

Center for American Progress



BOOK FORUM

**“A NEW PROGRESSIVE AGENDA FOR PUBLIC HEALTH AND
THE ENVIRONMENT.”**

**INTRODUCTION BY:
JOHN D. PODESTA,
PRESIDENT AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER,
CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS**

**FEATURING THE BOOK’S EDITORS:
CHRISTOPHER SCHROEDER,
PROFESSOR OF LAW, DUKE UNIVERSITY, AND BOARD
MEMBER, CENTER FOR PROGRESSIVE REGULATION**

**RENA STEINZOR,
PROFESSOR OF LAW, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, AND
BOARD MEMBER, CENTER FOR PROGRESSIVE REGULATION**

**IN DISCUSSION WITH:
FRANCES G. BEINECKE,
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE
COUNCIL**

JONATHAN HIATT, GENERAL COUNSEL, AFL-CIO

**JAMES E. TIERNEY, FORMER ATTORNEY GENERAL OF
MAINE, ADJUNCT FACULTY, COLUMBIA LAW SCHOOL AND
CONSULTANT TO STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL**

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 4TH, 2005

**Transcript provided by
DC Transcription & Media Repurposing**

JOHN D. PODESTA: Good morning. We are not really scary people up here so if anyone in wants to come the front – there are some seats up here in the front. I am John Podesta. I am the President of the Center for American Progress and I am really pleased that we could be here today with such a wonderful panel. I am delighted to be joining all of you in what I think is a very important conversation. You know, to some people a discussion of regulatory policy can seem like a journey into the arcane, but I think if you look at the cross-section of leaders here that we have at the panel, and the people who are in the audience, it says a lot about the potential to move this issue well beyond the conversation that takes place in – among – just amongst lawyers and in federal agencies and out into the public.

We're very pleased to be hosting this event and joined by Rena Steinzor. Rena, together with Chris Schroeder, is the co-editor of *A New Progressive Agenda for Public Health and the Environment*. She is a professor of law at the University of Maryland and a scholar, and board member and a founder of the Center for Progressive Regulation. And the purpose of this really is to discuss the ideas that are contained in the book. And so the way that we're going to proceed this morning is after I give a couple of remarks, Rena is going to introduce the book, and then we're going to hear comments from our panel. And they include Frances Beinecke, the executive director of the Natural Resources Defense Council; John Hiatt, the general counsel of the AFL-CIO; and Jim Tierney, the former attorney general of Maine, and currently adjunct faculty of Columbia Law School and consultant to state attorneys general.

In publishing *A New Progressive Agenda for Public Health and the Environment*, Rena, Chris, and the scholars at CPR have made a major contribution to the discussion of what truly constitutes progressive regulation. And I think that the panel here this morning will add to that view and add to that discussion. Of course, there are really very many different dimensions to this question. At the Center for American Progress, we're exploring the relationship of science and information to policymaking and regulation, particularly the new – the role new technologies can play in their integration.

As I think most of you know, this is anything but a new issue. I think if you go down a few blocks south of here and enter the Jefferson Memorial, you'll see etched in a wall a quote from Thomas Jefferson in a letter he wrote to Samuel Kercheval on July 12, 1810, where he said, “. . . [A]s new discoveries are made, new truth disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times.” Today, I think it is fair to say that truth itself or at least the fealty to accurate scientific data is under assault.

You know, when they were out of power, the kind of pseudo-scientific approach as championed by right-wing think tanks and corporate-sponsored scholars seemed to

probably to some of us almost laughable. But I think that an ideologically driven, rather than a data-driven, policymaking context has morphed into federal policy and I don't think people are laughing anymore.

Every year, power plant pollution causes an estimated 24,000 premature deaths. Food-borne illnesses kill 5,000 and sicken 76,000,000. Nearly 6,000 workers die as a result of injury on the job with an additional 50(,000) to 60,000 killed by occupational disease. And on a global basis, catastrophic climate change and toxic pollution continue to threaten our future. There's no question that our side has offered vigorous opposition to the direction that regulatory policymaking has taken in the last few years, but we also need to provide, I think, a competing vision for sound scientific-based health, safety, and environmental decision-making. Rena, Chris, and the other scholars who contributed to this book have helped to frame that vision.

At the Center, we believe public officials and regulators at all levels should be compelled to use the technology that is available today to collect and analyze quality data, and use the data to drive decision-making. We already know that low-cost wireless sensors can provide real time air and water quality data right down to the neighborhood level. Combined with new database technologies, not only policymakers but scholars and citizens themselves could sift through that data and identify risks that otherwise might be missed to detect sound from noise, as they say in the radar world, to track policy progress, determine which policies are succeeding and which are not, and why.

The bottom line is that today new technology gives our country the capacity to build an information infrastructure that strengthens health, safety, and environmental protection as never before. The Center has laid out a series of recommendations that can make that happen. We're releasing that today, and you'll be able to receive that at the conclusion of this panel on your way out. There'll be copies of that at the back of the room.

But the infrastructure, necessary as it is, will not exist absent the efforts of the people who are with us today and others like us throughout the country. Collecting better data, providing detailed high-quality analysis, and using technology to make them widely available, that goes to the core of what a progressive vision for public health and environment regulation can be all about. That's why we're so proud to be working with the Center for Progressive Regulation. As we know, there are solutions, and in this book, Rena and Chris not only help identify some of them, they also demonstrate how scholars once organized can really be mobilized to promote them.

The issues they are raising and that we are considering today are anything but arcane. To the contrary, I think the future of the country hangs in their balance. You have – I think in your packets you have long bios of our panelists, so I'm not going to give lengthy introductions. I'm really just going to turn it over to the panelists. All these people are well known to you. We've all worked together on many, many efforts over the years.

So with that, let me just turn it over to Rena.

Thank you.

PROFESSOR RENA STEINZOR: Thanks very much, John.

MR. PODESTA: You probably need to pull the mike up to the podium.

PROFESSOR STEINZOR: I have to pull it forward?

MR. PODESTA: Yeah.

PROFESSOR STEINZOR: Before I begin, I want to acknowledge the people that made this day possible: Of course, John Podesta and his terrific staff; the members of the public interests community who helped us get started, many of whom are in the audience today; the Deer Creek Foundation, Belden Fund, Bauman Foundation and the Rapoport Foundation, our primary funders; and the Gottlieb Foundation, which supported publication of our book. Several CPR scholars are in the audience, and all of our small, but mighty staff are here, and we look forward to talking with you later. Tom McGarity, raise your hand. He's our president. And I want to thank the panelists for filling this packed house. I'd have preferred that you were all out running the country, but I'll take this as second best.

