

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):

FOIA Number:

S

# 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:** Speechwriting, White House Office of  
**Series:** Speech File Draft Files  
**Subseries:** Chron File, 1989-1993

---

**OA/ID Number:** 13519  
**Folder ID Number:** 13519-003

---

**Folder Title:**  
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2/5/90 [OA 4391] [1]

---

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
<b>G</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>

---

8:50 AM

DARMAN: Sandy had talked to D<sup>2</sup> about it. Will be coming soon.

Document No. 109727SS

### HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

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

REMARKS: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NEWMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BATES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UNTERMEYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGERS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CICCONI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	WINSTON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PINKERTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DELAND	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	BROMLEY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HAGIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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:

90 JAN 1 12:34

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.

*by being here, hope to understand my country  
Proud to be first Am. Pres. to address my country  
ed hope for justice*

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~~ *precious* 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.

*between us & nature that has gone on too long.*

*MA*

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

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.**

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

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

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.

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. <sup>pollution prevention</sup> 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.


# # #

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NEWMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BATES 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UNTERMAYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGERS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CICCONI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	WINSTON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PINKERTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DELAND	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	BROMLEY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HAGIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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:

90 FEB 2 8:07

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

## THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 1, 1990

MEMORANDUM FOR CHRISS WINSTON

FROM:

DAVID Q. BATES 

SUBJECT:

President's February 5 Speech to IPCC

In addition to specific comments and suggested modifications to the language of the draft of the President's speech on Monday to the IPCC that may be forthcoming from members of my staff, three principal points should be made:

(1) The speech varies significantly from the outline prepared by the Department of Energy and EPA, which was reviewed and approved (with some minor modifications) by the DPC Global Change Working Group at its meeting on Tuesday. A copy of that outline is attached.

(2) The speech does not contain any reference to the White House conference/seminar on scientific and economic research scheduled to be held this spring. This meeting was announced in Malta and will be co-chaired by Drs. Bromley and Boskin and Chairman Deland. There was consensus among the Working Group that the dates for the meeting should be announced as part of the speech. The invitees need not be named, with only a general reference to a representative group of nations in attendance. It could be built into those portions of the text that note the current gaps in scientific and economic knowledge and presented as the President's method of facilitating the development of the needed knowledge and becoming more personally informed on these issues. ✓

(3) The speech also does not reaffirm the President's offer, also made at Malta, to host the first negotiating session for a framework convention on global change following the completion of the work of the IPCC. The inclusion of this point, which need not be elaborate, was also a consensus recommendation of the Working Group. ✓

TAB A

**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.
- 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.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

February 5, 1990

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT  
AT THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Georgetown University  
Washington, D.C.

10:20 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Dr. Bolin, and thank you for all you're doing in leading this very important effort here. To Professor Obasi and Dr. Tolba, and all the delegates of the World Meteorological Organization, and the UNEP -- the United Nations Environment Program. Let me commend all of you for coming together to examine an issue of such great importance.

I also want to salute Bill Reilly, our able EPA Administrator. He will become the next Cabinet official in the U.S. government. I want to thank Assistant Secretary Bernthao for his leadership from the U.S. side of things. And also salute my able Science Advisor who is with us today, Dr. Bromley, who many of you know.

The recommendations that 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 personal concern about your work, about environmental stewardship, and to reaffirm our commitment to finding responsible solutions. It's both an honor and a pleasure to be the first American President to speak to this organization, as its work takes shape.

You're called upon to deliver recommendations which strike a difficult and 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 need not be 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 much 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 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

MORE

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 you efforts, I am pleased to note that funding for the U.S. Global Change Research Program will increase by nearly 60 percent, to over \$1 billion.

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 science.

Our program allows NASA and 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 and 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 the 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, turn it around -- not unilaterally, but by working with our international neighbors.

The economics of our response strategies to climate change are getting intensive study here in our country, in the United

States. We're 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 in 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 tremendous 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 personally 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 -- and there are others, but I'll single out one of them -- 3M started an in-house program called Pollution Prevention Pays -- one company. And that has saved the company well over a half a billion dollars since 1975 -- 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 ideas. And they have clearly demonstrated the benefits of doing it right.

Where developing nations are concerned, I know some argue that 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. And so 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 all very much. It is a great pleasure to be the first President to address this distinguished group. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END

10:36 A.M. EST

## 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NEWMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BATES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UNTERMAYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGERS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CICCONI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	WINSTON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PINKERTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DELAND	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	BROMLEY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HAGIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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:

*Detailed comments sent directly to C. Winston, et. al.*

*DBS x3742*

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

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

1990 JAN 32 PM 12:04

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.**

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.**

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

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

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.

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.

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.

# # #

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

February 2, 1990

MEMORANDUM FOR CHRISS WINSTON

FROM:

JOHN P. SCHMITZ *ips*  
DEPUTY COUNSEL TO THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT:

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON  
CLIMATE CHANGE

The White House Counsel's Office has reviewed the above captioned document. We have no objections, although we recommend a number of changes in the draft speech. These changes have been communicated to your office. We appreciate the opportunity to review this matter.

*Per our conversation, Boyden has not yet provided his comments, but will wait for the next iteration.*

*ips*

cc: James W. Cicconi

90 FEB 2 11:22

# 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NEWMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BATES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UNTERMAYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>ROGERS</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CICCONI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>WINSTON</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>PINKERTON</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>DELAND</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>BROMLEY</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HAGIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>                    </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

1990 JAN 32 PM 12:04

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 <sup>how</sup> the ~~most~~ ecologically fragile <sup>are some</sup> 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.

