

**Timothy E. Wirth**  
**United States Senator, Colorado**

Opening Address:

**ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT:  
NATIONAL SECURITY IN THE 21st CENTURY**

Good morning. Thank you all for coming. It is a great pleasure to be with you today as you begin the excellent program lined up for this conference.

Your conference begins one month before the opening of the next round of talks on a convention to prevent global warming. Unfortunately, precious little progress was made in the four previous sessions that total two months worth of negotiations. With only 15 negotiating days remaining, the draft convention is with bracketed text, which simply means that much of the text has no meaning, that the nations of the world have not come close to reaching an agreement.

So, five months out from the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development—the most significant environmental diplomatic conference in 20 years (and perhaps the most important leadership summit in world history)—the prospects for the change necessary to meet our global environmental challenge is not good. And unhappily, the United States' contribution to the stalemate should not make us proud.

I would like to discuss today how we, instead of being naysayers, might contribute as a nation to these efforts with vitality and a sense of purpose. Let us first step back and take stock of where we are and where we are going. First, we must recognize that the world is rife with change.

**I. OUR OLD ENEMIES ARE GONE**

The Cold War—which defined our position in the world, dominated the consciousness of every adult in America, and cost trillions of dollars of scarce national treasure—is over. Eastern Europe has rapidly been transformed, market economies dominate the global economy, superpower duality is gone, and human rights are becoming a world-wide concern.

These are accomplishments of enormous magnitude, in which we as a people took the lead, and for which Americans can certainly be proud. We shared national purpose, we articulated common sense and we sacrificed together. The fruit of our common effort was sweet, and our national satisfaction has been justified.

But not for long. Alice Roosevelt Longworth, daughter of Teddy Roosevelt, wife of a powerful Speaker of the House, indefatigable Washington pundit, summed it up just right: "No good deed goes unpunished." And so it is today.

We are challenged economically wherever we turn. Germany and Japan are economic superpowers, and our standard of living may not even be in the world's top ten. Our national economic accounts are a mess; the deficit ballooned in the last decade; and we are spending well over \$200 billion to bail out the savings and loan disaster, yet we can't even pry open the government's secret documents to find out where the money went.

The American public is fearful and angry. There is an unspoken feeling that we are adrift in the sea of change that engulfs world affairs. One only has to witness the reaction to the President's handling of the economy or his trip to Japan to get a sense for the overwhelming sense of dissatisfaction that pervades the American electorate.

It has taken us far too long to recognize how far the 1980s set back our long-term interests. Nowhere is that more evident than in the area of the environment—which polls show to be the fastest growing national issue since the last Presidential election. Global environmental protection is an issue that can help galvanize our sense of purpose and invigorate our effort toward economic renewal. And other nations recognize that fact.

## II. NATURE — THE NEW SUPERPOWER

Once defined by our relationship with the Soviet Union, our national security is now defined by our relation to the environment. The Cold War is over, and we won. In 1961 the Soviets built the Berlin Wall, and as a private in the Army, I thought I might go to war. Thirty years later my children attended a Pink Floyd concert in Berlin and brought home pieces of that same wall.

Thirty years ago, our environmental history was only vaguely defined. Chlorofluorocarbons were considered wonderful new chemicals. Global warming wasn't in science books. Clean air was taken for granted. We viewed the environment as benign, constant, impervious to human impact.

How much has changed. Today there is only one superpower, our Earth.

What we learned about common security in the area of defense applies equally to the planet's environmental systems. States that burn coal generate acid rain that falls on states that do not. Nations that burn their forests or consume large amounts of fossil fuel contribute carbon dioxide to the atmospheric greenhouse, but we all get warm together. There is no longer safety in wealth or power.

The 1990s represent a defining moment in our battle to understand and react to what we are doing to the globe. If this battle is lost, it may be too

late to prevent major environmental disasters. It is now time for us—individually and collectively—to commit ourselves to establish environmental security in this decade. We have the tools to tackle these problems. We in this room share a wonderful sense of optimism and possibility, traits that have always characterized America and the American West. It is a belief in the possible, a willingness to take on our challenges and a determination together to raise the barn, build the church, start the school. This optimism and sense of the possible must be invested now in a common purpose for the last decade of the 20th Century.

Central to this effort, of course, is the issue of energy—domestically and internationally. We have before us the technological, environmental, economic and political opportunities to develop a new course for the 21st Century; the question is—what will we do with these opportunities? How will the next generation judge our handling of these promising responsibilities?