As John said, if we are alert, we are confronted every day with ominous signs that we are rapidly losing ground in protecting public health and the environment. Fifteen percent of American women of child-bearing age have elevated levels of mercury in their blood that could cause neurological damage to their unborn children. In many of our largest cities, children and the elderly are warned not to venture outside on code red days. The Bush administration has opened vast swaths of wilderness land to logging and drilling, charging extractive industries a small fraction of what these irreplaceable resources are worth.

And even these daunting problems pale in comparison to what people suffer as a result of environmental degradation in other countries. In the developing world, the number of children who die each year because they do not have safe drinking water is larger than the number of people killed by the tsunamis. There is no reputable scientist who will dispute that global climate change is an increasingly urgent problem, but international bodies are paralyzed, unable to formulate any effective response, especially because America has been so intransigent.

In the wake of the 2004 election, much has been made of the red state/blue state split, with many arguing that red states will never support a progressive agenda on virtually any social issue. Conservatives gloat about the extraordinarily low profile environmental issues appeared to have when people went to the polls. I could stand up here and spin out defenses to these arguments until the cows come home, but none of that hand wringing would get us in a position to win the country back.

We wrote *A New Progressive Agenda* because we are convinced that the time for shock and awe is over. All those mothers and fathers out there who worry, however quietly, about the condition of the natural world that we will leave to our children do not think of themselves as red-staters or blue-staters; rather, they are waiting for someone to explain in terms everyone can understand what we can and should do to make this crucial aspect of their children's inheritance safer.

Our vision is simple, straightforward, and large, and therefore unlikely to have much influence on Washington policy making in the near term, but we need to learn a lesson from the playbook of our opposition. I was a kid when Barry Goldwater's candidacy went down in flames. The right wing did not wallow in its defeat. Instead, it built the intellectual infrastructure that is the foundation of how America is governed today. Progressives have been articulating a different vision for an equally long time.

Now more than ever, we much draw all of these threads together explaining to anyone who will listen what we would do if we were in charge. Everything we say in the book boils down to a handful of core principles. We must change the fundamental theory that now dominates environmental policymaking: that the interests of polluters, and the interests of citizens should be balanced against each other by the so-called free market, with the government intervening only when the economic benefits of protecting people outweigh the costs of cleaning up.

This formula neatly flips responsibility for staying safe from those who cause the harm to those who are the victims of it. Rather than making antiquated power plants control their emissions or demanding that cars be more fuel efficient, we tell children and their grandparents to stay indoors. Progressives believe that American industry can and should take back these responsibilities, striving to reduce harm, rather than asking citizens to avoid it. Dirty power plants in the Midwest must install state-of-the-art pollution controls or be put out of business. The nine outmoded chemical plants that lose 65 tons of mercury into the environment every year should be converted to readily-available clean technologies. To be sure, we must consider the costs of such controls, but we must stop putting a monetary value on individual human lives, insisting that the dollar amounts arbitrarily assigned to illness and death exceed what polluters claim it will cost them to avoid such grievous injuries.

We are now engaged, as John explained, in an exhausting, ultimately fruitless struggle to discover exactly how much pollution can be tolerated, and how many natural resources can be harvested before the consequences are manifestly dangerous. Regulatory debates have become so hypertechnical and convoluted that no one outside of a small cadre of experts can understand what is at stake.

Progressives believe that instead of splitting hairs over how much risk is tolerable, we should tell the industry to do the best it can by installing state-of-the-art clean-up technologies or, as our mothers would say, better safe than sorry. In the remote event

that we clean up too much, we will be ahead of the game that we have been losing for too long.

Although the right wing plays strident lip service to the notion that we need sound science before we take action, their allies in regulated industry have fought tooth and nail to avoid gathering the information we must have to decide which problems to tackle first. We are painfully ignorant about the ramifications of using the majority of chemicals that are sold in science – sold in industry. Even when we do have information, shrinking government has no capacity to organize and disseminate it effectively. Progressives believe that we should harness the potential of the information age, gathering all available information, spotting data gaps, bridging those gaps, and using information as an incentive to stop activities that threaten public health. We should establish an independent bureau of environmental statistics that will speak truth to power, and give government scientists the resources they need to conduct cutting edge research on such emerging threats as endocrine disruptors.

The Reagan era began with the systematic destruction of the reputation and morale of government employees at both the federal and state level. Even as federal spending increased dramatically, conservatives managed to distract attention from that inconvenient situation by deriding big government, and everything and anyone who had anything to do with it. Progressives believe that it is long past time to stop starving and degrading the federal and state employees who act on behalf of the public interests. We do not flinch from advocating as much government as is necessary to control the polluting side effects of profit-seeking activities that endanger the common good.

We believe that the equal partnership between the national and state governments must be restored with adequate resources given to the states to do the bedrock tasks of testing the water and the air, and policing those who break the law. Such changes will cost billions of dollars, but these amounts pale in comparison to what it is really costing the global community to squander environmental quality.

Last, but not least, progressives are committed to restoring corporate accountability to the American people. Whether the topic is pension funds or Vioxx, unsafe working conditions or midnight dumping, dioxin or the effect of pesticides on fragile ecosystems, companies should disclose everything they know about such hazards to the public and as important to their investors. We should have a freedom of information act that applies to the private sector whenever industrial activities threaten the public.

Again, I want to thank CAP for sponsoring this event, and I look forward very much to the comments of my fellow panelists.

MR. PODESTA: Thank you, Rena.

Just before I turn the microphone over to Frances, I think that I want to read you one sentence from today's *Washington Post* – the lead sentence in a story, the headline of

which is “EPA Inspector Finds Mercury Proposal Tainted,” because I think it sums up everything we’re saying here today. “The Environmental Protection Agency ignored scientific evidence and agency protocols in order to set limits on mercury pollution that would line up with the Bush administration’s free-market approaches to power plant pollution, according to a report released yesterday by the agency’s own inspector general.” I mean, that’s really the heart of what we’re talking about here today.

So, Frances, let me turn it over to you, and then we’ll go through the panel, and then open it up to the audience.

FRANCES G. BEINECKE: Okay. Thank you, John. It’s a pleasure to be here today for the launch of the Center for Progressive Regulation, and for the launch of their new book. It’s refreshing and essential to look ahead at how to reach important objectives to protect public health and the environment.

This is the time for bold, new thinking, for new strategies, for new and renewed alliances, and it’s the time also to renew our own commitment to the prevention and the precautionary principle, the principle that the polluter pays, the right-to-know principle, the use of science in decision-making, and the role of government, which has a fundamental role in protecting the lives of people across this country.

