that will also help reduce emissions of carbon dioxide and other

→ These should be rephrased ~~to~~ to be sensitive to the fact that there will be many very poor countries in the audience.

6

gases now building up in the atmosphere. Let me outline them very briefly:

We want to stabilize -- and reduce wherever we can -- both our energy consumption and our total emissions. So we're pursuing new technology development. Creating a revised Clean Air Act with incentives for industry to find creative, market-driven solutions. Working out a comprehensive review and revision of our National Energy Strategy. And launching a major reforestation initiative to plant a billion trees a year on private land across America.

We're also working through diplomatic channels, *with our colleagues in other countries*, and through innovative measures like debt-for-nature swaps, to do more than simply reduce global deforestation. We hope to reverse it.

The economics of our response strategies to climate change are getting intensive study *in our country*. We intend to develop real data on the costs of various response strategies, assess new measures, *look forward to sharing our data with studies by other nations.* and ~~challenge other nations to follow suit.~~ And we ~~will offer~~ *look forward to sharing* technical support ~~to those who need it.~~ *our international colleagues* —

As we work to create policy to manage CO2 and other emissions, we want to encourage the most innovative responses. Wherever possible, we believe that market mechanisms should be applied -- and that policy must be consistent with economic growth and free market principles in all countries. But we will break the hold of the environmental cold war only through dialogue -- through a shared commitment to consensus.

no war!

note: we aren't the only ones doing this.

7

If we hope to promote environmental protection and economic growth around the world, it will be important to work with, not against industry. That will mean moving beyond the tradition of command, control, and compliance -- toward a new kind of environmental cooperation. Many industries, in fact, are already providing crucial research and solutions. And a few are already ahead of us.

not in this speech!

One power-plant management firm, just across the river in Virginia, donated \$2 million in 1988 for tree planting in Guatemala -- to compensate for a coal-fired plant it was building in Connecticut. And the company expects to couple tree-planting programs with all of the new power plants now on its drawing boards.

Where developing nations are concerned, some suggest we'll have to abandon the laissez-faire, free-market principles that allowed the industrial world to prosper. In fact, we think it's all the more crucial, in the developing countries, to apply the principles of the free market in the service of the environment.

To the extent we can accelerate the advancement of these nations, it will take less energy for them to produce wealth: in modern industrial countries, energy use per unit of G.N.P. has declined over time -- steadily, and dramatically.

look forward to working with
So we ~~need to work with~~ the developing nations: Applying the power of the marketplace, considering technology transfer, and encouraging industry *to work with* ~~to assist~~ developing nations in making quantum leaps in technologies. That will allow developing

8

nations to grow more quickly and easily -- and may help them avoid making the environmental mistakes we older nations have made.

nice

As I said a moment ago, I believe we should make use of what we know. We know that the future of the earth cannot be compromised. We bear a sacred trust in our tenancy here -- and a covenant with those most precious to us: our children, and theirs.

no war!

We also know of the efficiency of economic incentive -- and that free markets yield the most creative solutions. We must now apply the wisdom of the market, in defense of the environment we share. ~~It is time to heal this false schism. It is time to put an end to the environmental cold war.~~

Working together, with good faith and earnest dialogue, I believe it can be done. But more important: We know it must be done.

Thank you -- and God bless you.

*More here about the good work of IPCC, etc
and urge them ^{much} in their continuing
efforts to address this very difficult issue*

February 1, 1990

Comments on Draft Presidential Speech

1. The speech will be perceived as a step backward on the President's environmental commitment, particularly in its apparent dismissal of any sense of urgency about climate change. The rhetoric is inflammatory and will be very badly received by the conference participants, the environmental community (both domestic and international), and the press.
2. The tone is negative and not one of Presidential leadership. The draft misses the opportunity to lead on the issue and to be positive on our commitment to a serious approach to the greenhouse effect and to be part of the international process of finding solutions.
3. So much emphasis on scientific doubt -- (e.g., computer models and melting of polar ice cap) -- will be viewed as U.S. foot dragging rather than a serious and responsible Presidential approach.
4. Omits U.S. accomplishments on CFCs, energy conservation package recently announced by DOE, AID efforts, and could have more emphasis on reforestation.
5. Inexplicably, the speech fails to reiterate past policy initiatives and planned future initiatives -- Malta offer to host first negotiating session of Framework Convention, April meeting on science/economics/environment, Noordwijk commitment to stabilizations, Baker commitment to search for initiatives that make sense in own right.
6. Misses opportunity to challenge other nations to join us in serious analytic work on the science, economics, technical activities.
7. Misses opportunity to challenge other nations and individuals to conserve energy, plant trees, and ensure both environmental protection and economic growth -- establishing a world worthy of our grandchildren.
8. The negative tone that permeates the draft makes line-editing impossible; an entirely new speech is needed.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF
THE ADMINISTRATOR

TO: Dr. Allan Bromley

FROM: William K. Reilly, Administrator
382-4700

COMMENTS: For your personal review -- IPCC speech comments

Number of Pages to follow: 1

Date: 2/1/90

Time: 7:00 PM

Transmission Number: (202) 252-0279

Verification Number: (202) 382-4700

Office of the Administrator
401 M Street, S.W.
Room 1200 West Tower
Mail Code: A-100