### III. THE ENERGY-ENVIRONMENT NEXUS

Energy, and the way we use it, is a central determination of both the economic and environmental well-being of all nations. It shapes the way we produce and distribute goods and services; it is essential to the way we organize society for shelter, education and employment. And energy fundamentally determines the condition of our environment. Energy, the environment and the economy are inextricably linked.

We are not balancing the triad at home or abroad. We have underpriced energy, undervalued external costs and overwhelmed the capacity of our environmental systems to cleanse themselves. We are gorging ourselves on cheap fuel. In the developing nations, an acute undersupply of energy has resulted in the overexploitation of forests and other natural resources—unwittingly making poor nations a toxic force.

Coupled with rapid population growth, these trends simply cannot be sustained. Just to provide today's population of 5.3 billion people with the amount of energy used by industrialized societies would require a tripling of global energy use. That is impossible as long as we use the current energy mix. The environmental burden of such an expansion would be too severe. And yet the population of the globe will double in the next 40 years, as will the appetite for energy.

Job number one is to develop an energy policy for this nation—by far the world's most profligate energy consumer—and make that policy a model for all nations.

The campaign should start with an energy policy that sticks to a few basic concepts:

- priority for energy efficiency and conservation
- environmental balance
- long-term thinking and
- the realization that alternative fuels, not increased conventional production, offer the best lasting solution.

Such a campaign poses a challenge worthy of American ingenuity and determination. It gives us a mission that can unite us for the long term as the Desert War united us for a shorter time.

Let me touch on each of these energy priorities, starting with conservation.

#### IV. CONSERVATION

As the Department of Energy reported after months of nationwide hearings: "the loudest single message was to increase energy efficiency in every sector of energy use." But the National Energy Strategy sent to Congress by the White House provided precious little to make America more efficient. It did *not* propose higher fuel economy standards for the transportation sector (where we use the overwhelming majority of oil); it did *not* deal with new building and appliance standards. It ignored the regulatory reform issues that would stimulate utility investments in conservation.

In the Congress we are trying to fix that plan, with legislation in February that will include a major conservation component. In the United States, we use twice as much energy per unit of GNP as our major competitors, the Germans and the Japanese. While the parallel is not perfect, it is instructive as to where we can do much better.

Another major change is dictated by economics. Because world markets are now and will be for some time saturated by oil (as they were in the 1980s), price will probably not be the force that shapes energy policy. Environmental security must be the driving consideration instead.

To a degree it already is. The Clean Air Act was in part energy policy. Discussions about global warming are about energy policy.

If we recognize this new reality, then our energy policy must take a longer view. We must get off the roller coaster of rising and falling prices and dependence on imports — these play havoc with our economy. Instead, our goals must be to reduce oil consumption and develop real alternatives to oil use.

We cannot do that if we continue to neglect the long-term investments needed to develop alternative forms of energy; more efficient processes and products; and new methods of planning for transportation, employment and resource management. Investments in non-defense research and development declined by nearly 50 percent in the 1980s, and not surprisingly, in constant dollars the amount of money invested in energy research declined

even more sharply. We cannot reach the future we all want unless we think long-term.

Thinking farther ahead means thinking smarter now. One shift is to make the powers of the marketplace work for our environmental goals. This was the idea behind *Project 88*, which I cosponsored with the late Senator John Heinz of Pennsylvania, in which we proposed that our environmental objectives also have a major economic component. The introduction of tradeable permits, for example, will reduce the compliance costs of last year's Clean Air Amendments by at least \$1 billion a year.

## V. PRODUCTION ONLY?

Thinking smarter also makes it clear that we cannot produce our way out of the current energy dilemma. That course only temporarily boosts domestic production; it does nothing for our long-term interests or the environment.

It is technically feasible to squeeze some more oil out of pristine areas in Alaska or off the California, Atlantic, Florida and Gulf coasts. But when that runs out, what will we do? We will have to come back to the same tough questions we face now. Where does our thirst stop?

And where does our good sense take over? We must recognize that our leverage is not as a petroleum producer, but as an energy consumer. The Middle East holds more than 60 percent of the world's estimated oil reserves. That is a geologic reality—just as our share of world consumption is upwards of 20 percent. We cannot produce our way to a better energy or environmental future.