We have reached the moment when we are over the edge, not on the verge, of losing important protections for the health and environment that we have all worked hard at achieving over the last 30 years. The examples are many, and many are enumerated in NRDC’s annual report, “Rewriting the Rules,” our day-by-day accounting of the Bush administration, which documents over 150 rollbacks of environmental regulation over the last four years. You can pick really any date, your own birthday, your anniversary, your child’s birthday, and you will find – and I promise you, it’s true – one rollback or another or an invasion into the principles of protecting our public lands. There are so many, it’s really impossible to recount the most egregious ones, but here are just a few ones that we have already spoken about.

Mercury. This powerful neurotoxin is increasing at alarming rates among children and young women of the childbearing age all across the country, yet the opportunities to control it through EPA rulemaking and legislation have been intentionally squandered. The administration seeks to minimize this threat and delays controls, thereby allowing additional tons of mercury into the air, the water, and ultimately into the food we eat. And is anyone in this room surprised by the inspector general’s report from EPA? Don’t we already know that these are the instructions that are going to the EPA civil servants and having create these regulations, and that’s been true day by day over the last four years? The administration’s message on mercury is, “don’t eat the fish,” rather than “control the mercury.” That’s inexcusable.

In the area of power plants, the administration is leading us pell-mell backwards in energy policy. Again, no surprise to anyone in this room. By continuing subsidies to old technologies, and about – there are over a 100 coal-fired power plants that are going

through the permitting stage in this country that use old technology. This will lead us down a path of increased SOx/NOx, mercury and carbon, and make the necessity of moving forward with new energy strategies and technologies, including those that capture carbon and deal with global warming, even more difficult.

Another area: air quality. Since 1991, we have seen a 52 percent decrease in EPA clean air inspections at refineries, a 68 percent decrease in notice of air violations to refineries, and a 31 percent decrease in enforcement actions against refineries. And that's only in one industry. Those numbers are replicated across sectors. Under the administration, there is no intention to enforce the law to the extent that's required. The stark realities of the Bush administration's policies need to be powerfully communicated to the American public, so it demands government action, action to protect public health.

But beyond opposing the negative, regressive, 19th Century mentality, the environmental community, the progressive community, the labor community, and most of all the public need the intellectual firepower of CPR to help us bring that to the table. We're all very aware of the examples and those of us in the advocacy community bemoan them and wring our hands every day. But the solution for us is not that just to be on the defense. It is to have bold, new ideas, and that's where CPR comes in.

Several years ago, NRDC was fortunate enough to have Rena Steinzor in our office while she was on sabbatical. And during that period, we were speaking with her on a regular basis about how do we change this structure that we're faced with. Well, there's a lot of talk going on, and we've all been part of it for four years, but very few people move beyond the talk and take real action to change the climate, and that's where CPR comes in. Rena, Tom, Chris, and all of their colleagues who have come together as a force to present us with the principles and the guidance that can move us forward down the road of a progressive agenda for the environment for public health, and can really set us on a course that we can all follow to make sure that America and the principles that we stand for, as far as public – protecting public health and the environment are realized.

So this is a terrific day, and we are very pleased to be participating and working with CPR going forward to ensure that these principles are realized.

Thank you.

MR. PODESTA: Thank you, Frances.

John Hiatt?

JONATHAN HIATT: Thank you, John. And I, too, wanted to start by thanking both centers, the Center for American Progress and CPR, for hosting this meeting and for the book and the great work that CPR does. We are extremely appreciative to Tom McGarity and to the rest of the CPR folks who have really taken works of some great academics and translated them into policy goals and recommendations that have real significance in the current policy debate in the current context that we're facing. And

that's somewhat unusual for academics to have that work get so effectively translated into the real world context. And when that happens, I think it's just – it's tremendous, and we're very appreciative of that.

Our collective challenge, I think, is to build on the work that – the recommendations that CPR has issued in this book to help publicize them, to make them part of the policy debate, and try to stop and reverse the anti-regulatory zealots and to do something about this anti-regulatory climate. And I think the significance of the invitation to a representative from the labor movement to be at this – on this panel is a recognition that the coalition work that we've done with the environmental community, the public health community, and the labor movement has been very effective in the past. We, I think, deserve a good deal of credit for a lot of the work in staunching the Gingrich revolution, which had many of the same components back in the early '90s. And so it can be done. We've worked together effectively in the past and we need to do that again.

What is so troubling to us about the anti-regulatory agenda that's being pursued, I think, is how much of it is being dictated by the business community allies of the administration, and workers have been among the primary victims of this crusade. It's no coincidence that the first law of substance that was signed by President Bush was a repeal of the worker safety protections on ergonomics. These regulations had been some 10 years in the making. They had started under Republican Secretary of Labor Elizabeth Dole. They've been widely endorsed by Republicans and Democrats alike, but this became one of the major targets of the business community and the Bush administration, and was – the rules which would have prevented hundreds of thousands of repetitive motion injuries in workplaces every year, and which had been completed shortly before the end of the Clinton administration were repealed among the first acts.

And in classic fox-guarding-hen house fashion, the first Department of Labor solicitor, Eugene Scalia, was someone – a lawyer who had basically made his name fighting ergonomics rules not only on behalf of clients, but on his own in law review articles, and in other publications where he had railed against ergonomics as being junk science and so on. And this was the person who was brought in to oversee OSHA's handling of the ergonomics policies of the administration.

In repealing the rules, DOL promised that there would be a comprehensive substitute some four years later. We're still waiting for that comprehensive substitute.

It's also no coincidence that the first executive orders of substance that were signed by President Bush were a series of anti-worker orders that drastically affected protective regulation in the workplace. A terrific Clinton administration order that had ensured retention of long-term service employees when in the context of increasingly common turnover of federal building contractors was wiped away in the first month of the Bush administration.

But what's so troubling about these executive orders was, again, this double standard: anti-regulatory when it suits businesses purposes, but totally regulatory when

the other side of the coin is at stake. And so one of the other executive orders was a requirement that – the right not to belong to a union and not to pay dues to a union be posted in all workplaces of all federal contractors, all – and all employers doing business with the federal government.

We had made clear going back to, you know, the first Bush administration that we had no objection to that type of regulation, that is, the posting of rights under the National Labor Relations Act as long as all rights were posted, the right to organize, the right to bargain collectively. But of the large number of rights that the act in theory guarantees workers in connection with organizing and collective bargaining, the one that the Bush administration through this executive order has now mandated be posted in every workplace is the right of workers not to join a union and not to take dues if they don't wish to do so.

And as I say, it's this double standard that I think we find most troubling, because it shows that the administration's crusade is not simply anti-government. It's not even based on principles to anti-regulatory ideology, but rather it's just completely opportunistic deference to big business.

