

YUCCA MOUNTAIN - PRESIDENTIAL PRESS CLIPPINGS

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

October 15, 1992

SECTION: ENERGY

LENGTH: 560 words

HEADLINE: SURVEY: WHERE BUSH, CLINTON STAND ON ENERGY, ENVIRO
ISSUES

BODY:

Energy America, a coalition of environmental, consumer and sustainable energy organizations, is releasing the results of a comprehensive candidate questionnaire today. Pres. Bush and Dem presidential candidate Bill Clinton, along with 30 Senate candidates, completed surveys (Energy America release, 10/14).

"Do you favor raising the Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards for new automobiles to at least 40 mpg by 2001?"

BUSH	No	CLINTON	Yes
------	----	---------	-----

"Do you support the proposed "one-step licensing" process for nuclear power plants that would curtail public participation and accelerate nuclear power plant construction and operation?"

BUSH	Yes	CLINTON	No
------	-----	---------	----

"Do you favor opening the Arctic Wildlife Refuge to oil and natural gas development?"

BUSH	Yes	CLINTON	No
------	-----	---------	----

"Do you support committing the Department of Energy to a goal of U.S. energy self-sufficiency through a shift in funding from nuclear fission and fossil fuels to the development and implementation of energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies?"

BUSH	No	CLINTON	Yes
------	----	---------	-----

"Do you support the adoption of a federal transportation policy committed to the development of high speed rail, light rail, and other environmentally sound mass transit systems?"

BUSH	Yes	CLINTON	Yes
------	-----	---------	-----

"Do you support the siting and construction of the proposed high level nuclear waste facility at Yucca Mountain and opening the Waste Isolation Pilot Project near Carlsbad, NM?"

BUSH	Yes	CLINTON	No
------	-----	---------	----

"Do you support the authority of state governments to protect their citizens from radiation with stricter than federal laws and regulation?"

BUSH	Yes	CLINTON	Yes
------	-----	---------	-----

"Do you support the reauthorization and strict enforcement of the Endangered Species Act?"

BUSH	No	CLINTON	Yes
------	----	---------	-----

March 9, 1992, Monday, Southland Edition

SECTION: Part A; Page 1; Column 2; National Desk

LENGTH: 935 words

HEADLINE: BROWN APPEARS TO LEAD PACK IN NEVADA

BYLINE: By DAVE LESHER, TIMES STAFF WRITER

DATELINE: LAS VEGAS

BODY:

Nevada Democratic officials predicted that former California Gov. Edmund G. (Jerry) Brown Jr. would score his second victory of the presidential race Sunday with a first-place finish in the Nevada Democratic caucuses.

With more than half of the precincts reporting, Brown was leading with 32.3%. Arkansas Gov. Bill Clinton was second with 27.9%, followed by former Massachusetts Sen. Paul E. Tsongas with 19.7%.

The withdrawal of Nebraska Sen. Bob Kerrey -- and the apparently imminent departure of Iowa Sen. Tom Harkin -- created some late confusion in the Nevada campaign that was reflected in Sunday's contest when 18.6% of the caucus-goers voted for an uncommitted slate.

With Brown's victory Sunday, voters continued to spread their wealth among the Democratic candidates as both Clinton and Tsongas scored first-place finishes on Saturday. Clinton won a primary in South Carolina and a caucus in Wyoming while Tsongas finished first in Arizona's caucus.

The Republicans held their caucuses last month, but their delegates are not pledged to any candidates.

For Brown, the victory capped a strong week that saw his campaign gain credibility and outlast two opponents who had entered the race with high expectations. Brown started the week by winning the Colorado primary last Tuesday -- triggering Kerrey's withdrawal -- and he scored strong second-place finishes in Utah and Wyoming.

"People are just starting to get it," said Kevin Connor, Brown's deputy campaign manager, who watched the Nevada returns. "We have a huge volunteer corps."

In Nevada, Brown's campaign attributed the governor's success to former Kerrey supporters who switched when their candidate dropped out of the race on Thursday as well as to a strong showing from the biggest union in Las Vegas.