## VI. AGENDA FOR ACTION

Based on our commitment to conservation, to integrating energy and environmental goals, to thinking smarter and long-term, we can produce a comprehensive energy and environmental strategy. But it can only be done if we have leadership from the White House.

The President did a masterful job of assembling a global coalition against Saddam Hussein. He proved what we all know: *American leadership is essential to international action.* We must draw that same lesson on the battlefield for environmental security. We must make ourselves leaders again in a cooperative world effort that integrates energy and environmental policy.

Unfortunately, we are not getting that leadership from this Administration. Consequently, while other nations are moving forward, we are falling behind. Where other nations see the need and opportunity in the enormous market for energy technology in the developing world, the Bush Administra-

tion is fighting the development of new technology at home. Where other nations are making commitments to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, we are underinvesting in energy efficiency.

Developing a commitment to integrating energy, economic and environmental policymaking is extremely important, by itself, and as a symptom of a more profound and far reaching set of conflicts:

- between business as usual, and recognition of the need for change;
- between national selfishness and global responsibility; and
- between an old world order and a truly new one.

## VII. THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT: OUR CHALLENGE, OUR OPPORTUNITY

Stemming the tide of environmental degradation, providing new technology and reinventing economic growth so it parallels environmental security, these are our challenges — and our opportunities.

For too long, many policymakers in Washington have viewed environmental issues as a burdensome threat to our economic future. Today, however, the necessity of environmentally-sound economic development is becoming clear. And as we distance ourselves from the Cold War, we are going to have to look for a new basis for economic growth.

In addition to investigating the economic *hurdles* that must be cleared in order to protect the global environment, we should join together and search for the economic *opportunities* that we can seize as the nations of the world band together to protect the global environment. Rather than perceive global environmental initiatives as a liability, we should instead launch an effort to search for economic opportunities.

Clearly, the Japanese recognize the scientific and public consensus that has emerged rapidly around the world and they are poised to take advantage of it. The Japanese have issued “New Earth 21”, a sweeping vision for the future and an action program for developing energy technology for the 21st Century. They are not backing away from global environmental challenges, they are taking advantage of them. Japan appears to be consciously carving out the environment as a new area of international influence.

Similarly, we in the United States should rise to the challenge, roll up our sleeves and apply our legacy of innovation and hard work to address and capitalize on the new realities of the global environment. On a national and global scale, we should seek to harness technology and economics in preserving the environment.

We should look at the prospect of utilizing major environmental agreements as fuel for American economic revival—a new thrust toward environmentally-based economic growth.

In the next 15 years, \$1 trillion worth of energy technology will be needed by the developing nations. Will we have a share of that market? The United States possesses the scientific and technological capability and creativity to seize that opportunity. In one market, solar energy, the United States has met the technological challenge—but the Germans and the Japanese have seized the marketing opportunity, reducing our share of the global solar market from 75 percent in 1980 to 30 percent last year. We can and must do better.

A commitment to alternative fuels could provide significant long term economic benefits. Backing out of foreign oil helps our balance of payments and leaves scarce capital in the United States to invest at home. And we have this enormous, largely unrecognized and clean energy source right here in the United States—natural gas. If we tap that abundant, clean, domestic resource, we can reduce imports, create jobs and strengthen our economy.

And so would changes in forest strategy. U.S. pharmaceutical companies can be leaders in “prospecting” the rainforests of the world for plants with promising commercial values. The world’s largest pharmaceutical company announced recently a joint agreement with Costa Rica’s National Institute of Biodiversity to screen plants and insects in the Costa Rican rainforest for chemical compounds that might be used for drugs. This is a first step in an effort to link U.S. biotechnology/bioengineering capabilities with the genetic capital of the natural world.

Biological diversity begs for industrial initiative and entrepreneurial activity. The examples—energy, technology transfer, forest policy, biological diversity—are only a preliminary and illustrative demonstration of the economic opportunities the United States should be examining. And I hope that you will help us in this effort. I believe that therein lie the seeds of a new era for our nation. The next will be the Century of the Environment, and we better be prepared for it.

The nations of the world are looking to us to exert leadership in the effort to meet this challenge. I sense that the American public is demanding that we summon that leadership to take advantage of that opportunity.

Thus, preservation of the globe, restructuring our energy policy and building a new economic future are both challenges and opportunities infinitely worthy of an American objective for the 1990s. It must engage us all as it engages you in Tucson this weekend. Have at it, good luck and thank you for inviting me to be with you.