We saw this firsthand in 2003-2004 in the Department of Labor's – one of the largest regulatory efforts – initiatives ever undertaken by the Department of Labor in connection with union reporting – accounting and reporting requirements. And this was an area where CPR was extremely helpful. Every – unions have been regulated since the '50s; have to report their expenses. These are public reports. Already our requirements are every bit as detailed and onerous as what big business is expected to do now under Sarbanes-Oxley. But the Bush administration – the first Bush administration had attempted at the behest of Newt Gingrich, who in a memo that was recently made public, revealed that his urging was in order to “weaken our political enemies,” attempted to impose on us reporting requirements, changes in the reporting requirements that, first of all, would have required labor to categorize their expenses functionally – in functional categories different from the reporting that we have to do with every other federal agency in order to get at the political – every expenditure that we're spending on allegedly political activities.

Secondly, that again unlike any requirements imposed on business, we have to itemize every single expenditure from any vendor or outside business with whom a union does business, and I'm talking not just national unions, but local unions with, you know, mom-and-pop size with officers who are full-time workers and volunteer union officers have to itemize every expenditure over what at the time was proposed to be a 2,000 – you do more than \$2,000 worth of business with any employer over the course of the year.

And finally, electronic filing with software that the Labor Department had promised to provide, but never came out with. And this – the proposed regulation went to OMB and was approved on a one-day turnaround basis. We went to OMB, met with John Graham (sp), and again with help from CPR, and also with a former chief accountant from SEC to complain about the double standard or to at least raise the fact

that under the small – under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, under the Paperwork Reduction Act, under Executive Order 12866, there had been none of the kind of analysis that the Department of Labor was supposed to have undertaken and that surely this wasn't the type of analysis that was expected in a new regulatory initiative of this kind, but it made no difference. Certainly any Clean Air Act initiative or OSHA rule protective of workers would hardly have flown through in this fashion.

This, of course, was no surprise from an agency which in its first year put on its web site – posted a mission statement indicating that its priority was to provide employers – this is the Department of Labor, not the Department of Commerce – was to provide employers with compliance assistance. This was going to be its top priority for its first year – for the first year in office in working through reams of regulations that no normal businessperson could be expected to understand. This was the chief mission of the Labor – of the Bush Labor Department.

One last example of particular outrage to – many of you will relate to, because this was, I think, a great example of collaborative work between the environmental civil rights and labor communities, and with a lot of help from John Podesta and the Clinton administration was the contractor responsibility regulations where all we were seeking was to try to require government to take a hard look at a bidding contractor's track record in abiding by the federal government's major laws in labor, environmental, and civil rights areas. It seemed pretty reasonable, but the business community dubbed these blacklisting rules and made them, again, one of the top targets for repeal in the first few months of the first administration.

Well, they're not done yet. We've all read in the papers in addition to some of the examples that have been kicked off by earlier speakers. We've seen in our world the intent to do away with Civil Service in federal government, to do away with collective bargaining rights for federal employees, and we'll need coalition help, I'm sure, again in the future. And I think that leads to one of the few lessons that I'll just end with.

One is that I think, as I've said before, we've been successful and we've worked in coalition. We need to keep doing that. We need the help of the Center for American Progress and other organizations in this policy debate, but also that the activism that so many of your groups and organizations bring to these fights.

Secondly, I think we really need to do something about the revolving door phenomenon. It's not just Gene Scalia who came in from an anti-regulatory practice and then has gone right back to – he did not get confirmed, but after his recess appointment expired, he went right back to his practice where he was doing the same thing. You all have many examples of that: William Myers, who was the solicitor in the Interior Department with – after a distinguished career representing mining and grazing interests has gone back to representing mining and grazing interests with a short interruption for an unsuccessful nomination to the Ninth Circuit. He's about to be renominated there, all the time, again, still practicing on behalf of industry.

And that takes me to the third suggestion, which is that we really have to work together to fight some of these extremist judicial nominations. And it isn't just the Supreme Court nominations that affect us. In many ways, I think the appellate – the circuit court appointments in the long run have as much, if not even more, impact on us on the labor, environmental, civil rights laws as the Supreme Court vacancies, and we can't let our allies on the Hill put all of their focus on the Supreme Court fight if it means neglecting some of these horrible extremist judicial nominations that we've been successful at fighting in some cases, and really need to ramp up our efforts.

And lastly, the fight against the anti-union climate in this country. There's a direct connection, we feel, between the – with the decline of collective bargaining, the decline of union density in this country on the one hand, and the ability to make the most of protective regulation on the other. No matter how much money is put into government enforcement and into government regulation, it's collective actions in the workplace that put the flesh on the bones of protective regulation, and we need your help in keeping the standards up by having a thriving labor and free labor movement that can really make the most of protective regulation.

Thank you.

MR. PODESTA: Thank you, John.

Jim? Now you're going to give us the good news.

JAMES E. TIERNEY: Well, yeah, thank you. (Laughter.)

It's an absolute miracle that I'm here. Now, whether that's good or not will depend on whether you like what I'm going to say. But I was sitting at the Portland airport this morning. We've all had flights cancelled, but this is just too good not to share. We're all sitting there lining up for the 6:00 a.m. flight to Reagan airport and we get the news that when they went out to de-ice the plane, someone left the door open on the plane. So all the de-icing gunk kind of went inside the plane and it's still there. But due to the miracles of modern transportation, I am not. I am here, because I was able to jump on another airline and get in through Dulles, so thanks for having me. This is a great opportunity.

And I jumped at the chance when Tom told me to come, but I did tell him that unlike – I won't, you know, appear someplace unless I've actually read the book. And Tom McGarity is a wonderful guy. He said, "No, no, no. You don't have to read the whole book. Just read chapter three," you know, and I'm not going to embarrass the other panelists, but I actually – because I'm from Maine. You have a lot of time on your hands – I actually have read the entire book.

And I guess I would like to say, first of all, it's a terrific book. It's wonderful. I hope you do. But I do not think it is a compilation of bold, new ideas. I think it is a compilation of bold, old ideas. This is really asserting some of the essential elements of

how government is supposed to work. You pay your employees well. You honor science. You do things in a nonpolitical manner. You take a look at the facts and then you find out where they're going to lead you so that we can make everybody's life better.

We shouldn't live in the world where that's a new idea. And I think, frankly, if we look at American history, it isn't a new idea. And I think if we look at regulatory structures in other countries that exist now, you'll find this isn't new ideas. It's the right thing to do. It ought to be done. But sad to say, we have a sell-out crowd today because it's not being done; because if it was, there wouldn't be any need for this book. No one would be saying we don't like revolving doors, because 80 percent of these people in this room would be working for the Kerry administration, and so we wouldn't like that revolving door. Look, if he says he doesn't like revolving doors, who do we have at the end here? John Podesta, right? I mean, who is going to believe that we don't want revolving doors, but I know you probably have to say that. It's part of what – it's part of what you do. (Laughter.)

