

REMARKS OF SENATOR JOHN HEINZ (R.PA)
CHEVRON CONSERVATION AWARDS
WASHINGTON, D.C.
WEDNESDAY MAY 17 1989

Thank you, Will. Clair Ghylin, Will Price, honored guests, I'm greatly honored to join all of you this evening and very privileged to participate as these prestigious Chevron Awards are bestowed on such an exemplary group of people.

It's said that "change begins with the individual." We Americans believe a single person can make a difference, can persuade, encourage and inspire their friends and neighbors to change, their nation to change, and, ultimately, their world to change. Ed Zern, you are just such a person. And we must remember your example, for, as Will has reminded us as we approach the last decade of the twentieth century, the urgency for change -- change in behavior, change in mind-set -- becomes ever clearer with each new scientific report. Man's current behavior is destroying the environment at an increasingly rapid pace. Global warming. Destruction of the ozone layer. Acid Rain. Irrevocable loss of wetlands. And, this is only a partial list.

Theodore Roosevelt's conservation ethic at the beginning of this century marked the first important era of environmental concern. America established the National Park system and set aside our most precious national resources for future generations.

A second era began in 1965 with the publication of Rachel Carson's "Silent Spring", warning of a world too poisoned to support life any longer. America enacted landmark legislation, the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and Superfund to name only a few.

I submit that we are now entering a third era. An era of change in which we must ensure that our daily lives and our planet's safety are no longer at odds. I believe it will be a time when the entrepreneurial genius of America must be harnessed to fulfill our environmental goals.

Governments are beginning to act: for example, the Administration's and the European Community's recent proposal to eliminate production of chlorofluorocarbons by the year 2,000. A very important step, and a signal, I think, of the attitude of President Bush on global environmental threats.

While this step by policymakers is welcome, we politicians that make those decisions are driven by what people think and what individuals do.

In January, I visited Rio Branco, Brazil, home to Chico Mendes, who was assassinated last December fighting for the right of the rubber tappers and indigenous people of the Amazon Rain Forest to pursue a livelihood that was self-sustaining and ecologically sound.

While in Brazil, I was privileged to sit down and talk with Ilsemar, his widow, and the rubber tappers whose way of life he died defending. He was a man with few illusions who died a soldier-become-martyr in the universal fight against depredation, greed and the exploitation of people and nature.

To see the rain forests is to see creation. To see Brazil's rain forests today is to witness the plowing under of the garden of Eden.

The murder of Chico Mendes did not stop the movement he led, but strengthened it. Yes the legacy of one person can be a powerful force.

It is the power of the individual we honor tonight, the novel approaches tried, the new paths explored; lessons to learn, experiences to build upon, and challenges to us all.

From Oregon, Judie Nelson has organized the cleanup of more miles of more beaches than any normally constituted person could walk in a lifetime.

In Rhode Island, George Sprague claims he's retired. Yet, he has dedicated more hours to environmental education and public service than many full-time workers. Seven thousand hours of volunteer work.

The United Anglers of Casa Grande High School in California are bringing back to life the streams in their area.

As one who believes that the hours spent fly fishing are not deducted from one's allotted time on earth, the achievement of these young students is a special legacy that thousands will enjoy and remember.

In sum, tonight's award winners are making a difference, bringing change about, in so many ways. You are fulfilling man's highest goal -- to leave the next generation a better, cleaner world -- and I salute you for it.

Your achievements challenge those of us in government to tap the same reserves of creativity, ingenuity and commitment in carrying out our responsibilities as good stewards.

Public demand for environmental protection is strong. In the past, government has responded to that demand in one of two ways: by direct spending programs, like Superfund or sewer construction grants, or by requiring industry, and therefore, consumers, to pay by mandating specific technologies or ways to achieve specific goals.

Those approaches have worked but they have limits. Our environmental problems are growing, more costly and more difficult to solve. At the same time, the federal government is running deficits and American industry faces ever more difficult global competition. The result is increasing political resistance. It is my view that the scale of improvement in environmental protection we need will be either unobtainable or unaffordable unless we fundamentally shift our approach.