The day he withdrew, Kerrey was set to be endorsed by Culinary Local 226, representing 30,000 food service employees in Las Vegas. Instead, the union voted to back Brown one day

after the ex-governor joined a picket line of striking casino workers and blasted their employer in a televised, face-to-face shouting match on the sidewalk.

"We threw our support behind Brown because he supported us," said Kevin Kline, a Culinary Union member who formerly backed Kerrey. "I think Nevada is going to send a strong signal that this is our guy. He cares about us."

The union support was especially helpful in Nevada because success in a caucus often depends more on a candidate's organization than popular support. State Democratic Party Chairman Richard Segerblom said Brown's union endorsement had "a major impact, no question about that."

With Harkin dropping out of the race Sunday, the remaining candidates will scramble for the strong labor support that the Iowa senator had acquired. Brown is hoping that he will become the liberal alternative to Clinton and Tsongas and, as a result, that he will inherit the labor support before the campaign moves to the delegate-rich industrial states of the Midwest later this month.

Brown, who won the Nevada caucuses when he ran for President in 1976, had been expected to do well again after he got a Western boost from Colorado and because he had already demonstrated his ability to organize a caucus in Maine, where he finished in a virtual tie with Tsongas.

The environment also is a big issue among Nevada Democrats, and Brown staked out the issue by declaring the strongest opposition of any presidential candidate to a nuclear waste dump that the Department of Energy is planning to build in Yucca Mountain, about 100 miles north of Las Vegas.

Segerblom called it the "No. 1 political issue in Nevada." **Although none of the candidates endorsed the dump, only Brown said flatly that it should not be built. Clinton, Tsongas and Kerrey each said the government's research on the proposed site was inadequate and it should be re-examined.**

Before he dropped out of the race last week, Kerrey made Nevada a key part of his strategy to become the leading candidate in the West. His campaign had the biggest organization in the state and, when it collapsed, there was a major reshuffling of support that appeared to leave Brown as the biggest beneficiary.

Kerrey had the only campaign office in Nevada, and he had key endorsements from Las Vegas Mayor Jan Laverty Jones and the state's two Democratic senators in Washington -- Harry Reid and Richard Bryan.

Both Clinton -- who was backed by Nevada Gov. Robert Miller -- and Tsongas were in the state last fall for campaign visits. They have not been back this year, but both mailed letters to Democratic voters and solicited endorsements from elected officials.

Even before Harkin's withdrawal, the caucus was a three-way race that remained unpredictable until the final vote count. By Saturday, six rural Nevada counties had already held their caucuses and, with 160 ballots cast, Brown, Clinton and Tsongas were locked in a dead heat with 23% each.

Although Sunday's caucus was not a major event in the presidential campaign schedule, Nevada Democrats were happy that the state got more attention from the candidates than it has in the past.

Previously, the state's caucus -- which selects 17 delegates to the national convention -- was held on a Tuesday night, and in 1988 it was completely overshadowed because it fell on Super Tuesday, when a block of states hold their contests. The party recently moved its caucus to Sunday afternoon in hopes of getting more attention from the candidates and energizing local Democrats.

"The fun thing about this year is that we've got to see all of them," Segerblom said.

October 19, 1992

SECTION: ELECTION 1992; Pg. 7

LENGTH: 894 words

HEADLINE: GROUPS SAY NEW SENATE WILL BOOST SUPPORT FOR RENEWABLES, EFFICIENCY

BODY:

A survey of candidates in this year's 34 senate races shows that the next Senate will be more supportive of energy efficiency and renewable energy initiatives than the 102 Senate has been, according to a coalition of environmental and consumer groups that sponsored the inquiry.

"It certainly appears that the next Senate could do a far better job, and we hope that it will take upon itself to correct many of the problems in the energy bill," Michael Mariotte, executive director of the Nuclear Information and Resource Service, an anti-nuclear group, said at a press conference Wednesday. Comprehensive energy legislation (H.R. 776) recently approved by Congress was criticized by environmentalists for failing to go far enough in reducing the nation's dependence on foreign oil.