Now, having said this, I want you to know that I've been for 15 years out of office. I have been teaching, and I've done the best I can to try to pretend to be like the real scholars are. But one of my students – God love them, you know, they can do these evaluations, so – most of them were very good last semester, but one of them said, "You know, I got to say this about Professor Tierney. This guy was so deluded, he really thought John Kerry was going to win. But what do you expect? He's a politician." I mean, that's what – I was cut. It wasn't the John Kerry part that cut me; it was the fact that for all this work I'm still considered a politician, so if that is it, so be it.

I only have 10 minutes. I could go on much longer, if I could. I'll try to remember the rules that Ed Muskie taught me as a young politician. And for some of you in the room, Ed Muskie used to be a U.S. senator from Maine.

MR. : Secretary of state, too.

MR. TIERNEY: But anyway, he always used to tell me to tell the truth, because that way you can remember what you said. And I thought that was excellent advice, and I've tried to carry it through, no matter how much trouble it's gotten me in. (Laughter.)

I do want to say this is a great opportunity, but John's key words here at the beginning – he said this was a "discussion," and Frances said this was a "launch." And discussions and launch require many voices and many perspectives, and if this book is the end of the process, then we haven't done very much. It's got to be the beginning and an ongoing part of the process, which is essential to what we're doing. So towards that end, I'm going to point to two things, having read the entire book, that I think ought to be in there that aren't.

In the attack on the free marketeers, I'm afraid that there is scant respect and attention given to markets as to how that they can assure appropriate behavior by corporate America, and there are ways to do that. I've got lots of examples. I'm not

going to talk about that, because it's the second thing that I know the most about, which is not mentioned in the book, and that is the role of other governmental entities – governmental entities outside Washington – that can make the world a better place.

And in fact, if you look at the index, the word “mayor” doesn't appear, the word “attorney general” doesn't appear, and the only places where federalism are mentioned are wholesale attacks, frankly appropriate attacks, on inappropriate behavior by various state governments, usually red-state governments.

Now, I've been told that there's a great irony in this, because the scholars who wrote this book, including our chair, have worked – which you didn't know I knew – have worked long and hard with state governments and local governments to make the world a better place, and they have tried to help craft new ideas with success. However, it's not in the book and if it's not in the book, it's not part of the conversation. If it's not part of this conversation, then we have made, in my opinion, both a substantive mistake and a strategic mistake.

Now, to prove that I'm not really a politician, I'm going to now criticize the gentleman to my immediate left, your right, my good friend, John Hiatt. Now, I've represented labor unions on and off my entire period of time as a lawyer, over 30 years. There were those while I was attorney general for 10 years who said I continued to represent unions while I was – and actually, there were a few times I did a little pro bono work at night that I wasn't supposed to in order to – we used to have something called a strike back then, John. It's relegated now to labor history books, but we actually used to have them. And my clients never sliced anybody's tires. I wanted you to know that. It's always someone else who did that.

But the reason I say this: John gave a wonderful critique of the errors of this Department of Labor, but if you go, as I did last night, to the AFL-CIO web page, and if you look at the little place on the web page that says, “What do you do if you've been denied wages and overtime?” and you click on it, the AFL-CIO right now sends you to that same Department of Labor to get your money. That doesn't make any sense. It doesn't make any sense, for every state and cities and counties and municipalities have mechanisms existing to help people collect unpaid wages and overtime.

And we're just – John, to go back to technology, we are just a click away from being able – try to imagine some worker trying to – hasn't been paid overtime, hasn't been paid his money. He's trying to find out, he goes to the labor web page, and he's sent to Eugene Scalia by the AFL-CIO. Now, this isn't John's fault; he doesn't run the web page. But the point is, that – but the point is, it's not – it is a perspective which is deeply ingrained in the progressive community. And as soon as you say it, yeah, why isn't that in the book, and why didn't we change the web page. This is inherent.

Now, some organizations get it. I work with the NRDC on some litigation that they filed, and working very closely with some state attorneys general on climate change,

and Lisa came and spoke to us. But I'm telling you, you have to change it. And it's very, very difficult.

Now, let me tell you something. I don't know how all of you got here today, but my guess is you didn't get up at 3:30. You didn't drive on a wet, slippery road taking your life in your hands. You didn't have to jump airplanes in order to get here. There are some nice things about living in Washington. All right? When I go out around and tell people I'm from Maine in Washington, the first thing they ask me is, one, "How are things in Montpelier?" and the second thing is, "You know, I went to camp in Maine." Now, I'm not going to embarrass you by asking hands because I've done that in Washington crowds and these hands, ooh, they go up and then they come down, but I am sure there are people here who went to camp in Maine.

The point is that we have got to rethink this issue. Now, if NGOs like John haven't got it, if progressive people haven't always gotten the fact, the people who really do not have it are academia itself – scholars themselves. Now, no matter where you teach – I'll focus on law schools – no matter where you teach law school, no matter how remote, whether it's Stanford or Stamford, which is in Alabama – a law school – where did you go to law school? The old (alumni?) statistics are you went to five or six major, big, fancy schools like the one I teach at. And you can go through the curriculum of those schools, and if you can find anything about state and local government, you're lucky. And if you can find it, there's usually a professor who teaches it, tries to sell a textbook on it. It is not taken seriously.

And although there are billions of words – there must be billions of words – published in law review articles every single year, if you go and try to find and research what the state attorneys general, for example, my field are doing or mayors are doing, it is very, very hard to find. We would rather have the 17th law review article debating the 16th law review article on some U.S. Supreme Court decision, than we would actually want to get out of where we are and look at what is happening on the ground in various places. And as you can see, it drives me crazy.

So let me talk to you about the – I think, and I know I'm right because I'll tell you why I know I'm right – that states and state attorneys general – again, this is also true for mayors and so on, but I talk about what I know the most – are doing substantive things to make people's lives better. Tobacco, Microsoft, banking, insurance regulation, the environment, predatory lending, pharmaceuticals. It's a long list. And the reason I know I'm right is not because I'm sitting here with my blinders on; because my enemy knows I'm right. My enemy knows I'm right.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, (Cato?), all the list have made preempting states the top of their priority. They have made states the top of their priority in order to stop off the chokehold on American commerce that states are currently bringing. They know it. And yet, do you know it and do you understand the implications of that? And I think the answer is, with all due respect to the progressive community, the answer to that is no. So I know I'm right, because the enemy is doing it, and we are putting up an insufficient

fight. Doesn't make any difference whether environment, antitrust, banking – it doesn't make any difference.

