

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records
Subgroup/Office of Origin: Council on Environmental Quality
Series/Staff Member: Kathleen (Katie) McGinty
Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 2890
FolderID:

Folder Title:
Extremism: Earth in Balance Strategy

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
S	61	5	10	3

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

Oxford

EXPRESSITE

MADE IN U.S.A.

NO. RK-152 1/3

BRUCE ALAN 393-3323 AC

EXTREMISM: EARTH IN THE BALANCE

THE MESSAGE

SOUND BITES

o We have a hole in the Ozone layer over Antarctica the size of North America, caused by CFCs. Even the chemical industry supports the phaseout of CFCs.

o Our opponents have referred to me as and "environmental extremist." If that means that I point out the fact that the U.S. is facing extremely grave problems in[add details] and that the Bush-Quayle Administration has been extremely inactive in providing global leadership on environmental issues.....then I proudly accept that moniker.

ATTACKS ON QUAYLE

ATTACKS ON GORE/RESPONSES

o **ATTACK:** You have argued in your book and many speeches that the U.S. should make a major effort to address global environmental issues such as climate change. There are many more immediate environmental and economic issues of concern to Americans and others in the world. Why should this controversial problem with its high cost and long time horizon be on the agenda?

RESPONSE: First of all, despite the discussion over details, our addition of greenhouse gasses to the atmosphere at an accelerating rate is not sustainable. As with so many other environmental problems such as ozone depletion and air and water-pollution we will at some point be forced to curtail our emissions, it will be far less disruptive to society if we do that sooner rather than later - in fact much that we need to do to curb emissions such as more efficient energy use will actually improve our economic well being.

Second, the long term nature of the problem simply means that like the national debt, our failure to act now is simply pushing the problem onto our children and grandchildren. This is hardly supportive of any set of family values that I wish to support.

o **ATTACK:** You advocate a whole set of measures to improve energy efficiency in the US, wouldn't your proposals undermine the economic recovery by raising energy prices and mandating technological changes through increased regulation?

RESPONSE: One of the main reasons the U.S. economy is such bad shape is because of the inefficiency with which we use energy.

Just contrast our economic growth over the past 12 years with that of our European and Japanese trading partners who have prospered while using only half the energy per unit of GNP as we have. Within the U.S. economy, one of the few industries that has been a consistent net export earner has been the chemical companies that dramatically improves their energy efficiency since the oil embargo of 1973, while less efficient industries like auto manufacturing have languished, something like 10 to 15 per cent of the national debt (\$40 to \$50 billion annually) is directly attributable to energy subsidies. This plus subsidies to road transportation that rival the defense budget (an estimated \$300 billion, WRI) have distorted the economy, been a major contributor to our trade deficit and made us vulnerable to foreign oil disruption. Let us remember that a major contributor to the collapse of the Soviet economy was its even heavier subsidy of its energy industry. Again, we must think longer term and chart a new course on energy use that will benefit both the economy and the environment.

o **ATTACK:** But Senator, won't the cure that you propose to address environmental problems be worse than the disease? In the 1988 campaign, President Bush argued that it has been cheap energy that has built the US economy, and Vice President Quayle, through the Competitive Council, has tried to insure that environmental regulations will not be too burdensome to the economy. Your approach is to move in quite another direction. Can you demonstrate why your approach is better than theirs?

RESPONSE: The entire approach of the Reagan-Bush and Bush-Quayle administrations to the environment has been short sighted. While it is certainly true that poorly constructed environmental regulations can be a drag on the economy, it is increasingly the case that the policies of the past twelve years have saddled the economy with enormous costs and undermined the functioning of many free natural processes upon which we depend. The legacy of hazardous waste from industry and the defense industry probably exceeds the cost of the savings and loan scandal, and some sites may be impossible to clean up. What we are talking about is moving toward an economy in which such problems are prevented from occurring in the first place, rather than leaving to them others in future generations.

What this administration refuses to recognize is that today, approximately 5 million Americans are employed in supplying environmental goods and service to the U.S. economy and a global market. In Massachusetts alone, some 1,200 environmental firms have been identified by the Environmental Business Council and they form the backbone of that state's export policy. We would like to see the number of environmental and efficient energy jobs increase as America becomes the world leader just as it has in computers, software, and biotechnology. If we do it right, this increase in jobs and economic wealth need not involve just cleaning up our mistakes of the past, but will provide us with a truly sustainable economic future. The Clinton-Gore Administration will assist the economic transition as we scale back military production and make

the needed changes in our other industries through job training and investment tax policies.

BUSH-QUAYLE FACTS