Mariotte's assessment was based on the answers to a questionnaire sent by the New Hampshire-based Energy America to 68 candidates for the Senate. Thirty-six candidates, 27 of them Democrats, responded to the survey.

Mariotte cited as an example, the responses to a question asking whether candidates support language included in the energy bill that will streamline the licensing process for nuclear power plants. By a margin of 25-3, with eight candidates either not replying or qualifying their answer, he said, the respondents opposed the so-called "one-step" licensing process. Earlier this year, he said, the Senate voted in favor of the provision by a 52-43 vote.

According to Ken Bossong, an energy policy analyst with Public Citizen, 88% of the questionnaire's respondents supported reducing U.S. energy use by at least 10% over the next 20 years and tripling the current contribution of renewable energy technologies.

The same percentage, Bossong said, agreed that DOE should shift funding from nuclear energy and fossil fuels r&d to the development of energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies. Eighty percent favored raising Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards in automobiles to at least 40 miles per gallon by the year 2001. In releasing the survey results last week, Energy America re-issued a survey of presidential candidates it conducted earlier this year (IE/FL, 17 Feb, 6), that shows, not surprisingly, that President George Bush and Gov. Bill Clinton disagree on almost every major energy issue. H. Ross Perot, did not respond to the questionnaire.

The survey showed that, in addition to their widely publicized differences on increasing CAFE standards (Clinton said he is in favor, Bush is opposed) and allowing oil and gas drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (Bush supports the idea, Clinton is opposed), the two candidates differ on whether the licensing process for nuclear power plants should be streamlined; whether

DOE should shift funding from nuclear and fossil fuel r&d to conservation and renewable energy r&d; and whether nuclear waste repositories should be opened at Yucca Mountain, Nev., and Carlsbad, N.M.

In response to a question about whether he would shift funds from nuclear and fossil r&d to renewable energy r&d, Bush said, "my energy program promotes the development of renewable resources, and it also provides funding for clean coal technologies and other programs which will reduce the effect on the environment of existing energy technologies.

Clinton vowed that he would establish "a real national energy strategy to increase productivity and improve the environment." That strategy, he said, would "rely less on imported oil, and more on cheap and abundant natural gas," and invest in renewable energy r&d. He added that "I generally oppose the proliferation of nuclear power plants" because of safety concerns.

Clinton also criticized the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's enforcement of safety standards under the Reagan and Bush administrations, and said, "As President, I would ensure the active pursuit of nuclear power companies who fail to have an effective safety strategy. The NRC, under my administration, would be a strong body with a determination to ensure safety at all operating nuclear power plants.

Bush defended nuclear power as "a proven electricity-generating technology that emits no sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, or greenhouse gases."

But the president said he would not support a carbon tax on carbon dioxide emissions from oil, gas and coal because "the relationship between greenhouse gas emissions and global climate change is not yet well understood."

Clinton said he would "consider supporting" a revenue-neutral carbon tax "if it could be accomplished without hampering our industrial competitiveness or raising consumer utility rates. Polluters should pay externalities, and a carbon tax is one way to do this." Another option Clinton said he would consider to achieve that goal, is a system in which companies would be awarded tradeable credits for reducing or offsetting carbon dioxide output.

In opposing the disposal of waste at Yucca Mountain, and the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico, Clinton said "serious questions have been raised as to the longer-term environmental and safety concerns at the Yucca Mountain site and with regard to structural integrity at WIPP. Both of these proposals must be rethought." He said he would postpone proceeding with "actual storage" at WIPP until the integrity of the site was assured.

February 12, 1992, Wednesday

LENGTH: 751 words

HEADLINE: More than Half of the President Field Opposes Yucca Mountain, WIPP

BYLINE: By Katie Hickox, States News Service

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

KEYWORD: poll

BODY:

Four out of the seven major presidential candidates oppose the development of Yucca Mountain as high-level nuclear waste dump, according to a survey released Wednesday by a coalition of environmental and public interest groups.

Democratic presidential candidates Edmund "Jerry" Brown, Arkansas Gov. Bill Clinton, Nebraska Sen. Bob Kerrey, and former Massachusetts Sen. Paul Tsongas all oppose the siting and construction of Yucca Mountain, as well as the opening of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in southeastern New Mexico.