So let me give you an example of how you could put together the market forces and the substance and the technology, John, and the science in a simple case to make – where you can show how quickly good things can happen. I'll do it very quickly. GlaxoSmithKline: big drug company. They produce a drug, because Prozac is running away with them on antidepressants, called Paxil. It gets FDA approved for adults only; not kids. And they do five tests: one of them came out okay; four of them came out not so okay with kids. Matter of fact, it showed the kids – it increases suicidal thinking among young people if they take this drug. They file all five tests with the FDA, as they're required to do, but they only brag about the one test that has the good news.

The United Kingdom looks at this, and it's June of 2003, and says Paxil is not recommended for adolescents. Don't do it. The FDA looks at it and says, well, the evidence is inconclusive. We're going to do our own study. We're not going to recommend it, but we're not going to say anything bad. I wonder who represented Glaxo in front of the FDA on that one.

So they do their own investigation, which of course doesn't get done because, as you point out in the book, they're understaffed and there aren't enough people, and they don't have the access to science, and it has to be cleared through the general counsel, who, of course, used to work for the drug industry. And so the report never comes out.

One attorney general – and this happened to be the attorney general of New York, but on this fact pattern, it could have been the attorney general of Montana. It could have, in my opinion, exact same impact. He says, "What are you talking about? You're making a drug – you've got information out there that shows that the kids – depressed kids are getting suicidal thoughts disproportionately because – you have this information. Get this information out. Don't hide it." So he sues them for fraud.

The industry, of course, lines up its usual defenses, and they're pretty good legal defenses, counselors. I mean, it's preempted. It's commercial free speech, *Central Hudson* and on and on and on. But it didn't make any difference, because somehow the market decided – call me crazy, but you're buying and selling stocks, and you say wait a minute, I can buy lots of different drug company stocks. This one makes a drug that might end up with kids committing suicide. This one doesn't. I'm not going to invest in that. So Paxil stock goes down and in two weeks they quit. In two weeks they quit. No depositions. No motions. No First Amendment defense. Two weeks. They quit.

Shortly after that, the FDA quits, and now with no additional research being done, now they have a black box that says, "Do not prescribe Paxil for kids." And you know who else quit? PhRMA (unintelligible), which is the trade association now headed by Billy Tauzin and a great, great American, who now heads PhRMA. (Laughter.) They quit, too. And they said the pharmaceutical industry has got to find ways so the

companies make their scientific reports increasingly accessible through technology to decision-makers. So they all quit.

Now, this didn't take a lot of great research on behalf of the Office of Attorney General in New York. I'm proud they did it, but it could have been anyone. This was just making readily public available information and getting it out there – the marketplace and it (relates?) and the house of cards comes down. So I think states can do substantive things, and I think our discussion of progressive regulation ought to talk about it.

So how do we go from here? I think we ought to learn more, first of all. I'm going to make a blatant plug for my own web site, because it's hard to find out anything about attorneys general. I know. I look every day, so go to stateag.org. You can't forget that, right? Stateag.org. How do you forget that? And sign up for my newsletter, which some of you get, and it's free. It's okay. Go read my blog, if you're really into state attorneys general. Look to work with others. Now, here's a great book, which has been put out by the Environmental Law Institute. It's a George Soros-funded – it's called *Redefining Federalism*, and it's a terrific bunch of people, and they've done great work and you ought to take a look at that, think about it, and because it ought to be merged with what we have here in order to make these differences.

So that's it. Think differently, work harder, and keep the discussion going.

Thanks for having me.

MR. PODESTA: Well, Jim, I think you got your coffee on the airplane, so thank you. (Laughter.)

MR. TIERNEY: No, no, I –

MR. PODESTA: I apologize to the guy at the AFL-CIO who runs the web page, who's probably been terminated by now. (Laughter.) To add to the website plugs and to show, at least, you know, that – we may not do a very good job, but at least we're thinking about it – we just launched a new feature on our web site called stateprogress.org that highlights the work at state –

MR. TIERNEY: And I will link to you on my web –

MR. PODESTA: And we'll cross-link our web sites and I'll blog, and we'll put –

MR. TIERNEY: We'll put you –

MR. PODESTA: – you on our blog, and you cross-link to your blog.

I actually want – I think Jim's been – opened up a really rich vein of conversation, and as the microphone comes into the room and you ready your questions, I think I'm

going to ask the first question. And I'm not going to turn immediately to Rena. I want to actually ask Frances.

The NRDC really spearheaded the move towards the tailpipe emission standards in California, the Pavley bill. And I wonder whether you think that this – that we should, you know, just take Jim's advice and say at least in the next four years while we continue to push back misguided efforts and try to resist what's going on that that's been well documented, both today and in the book. We also really spend much more attention on trying to work with – in a bipartisan way with progressive governors, Republicans and Democrats, who are out in the states. And then just talk a little bit about that experience, and then maybe let Rena speak to it.

MS. BEINECKE: Thank you, John. We've had actually – increasingly been focusing our work in the states. NRDC, as you may or may not know, has – our headquarters are in New York, and we have two offices in California. These are two very big, powerful states. Both have Republican governors. And we've been able to advance significant environmental protections in both of those states. There's a – John referred to the Pavley bill, which is the law in California to control emissions – carbon emissions, which is really the first regulation to control carbon emissions in the country. And we're trying to replicate it in the Northeast through a cap-and-trade program, so we see actually huge opportunities in the states at this point, and we're making a real investment in it.

And I think that, you know, the hope is the more you invest in the states – and obviously we work with Attorney General Spitzer quite a lot – that we can get enough going, and this is not NRDC alone. There are plenty of organizations doing the same thing. That we can make changes, particularly in the power plant and global warming sector that will build the case, because ultimately it does have to come back to the federal government. We need a cap-and-trade system that applies in every state to everyone.

So to Jim's point, yes, we can get a lot done in the states, but ultimately the strategy is to get the federal government to take responsibility for those things that affect all people. It's great if you get a few states doing it, but that doesn't really benefit the public at large, so we have a very aggressive state strategy but, you know, ultimately the purpose of it is to bring a lot of those examples and get them enacted at the federal level.

PROFESSOR STEINZOR: We love criticism and debate, because we are academics and that's what we thrive on. The one thing I would say, though, is that the ideas that we're trying to talk about, the blame-shifting, the quantifying of how much a human life is worth – the going rate is about \$1.6 million – the failure to use – do the best we can, all of these ideas apply at the federal level, at the state level, and at the local level. So I hear you. I would be very surprised if we weren't pretty responsive, since Jim is on our advisory council, but it's the ideas that I'm trying to get folks to focus on now, and that needs to happen at all levels. It can't just be lobbying state legislatures instead of lobbying Congress. It's got to be talking in these terms with local examples to anyone who will listen.