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. *based on sound scientific evidence,* 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 <sup>to which</sup> of the alterations we've brought about ~~-- and how they're~~ <sup>may be</sup> linked to any 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.**

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 committment that is profoundly personal. I think all of

*We have an excellent resource in NOAA that*

*colleges have some of the best scientific talent in the area*

*in the future*

*with*

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

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 <sup>CFCs, or</sup> 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.

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.

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.

# # #

# WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 2/5/90 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: ----

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NEWMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
BATES	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	UNTERMAYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGERS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CICCONI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	WINSTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PINKERTON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DELAND	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	BOSKIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HAGIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	BROMLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

The attached has been forwarded to the President.

RESPONSE:

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

(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.

# # #

CHASS-

DOE REDACT - IGNORE OR USE AS YOU WISH.

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

BARON

KUBER

ONLY COPY

IN DEPT.

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 and to help the world embark in a new era of environmental protection and economic growth.

This era will be possible only if we understand that economic growth and environmental integrity are not contradictory

-2-

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 work of the I.P.C.C. will have a profound effect on the legacy we leave to future generations.

[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, one of the many important contributions to our knowledge of these issues.

-3-

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. Overall, the United States is 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.

Our budget 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 will also help reduce emissions of carbon dioxide and other 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 which will highlight energy conservation and efficiency as its centerpiece. And launching a major reforestation initiative to plant a billion trees a year on private land across America.

-4-

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 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 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.

Estimates regarding future ecological events keep shifting as the world's scientists gain more information from their work. This is to be expected and respected. We need to push very hard the limits and boundaries of our science on global change issues, and ensure that a new era of scientific cooperation, not competition, helps us understand our world better.

-5-

There are some scientists who right now 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 more -- are not ready to claim that the extent of global climate change can now be reliably detected -- or predicted. What they call for is the support of their governments to help them find the unknown.

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.

6

A

S

ON THE TIMING OR MAGNITUDE OF FUTURE CLIMATIC CHANGES. OUR CLIMATE MODELS DO NOT YET INCORPORATE ALL THE COMPLEX ASPECTS OF OUR GLOBAL CLIMATE AND CANNOT PROJECT REGIONAL PATTERNS ACCURATELY. PROJECTIONS OF THE FUTURE IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE ARE VERY SPECULATIVE. RESPONSIBLE POLICY CANNOT REST ON SPECULATION. THE UNITED STATES IS COMMITTED TO PROVIDING A SOUND SCIENTIFIC BASIS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY.

There is a reasoned middle ground, that matches policy to emerging scientific knowledge -- and reconciles environmental protection to economic development.

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.

If we hope to promote environmental protection and economic growth around the world, it will be important to work with, not

7

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.

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 and conservation 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.

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

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.

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.

## 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NEWMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BATES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UNTERMAYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGERS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CICCONI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	WINSTON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PINKERTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DELAND	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	BROMLEY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HAGIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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 suggestions.*  
*2/1/90*

01:54 1 JAN 06



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

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

1990 JAN 32 PM 12:04

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 <sup>express my appreciation to</sup> ~~thank and~~ <sup>devoting your time, energy and resources to this</sup> ~~congratulate~~ all of you, for <sup>recommending from?</sup> ~~taking on an issue of such great~~ <sup>critical</sup> ~~importance.~~ The <sup>prestigious</sup> ~~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 <sup>?</sup> 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.

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 <sup>well-being</sup> ~~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 <sup>and we</sup> 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~~. <sup>is</sup> 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.**

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~~ <sup>take significant steps</sup> now, on the chance that ~~significant~~ <sup>real</sup> 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

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~~ <sup>the United States is</sup> 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

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.

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.

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 <sup>harness</sup> ~~apply~~ the ~~principles of the free market~~ <sup>enterprise system</sup> 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.

# # #

# WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 2/1/90

90 JAN 1 P4:05

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NEWMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BATES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UNTERMEYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGERS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CICCONI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	WINSTON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PINKERTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DELAND	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	BROMLEY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HAGIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**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:**

*OK S.R. I think broader language on trees & planting would be appropriate - 1 Billion figure needs more explanation if we're going to be using it*

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

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

1990 JAN 32 PM 12: 04

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.

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.**

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

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

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 <sup>encouraging</sup> ~~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.

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.

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.

# # #

Steve Dammansky)

Barry M. Miller

Mr. Gorbachev and I discussed this concept of environmental stewardship at our meeting last December in Malta. I put forward to him, and reiterate to you today, the willingness of the United States to serve as host for a conference next fall to negotiate a framework treaty on global climate change. This would of course take place subsequent to submission of the IPCC working group's final reports.

The Chairman and I also touched upon the need before that negotiation began to get a better handle on the science and economics of environmental decision-making. As we move together into these uncharted waters, we need to make sure that our compass works, our radar is accurate and our fuel is sufficient to get us where we are going.

That is why I will invite the top science, economic and environmental officials from a representative group of nations to Washington on April 18 and 19. It will be a seminar, of sorts, to bring together the three essential disciplines: science, economics and ecology to share their knowledge, baseline assumptions and state-of-the-art research models. Hopefully, they will begin to identify the gaps in our current understanding and begin to chart a course toward arriving at a common set of assumptions and models. ~~I plan to personally spend sufficient time with them at this seminar to gain a better understanding of these issues and the decisions that we as political leaders must take.~~