Iowa Democratic Sen. Tom Harkin and President Bush support development of WIPP and Yucca Mountain as nuclear waste dumps. Pat Buchanan, a television commentator who is challenging President Bush for the GOP presidential nomination, did not respond to a survey question on the two waste repositories.

A energy policy survey released by Energy America, a coalition of consumer and environmental groups, lists written responses from presidential candidates on issues ranging from radioactive waste disposal to auto efficiency standards.

Candidates opposed to WIPP and Yucca Mountain listed concerns with worker safety and public health at the two sites. Democrats blasted President Bush's nuclear waste policies, saying the administration has sacrificed safety for expedited solutions.

"For the past 11 years, the Reagan-Bush Administrations have promised that they would find an acceptable way to dispose of nuclear waste," Clinton wrote. "They have not. Instead of a diminished problem our country faces an even larger problem exacerbated by 11 years of pro-nuclear administrations with little concerns for safety issues."

Kerrey recommended strong state and local role oversight over development and operation of nuclear waste dumps. "I simply do not trust the Department of Energy and Nuclear Regulatory Commission on these matters," he wrote.

Tsongas recommended that an independent entity, such as the National Science Foundation, reexamine the decisions to dump nuclear waste at WIPP and Yucca Mountain. Tsongas criticized Yucca Mountain's selection as a possible repository specifically.

"The government has not considered any other sites or attempted to address legitimate environmental concerns about the site's suitability," Tsongas wrote. But Harkin urged that the nation move forward with WIPP and Yucca Mountain.

"At some point, these facilities, or similar facilities, must be opened," Harkin wrote. "Particularly if they are less risky than the current practices of storing low-level waste in leaky storage drums scattered around the country, and storing spent fuel rods in pools of water on-site at the nation's commercial nuclear power plants."

President Bush agreed, calling Yucca Mountain "essential" to the nation's search for a solution to nuclear waste disposal.

About 100 miles northwest of Las Vegas, Yucca Mountain is being studied by the Department of Energy as a possible national site for high-level radioactive waste generated by nuclear power plants.

Designed as a permanent tomb for plutonium-contaminated waste from the government's nuclear weapons factories, WIPP is a network of salt caverns carved into rock salt beneath 16 square miles of southeastern New Mexico.

The Democratic presidential field opposes the deregulation of some low-level radioactive waste, which the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has proposed for dumping into municipal landfills. President Bush supports deregulating the waste, but Buchanan did not answer that survey question.

All five Democrats said they fully supported the Endangered Species Act, which protects disappearing wildlife. Both GOP candidates said they opposed strict enforcement of the law, which often pits jobs against the environment.

On related issues, all five Democratic candidates said they supported raising auto fuel economy standards. Buchanan and Bush are opposed to raising Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards (CAFE) for new automobiles to 40 miles per gallon by 2001, according to the survey.

Clinton decried the current 27.5 miles per gallon CAFE standard, and Kerrey said he has cosponsored Nevada Democratic Sen. Richard Bryan's legislation to raise the mileage requirement.

"Higher CAFE standards would be an expensive and dangerous way to address concerns that can be better addressed by other means," Bush wrote. "There are easier, less risky and less controversial ways to reduce auto emission that do not interfere with auto safety and consumer choice."

Energy Report

February 17, 1992

SECTION: No. 7, Vol. 20; ISSN: 0888-8183

LENGTH: 1145 words

HEADLINE: DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES COME OUT AHEAD IN NADER POLL ON ENERGY, ENVIRONMENT

BODY:

President Bush got a "D" and each of the five Democratic candidates for president received an "A" in a survey of views on energy and environmental issues conducted by Energy America, a New Hampshire environmental, consumer and renewable energy group.

Aided by activist Ralph Nader's Public Citizen advocacy organization, Energy America polled the presidential field on issues including automobile fuel efficiency, oil and gas drilling, nuclear power and waste and global climate change.