MR. PODESTA: Questions. How about starting in the back?

Q: Yeah. Yeah. Jordan Barab. I'm with the Chemical Safety Board. I find myself very frustrated at this discussion. I mean, I admit I haven't read the book yet, but just reading the materials and listening today – and I may be unfair, because I haven't read the book – but what I see is kind of a litany of what we've been hearing a lot, you know, the environment's going to hell, corporations are behind it, the Bush administration is letting them get away with it and, in fact, encouraging it; and that we shouldn't, you know, take cost-benefit – you know, we shouldn't use cost-benefit analysis for this, and we shouldn't – you know, we shouldn't let them get away with all these things.

And the book, it looks like it's great, and it would be a great plan if we had just been listening to John Kerry's state of the union address. In other words, it lays out a nice agenda for an administration that we would control. It doesn't seem to really have a – or let me put it this way, I haven't really heard today aside from Mr. Tierney talking about the attorneys general, I haven't heard a whole lot of new strategies about what we actually can be doing for the next four years in terms of educating the American people about the importance of public health and how it's important in their daily lives, and what we can be doing to mobilize and really organize people so we can get to the point where we can actually put this agenda into place.

And I just wanted to hear your responses to that. Thanks.

PROFESSOR STEINZOR: I was really serious when I said that we should take a page from the playbook of the right wing. Thirty years ago, they organized to draw together the threads of ideas that they could express to people, and they've been relentless ever since. And I guess what our answer to you would be is that, yes, we absolutely think the strategies are critical, and we think that grass roots organizing is absolutely vital, and we try to stay with our ears as close to the ground as possible, but that, again, if we're going to talk to the American people, we've got to lift the debate from the micro-details of government and start talking about the, if you will – dare I say – moral values that we support. And the moral values that we support is shifting the responsibility from those who pollute to – off of the victim back to those who pollute. And if we don't have a grand vision and a set of principles and a set of ideas that we apply everywhere – and we have them. It's not new. Jim is absolutely right. But we've got to articulate it in a bigger picture with a more dynamic framework to explain what we want to see. And we've got to get out of the technocratic details.

MR. PODESTA: Anybody else? Question? In the back?

As the microphone's moving, I think just also in response to the question, I think the paper we just put out has some new ideas, again, on the use of sensors, information technology. And if I could shamelessly plug some of the other things we're doing, we just put out a report that we did that came from an International Climate Change Task Force that we put together with the Institute for Public Policy Research in London and

the Australia Institute in Australia that was chaired by a member of Parliament, Steven Byers, and Olympia Snowe that I think has a real different strategic approach to where we go on climate change in a kind of – as Kyoto's coming into force how we bring the United States and Australia back into the game, and how we build out on that. So I think that while we can get a little gloomy, I think we're also trying to think through the questions that you're talking about.

Q: Thank you. What an excellent presentation and an excellent panel that you've put together. Thanks to CPR. It's just a thrill to be here. I want to – what I see in the book and from the presentation is that we want policies that rely on information, and we want the information to be good, and we want the information to be as reliable as possible. And to me, when I see information in the area that I work in, which is for NRDC – I oversee chemical policies, so I look at the regulation of toxic chemicals – the information comes from two basic areas. It comes from government scientists, in other words, not the industry data, but the data that I consider to be more objective and more reliable, and that's under attack. We know that funding is being removed and scientists are being let go or shut up. And the other place is toxic tort litigation, what comes out of legal discovery and industry documents, corporate documents that we can't get ahold of otherwise. And both of these things are under attack, and these to me are critical areas of information.

And what I haven't seen from the national community is any kind of organized, large-scale plan to protect these two areas of administration. I've seen some small-scale stuff on asbestos, which is the first toxic tort reform that's going to come through. The next is going to be medical, and then it's going to be, I think, wide-scale toxic tort litigation. So I adore Jordan, but I actually disagree. I think the people in this room are the people that really do know how to get things done. We are the action people, including Jordan, and so I want to know what the plan is to protect those areas of information.

MR. TIERNEY: Well, let me –

Q: The alternative to me is waiting for epidemiology, which we know is looking at the death certificates of workers.

MR. TIERNEY: Well, let me give you a quick shot. I did get a C in high school chemistry, which is the last time I analyzed any of those particular issues, other than to say I know who I trust and who I don't, so I trust you in what you're doing.

I think you have to look for allies. You know, I'm not going to give you a plan, but I am going to say allies. One thing that excites me about this program, all these programs, is that I do think the academic community is a tremendous source of potential assistance on this because it's not just twisting statistics. It's – or science, it's stopping to collect it. Very little-known article in John's field, the Department of Labor for years has collected statistics on migrant laborers. They're not going to collect the statistics anymore. Said it cost \$2 million; it was too expensive to use. So guess what? You stop

collecting statistics, a year goes by, two years go by, five years go by, problem goes away. Right?

So I mean, we do have to find new allies. You can't – it's not just the twisted science. It's the fact that there may not be any science at all, which I think we should point out. I do think you do have to reach out to the academic community. I think you have to ask people to work longer and harder for less or free. But I do think there are enough people who believe as we do who will do that.

MR. PODESTA: John?

MR. HIATT: Despite Jim's very personal ad hominem (laughter) and more importantly totally incorrect attacks on my organization and my organizational web site, I actually agree with one of his fundamental points about our need to look and see what state – what state approaches can do right now. And I think that despite the preemption issues that make it very hard for us, too, in terms of, for example, you know, analogously looking at every time we look for organizing-related legislation that we could get friendly state legislatures, friendly state governors to sign off on, we run up against federal preemption. But there are some back-door approaches that I think very much tie into the disclosure and access-to-information issue.

For example, one of the things that we're starting to do on a state level around the Wal-Mart good-jobs issues, and on healthcare – related to healthcare and Wal-Mart's failure to provide health benefits, and the effects that that's having on state health costs is to file – recognizing the limitations of health reform legislation at the state level, at least file disclose – get friendly legislators to file disclosure information, right-to-know information on what the impact of Wal-Mart and Wal-Mart-type employers is having on the healthcare cost burden to state taxpayers. This, in our polling, shows that there's a tremendous reaction among the public when they learn what the impact of Wal-Mart-type practices is on taxpayers assuming the healthcare costs.

So I think in terms of the public education needs that are addressed in the book and that relate to this larger question of how do we change the debate, how do we get people to – how do we get the public to see the anti-reg – the impact – the real-life impact of anti-regulatory policies, that there are disclosure – state legislative opportunities involving right-to-know and disclosure that really would be very useful.