One example of the political gridlock we are in is the Clean Air Act. Enacted in 1970 and amended in 1977, the Clean Air Act is supposed to reduce the amount of ozone, carbon monoxide, and particulate pollutants in our cities to reasonable and safe levels. Yet, 19 years after its passage, over 100 American cities have ozone levels far above what Federal standards allow. No penalties have been levied against these cities, and the reasons are obvious. The only available penalties under the act are unreasonable examples of command and control. The EPA is authorized to withhold federal funds from cities which fail to comply with the act. These include sewage construction grants -- which protect against water pollution -- and also highway funds. In effect, these sanctions would shut down whole portions of our cities. No one is willing to take those steps, and so nothing gets done. The social, economic, and political costs of action on clean air are such that traditional regulatory policies cannot cope.

To borrow from another vocabulary, the rising dangers to our environment calls for new thinking. That is why, early last year, my friend and colleague Senator Tim Wirth and I started looking for better ideas and new approaches to 13 of our most pressing environmental problems, including global climate change, clean air, acid rain, destruction of public lands, solid and hazardous waste, and more. Our thesis was that our environmental goals were right but that the traditional methods of implementation were so narrow and top down that less costly ways to achieve the same goals were simply

not being considered. The result was our 78 page study, "Project 88", in which we have suggested some specific proposals to harness market forces for the achievement of environmental goals.

"Project 88" is about making economics work for the environment as opposed to a free market in the environment.

"Project 88" makes recommendations to reduce the emission of greenhouse gases in numerous ways, especially through energy conservation. We would strengthen the automobile corporate average fuel economy standards. We would also provide incentives for the purchase and manufacture of improved technology, energy efficient cars, and penalize gas guzzlers at the same time.

And to deal with power plant emissions, "Project 88" advocates letting the market work to encourage energy conservation to compete with energy production.

One utility figured increased demand - 6,000 megawatts - required the equivalent of twelve coal-fired power plants at a cost of one and 3/4 billion dollars.

Instead, they adopted a load management program, going to customers, assessing their energy use, and offering incentives for specific conservation steps.

The result: the utility supplied the same 6,000 megawatts at a cost of only \$250 million, rather than the one and three quarter billion! Obviously, major increases in CO2 emissions have been avoided, and the conservation measures have helped consumers save \$3 billion since the program went into effect.

* Sometimes the federal government won't allow the market to operate when, if it did so, tremendous ecological destruction could be avoided. Right now, the federal government is paying loggers to destroy the Tongass Forest, the last temperate rain forest in North America.

In 1986 alone, the Forest Service spent \$48 million on roads to facilitate the cutting of almost 12,000 acres of Tongass Forest. The loggers put up about \$3 million mostly not cash but in kind. The result: the Forest Service -- and the taxpayer -- spent \$4000 an acre to get loggers to come in and cut down our rainforest and since there is no market for this timber locally, it is all sold to Japan. And, since the export of logs is prohibited, these incredible forest giants, spruce and hemlock 200 feet high and up to 700 years old, are turned into wood pulp and plywood.

Since withdrawing these subsidies makes so much sense, why haven't we done so?

The argument made is jobs. There are 2 sawmills which support employment of 1,420 people in the Tongass timber industry. In other words, the federal government is paying \$33,732 annually to maintain each and every job. All to destroy our last temperate rain forest.

* Or take water rights. Because water rights are generally not transferable, the people in Los Angeles are paying \$600 an acre foot for their water.

A couple hundred miles away the same water is sold to farmers in the Imperial Valley at \$10/acre foot. Because the farmers have a long term, low cost entitlement to the water with no incentive to conserve, it is estimated that fully as much water as is used for irrigation is lost to evaporation and seepage. If water rights were made marketable, it is estimated Los Angeles could acquire that 100,000 acre feet of water -- enough for a million people a year -- for less than \$100/acre foot -- a savings of over half what they would otherwise have to pay, and without any further depletion of the river and its ecosystem.

For years much environmental debate has been about goals. Opponents of those goals have debated the necessity for specific goals and they have even more frequently cited the costs and the

marketplace disadvantage they will face. I and Senator Wirth and increasingly others believe that we must make the marketplace the ally of the environment, and not its adversary.

By their actions, our award winners this evening have shown how individuals can build alliances for clean air, clean water and pristine lands. It's men and women, like you here, who will make this vital effort successful. Each of you has provided an example, an inspiration to friends and neighbors, to work hard and to be more conscientious of the great trust that is in our hands.

Through your personal achievements, you have improved the lives of people today and left a better place for generations yet to come. And these awards represent the appreciation each of us feels for you having accomplished so much for so many. On behalf of everyone here, permit me to offer my heartfelt congratulations on a job well done. Thank you all.