Responses were received from Bush, Republican challenger Patrick Buchanan and Democratic candidates Arkansas Gov. Bill Clinton, Iowa Sen. Tom Harkin, Nebraska Sen. Robert Kerrey, former Massachusetts Sen. Paul Tsongas and former California Gov. Jerry Brown.

Republicans, Democrats split on nuclear issues

Not surprisingly, the survey results showed the Democratic candidates to have similar views on the questions asked, with Bush and Buchanan's views usually differing from the Democrats'.

In the nuclear arena, for example, Bush and Buchanan said they would support pending regulations and legislation to speed the approval process for construction and operation of nuclear power plants.

All of the Democrats said they oppose this one-step licensing plan. Tsongas and Kerrey said the proposal would not provide sufficient safeguards to protect the public, with Tsongas adding he opposes construction of nuclear plants "at this time."

Harkin agreed with Tsongas' last point, saying construction should not go forward until the public feels nuclear power is safe, the cost of nuclear power -- taking into account waste disposal -- comes down, and a satisfactory waste disposal method is found.

In response to a separate question, Clinton said he opposes proliferation of nuclear energy because of concern about "the safety risks and long-term problems posed by such plants."

Each Democrat answered "yes" to a question asking whether a total re-evaluation of U.S. policy is needed concerning storage and disposal of nuclear waste. Buchanan said he is undecided, however, and Bush said at his direction Energy Secretary James Watkins already has under way a management review of government programs.

Harkin and Bush were the only candidates to say they support use of Yucca Mountain, Nev., as a long-term nuclear waste dump.

Harkin said the country needs to move ahead with storage of high- and low-level nuclear waste. He said there is no way to guarantee radioactive waste won't be released 10,000 years from now. The best available option, said Harkin, "is to reduce the risks of storing this deadly cargo to the lowest possible level."

He said that eventually Yucca Mountain "or similar facilities, must be opened, particularly if they are less risky than current practices of storing low-level waste in leaky storage drums ... and storing spent fuel rods in pools of water on-site at the nation's commercial nuclear power plants."

Tsongas said he has opposed selection of Yucca Mountain because no other potential sites were considered, and Kerrey said states and localities should have a strong role in selection and operation of any nuclear waste dump. "I simply do not trust (DOE) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on these matters," he said.

In response to a separate question, Clinton also questioned the credibility of NRC, saying the lack of commitment to nuclear power safety on the part of NRC and the administration "is clearly evidenced by the recent report that the NRC lied to Congress about safety problems at the Seabrook plant" (see story, page 119).

All Democratic candidates back CAFE increase

The Energy America survey, the results of which were released in New Hampshire last week in preparation for that state's primary elections Tuesday (Feb. 18), show all the Democrats support increasing the corporate average fuel economy standards for new automobiles to at least 40 mpg by the turn of the century. Bush and Buchanan oppose that change, with Bush saying it would cause serious damage to the economy.

Kerrey noted he is a cosponsor of legislation in the Senate that would achieve the higher CAFE goal; Tsongas said he helped pass legislation to require auto efficiency testing; and Clinton called raising CAFE standards from the current 27.5 mpg to 45 mpg the single most important step to helping the environment, the balance of trade and U.S. national security.

Asked whether they support establishing a carbon tax on carbon dioxide emissions from oil, natural gas and coal burning, only Tsongas specifically said "yes," with both Bush and Buchanan responding in the negative.

Clinton said he would consider a tax to discourage pollution if it could be done in such a way that industrial competitiveness would not be harmed and consumer utility rates would not go up. He also suggested a credit system -- similar to the 1990 Clean Air Act's SO(2) emissions credit system -- where CO(2) sources would need to have credits to emit CO(2) and those who reduced their CO(2) emissions received credits.

Harkin said he favors a "freebate" approach, whereby buyers of energy-efficient products get rebates and those who buy polluting products are charged an offsetting fee. Kerrey waffled. On the one hand, he said, taxes are "generally regressive, burdening lower income groups and rural residents disproportionately." But, on the other hand, the funds generated from such a tax could go toward compensating coal miners and rural groups hurt by the CAAA, Kerrey said.

Questioned about the controversial James Bay hydroelectric facility in Canada, Brown and Tsongas said they would not support importation of power from that plant to the Northeast. Bush and Buchanan did not respond. Both Clinton and Kerrey said they hope demand-side management (conservation and efficiency improvements) on the part of U.S. power plants would erase the need for this project.

Harkin said hydropower doesn't have the air pollution side effects of burning fossil fuels but could harm habitat of many species. He said he is reserving judgment on the project.

Finally, asked about the highest-profile environmental issue -- whether the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge should be opened to oil and natural gas development -- the Democrats said no. Bush's "yes" answer comes as no surprise since he and his administration have been pushing to have ANWR included in the comprehensive energy bill that is expected to pass the Senate this week (see story, page 118). Buchanan also said he supports opening ANWR to drilling.

Clinton said Bush should not be permitted "to use oil dependence as an excuse to open up (ANWR) to development." He said a strong energy strategy should be carried out to reduce the need for foreign oil.

Author: Beth McConnell

COPYRIGHT 1992 BY PASHA PUBLICATIONS INC.

SUBJECT: Energy (EN)

PTS-ACC-NO: 1367656

PTS-LOAD-DATE: 1992 Week 11

March 15, 1992

SECTION: Vol. 129 No. 6 INSIDE WASHINGTON; Pg. 38

LENGTH: 1237 words

HEADLINE: Presidential Candidates Discuss Energy Issues

BYLINE: By Thomas F. Berg; Thomas F. Berg is an associate editor of the FORTNIGHTLY.

BODY:

In a 15-question survey released on the eve of the New Hampshire primaries, seven major presidential candidates discussed their views on a number of energy-related topics including global warming, sustainable energy initiatives, auto fuel economy standards, the future of nuclear power and renewable energy, nuclear waste, and the appropriateness of drilling for oil and natural gas in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR).

The survey was conducted by Energy America, a coalition of environmental, consumer, and sustainable energy organizations, and respondents' answers reflected for the most part predictable, party-based ideology.

CAFE Standards

On the question of whether Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards for new cars should be raised to at least 40 miles per gallon by the year 2001, Democrats Jerry Brown, Bill Clinton, Tom Harkin, Bob Kerrey, and Paul Tsongas all said yes, while Republicans George Bush and Pat Buchanan said no. "No single energy measure appears to present such a significant opportunity for savings, national security, balance of trade, and the environment," said Clinton. In addition to supporting increased CAFE standards, Tsongas noted that he also supported "increasing the gas tax by 3 to 5 cents each year, which is a much stronger incentive to reduce fuel consumption."

Bush stressed the harmful impact such a move might have on the economy: "[I]n the rush to improve gas mileage I don't want to see the auto industry shut down and workers laid off or safety jeopardized. We have to strike a balance between mileage standards and jobs."

Nuclear Power

On the proposed "one-stop licensing" process for nuclear power plants, Democrats said nay, while Republicans voted aye. Harkin said that no new plants should be built until the American public accepts the safety of nuclear plants, the problem of waste disposal is solved, and the costs of generation fall. "[I]f the nation does decide to build more nuclear power plants," he said, "then we should develop modular-design nuclear plants, instead of having every utility building a unique plant with unique safety problems."

Kerrey commented that "The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has not been an accountable agency nor has it gained the public's confidence and trust." He also questioned nuclear power's economic viability, while Tsongas said that one-stop licensing would not provide sufficient

safeguards to ensure public safety. Tsongas added, however, that he would support research into whether smaller, safer, better-sited nuclear plants can be developed. "While I have reservations about nuclear power," he said, "my longstanding concern about global warming . . . led me to conclude that with further research it will be like coal and oil, a part of our energy future until such time that renewables and, hopefully, fusion, will provide our energy."

In response to many of the survey questions, Bush pointed to his proposed National Energy Strategy, in this case the provision which supports one-stop licensing, commenting that "Streamlining the licensing process is not inconsistent with rigorous safety review." He also touted some of the benefits of nuclear power, commenting that it is "a proven electricity-generating technology that emits no sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, or greenhouse gases."

ANWR Drilling

Opinions on whether ANWR should be opened up to oil and natural gas drilling -- a subject that caused bitter congressional debate last year -- also split along party lines. Bush, who has pushed hard for exploration, said ANWR should be opened up if it can be done in an environmentally responsible manner, while Tsongas said he strongly opposed opening up the region. Clinton said he supported legislation expanding wilderness designation in the refuge to include the 1.5 million-acre Arctic Coastal Plain, where the proposed exploration would take place.

Renewable Energy

Other survey questions concerned whether the country's focus should be shifted from nuclear fission and fossil fuels to the development and implementation of energy-efficiency and renewable-energy technologies. Clinton said that he generally opposed the proliferation of nuclear plants "because of my deep reservations about the safety risks and long-term problems posed by such plants." He also said that "we must rely less on imported oil, and more on cheap and abundant natural gas," while investing in the research and development of renewable energy. Tsongas, Harkin, and Kerrey all said that they favored the development of solar/hydrogen fuel systems and other renewables, while Tsongas added that if he were president, he "would channel substantial resources into such research."

Buchanan said that the market should determine what energy sources are used, while Bush balked at government-mandated energy reduction/efficiency targets because, he said, "they are unlikely to work, they invite government red tape and counterproductive intervention, and they can slow down cost-effective conservation by force-feeding uneconomic technologies into the economy."

Global Climate Change

On combating global climate change, Harkin said the federal government must create incentives for industry to produce, and for consumers to buy, energy-efficient, low-polluting appliances, motor vehicles, machinery, buildings, and homes. "I favor a revenue-neutral 'feebate' system," he said, "whereby purchasers of energy-efficient, low-polluting products are given a rebate, and those who buy polluting gas guzzlers are charged an offsetting fee."

Clinton noted that "the idea of a tax shift to discourage polluting is right in line with the principle of making polluters pay . . . and a carbon tax is one way to do this." Tsongas agreed that "a reasonable 'carbon tax' would be an effective way to combat global warming," while

Kerrey said that such a tax "is perhaps the most direct and cost-effective way of reducing CO[2] [carbon dioxide] emissions." Clinton also proposed a CO[2] emission credit system utilizing marketable allowances, much like the sulfur-dioxide allowance trading system outlined in the Clean Air Act, and added that he would support a climate change treaty in which the U.S. would agree to stabilize CO[2] emissions at 1990 levels by the year 2000.

Citing a lack of definitive scientific evidence, Bush said "It would be premature at this time to impose a carbon tax, or any other control measures that would place serious new burdens on the U.S. economy." He noted that he has, however, instructed U.S. representatives at the negotiating sessions leading up to June's United Nations Conference on Environment and Development to stake out "a strong position in support of the reduction of emission of chlorofluorocarbons and other substances that deplete the protective ozone layer."

Nuclear Waste

The potentially loaded question of what to do with the country's nuclear waste elicited few new ideas from the candidates, although criticism of present administration policy was rampant.

None of the Democrats, except for Harkin, supported the siting and construction of a high-level nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, but they all supported a comprehensive re-evaluation of U.S. policy regarding waste storage and disposal.

"Serious questions have been raised as to the long-term environmental and safety concerns at the Yucca Mountain site," said Clinton.

Tsongas, who has also criticized the proposed facility, called for an independent commission such as the National Science Foundation to explore the feasibility of site options. "Then," he said, "there will be no question that this is being examined on a non-political basis." Kerrey said that he supported a strong state and local role in the screening, selection, and operation of any kind of waste storage facility. "I simply do not trust the Department of Energy and Nuclear Regulatory Commission on these matters," he said.

In more pragmatic fashion, Harkin admitted that "No waste disposal system will be perfect. . . . The best we can accomplish is to reduce the risks of storing this deadly cargo to the lowest possible level." Toward this end, he supports the development of "suitable storage facilities for both high-level and low-level radioactive waste."

On the Republican side, Buchanan had not formulated an opinion on nuclear waste, but Bush called it "essential" that Yucca Mountain continue to be evaluated as a potential depository site. "If nuclear power is to take its place among the important energy sources for the United States," he said, "we must ensure that we have a permanent solution to the nuclear waste problem."