MR. TIERNEY: Right. And I'm in violent agreement here with John. And I want to just take it, and I chose the – I have hundreds of examples. I chose Paxil for a reason. It wasn't just to make one more life-long list of things in the New York's AG office. It was to show how the marketplace with disclosure could trump and change everyone, even the national trade association, if it is done and leveraged correctly.

Now, let me give you a Wal-Mart example. Sam is dead. Wal-Mart will change. I've sued them. If they get in a jam, they will change. For example, some major investors took a piece of Wal-Mart. They bought them and they said, "We're going to

give you 18 months to change your discriminatory practices against gays and lesbians in terms of how you provide health benefits.” Now, they don’t provide health benefits to many people, but if the people you do provide it to, you’re going to have to change. “Now, we’ll let you publicly announce that any way you want, but you’ve got a deadline.” And Wal-Mart just before the deadline mysteriously announced that it’d gotten a letter from some of their employees in Seattle; they’d never thought about this before; they talked about it and they decided that they are going to eliminate the discrimination in the health care packages.

Why did that happen? Maybe they had – maybe it was moral. I don’t think so. I think Wal-Mart, the largest employer and the largest marketer, was looking at a huge marketplace of their own employees, who they have to manage, and a lot of customers walking in the door, and they made an economic decision.

So this is the kind of back-door leverage – look, as I said at the beginning, I wish we were in a different room talking about different issues, but you do have to be creative in finding ways to do it. Talk too much.

MR. PODESTA: More questions? Right here. Go ahead. No, go ahead. Go ahead. One, two. Go ahead.

Q: This is a great discussion, and I’m so – I was so intrigued by the invitation that put public health and environment in one sentence, and there’s so much organizing around the sort of an inclusive frame, but it’s fascinating to me that there’s not a single health – if I had – if we have to caricature where the communities that you guys represent, there’s not a single health or public health person, as least as I understand your kind of – your roles.

And I just wonder, you know, is there a reason for this as you talk about working on public health and the environment through regulation and other kinds of arenas? Is there not a way to sort of bring those alliances more visibly into force, because they’re certainly – they are among pediatricians and cardiologists, and the parents of kids with learning disabilities who increasingly understand the links between exposures in their kids, and (inaudible) breast cancer. There’s just been a ton of organizing including supported by the funders that are supporting their work. So I’m just wondering, you know, where’s the health person? Not that you guys aren’t allowed to care about that, too, but –

MR. TIERNEY: Well, the attorney general of Illinois has a full-time physician on her staff to address those kinds of issues. I mean, you have to get out and you have to look, and you find out some kind of neat things.

MS. BEINECKE: Well, also, the environmental community, at least at NRDC, we have a health and environment program, and we try to make those alliances. And I think it’s critical because the reality is to make these issues resonate, most of the people – it’s how people are affected, and more and more it’s how people’s health is affected.

And, of course, in the mercury issue, that's the issue. It's totally a health issue, and it's about children and how children are going to be exposed to a neurotoxin that could affect their learning capabilities. So you're absolutely right. It's a critical link.

And I think to the earlier point, too, to really succeed and move forward on these issues, it requires much broader alliances with labor, with health groups, with all the different groups that work on these issues in a very segmented way. And that has to be, I think, a major transfer of the progressive public interest community going forward. We have to broaden the alliances and give ourselves some space and some time to take – to sort of get out of the completely defensive mode on the bazillion issues that are out there, and develop the alliances and the forward strategies to communicate to the public in a much more effective way. Because, you know, here we are in D.C. This is a group of people and a group of organizations that are in constant discussions with each other all the time, but to really make the changes we're talking about, it has to be a discussion going on across the country, and we have to communicate very differently and much more broadly.

MR. PODESTA: Okay. Last question.

Q: Hi. I appreciate the coalition-building along all different lines. And I was wondering, a lot of this seems like it should be also being discussed in terms of human rights and on an international dimension. When you talk about sort of rogue corporate actors that are, you know, refusing to modify their corporate behavior and endangering public health, it strikes me that there should be international protocols and standards and cooperation to address what is and is not acceptable corporate behavior along those lines, particularly because we're not getting an administration that sort of respects this, really, much at any level. So I just was wondering what was being done to build these sort of coalitions and raise this on that dimension.

MS. BEINECKE: Well, I think this is the counterpoint, of course, to working more actively in the states, and it's looking out for where can you make progress. We're engaged in a very broad-based international project right now on mercury where the international – the European Union has taken very strong steps to control mercury. They're part of an international forum that's working really across the world to control mercury much more aggressively than it's proposed to be controlled in this country. And I think, again, it's the strategy of kind of cornering the United States federal government, which – who knows how long it will take to do that, but to – we are an outlier in so many arenas, and to continue to both make progress and show the example that we are demonstrating, I think, is really important, so you're right.

PROFESSOR STEINZOR: It actually is something that we try and talk about at more than just the governmental level. It's increasingly clear that we are all in the same leaky rowboat together. There is a global mercury cycle, and large proportion of the mercury comes from countries that burn coal without any controls or care, because they have nothing else to keep warm with. And, in fact, ironically, that is the major argument

of U.S. industry about doing anything about mercury. They say, why should we do anything until China and Brazil clean up their act.

So to point out that if we don't do something internationally – stop being a rogue nation, and start working to help the developing world, we are all going to sink. I mean, climate change is going to overwhelm our coasts, as well as coasts in Indonesia. If we don't point that out early and often, there will be much less motivation and Americans will think that somehow they live in a glass bubble where nothing crosses our borders through the air or water.

MR. PODESTA: John?

MR. HIATT: I'd just had one other thing, which is that the work that the environmental community and labor have done together in terms of public education and government lobbying around trade agreements, and trying to get labor and environmental worker standards and environmental standards into multilateral and bilateral trade agreements, I think, is a good example of a lot of progress, although very slow, that's been made.

I mean, the Seattle – you know, Seattle was something of a watershed. It wasn't just the anarchists who were demonstrating in Seattle. It was some very mainstream environmental groups and labor groups together, and the effect of that, I believe, both on government and on the public was to put under much more of a public spotlight the whole issue of labor rights, environmental rights as human rights, than had been true before that. We haven't done nearly enough, and there's a huge way to go, but I think that is a good example of where – of the kind of grassroots and public education role that the book recognizes is so necessary, but which can be done.

MR. PODESTA: Well, one announcement, which is – one of our staff people handed me this piece of paper, which is we're actually doing an event in mid-March with Doug Kendall who wrote *Redefining Federalism*. Please hold the book up again, Jim. And it will be either March 14th or 18th. We're working with Doug to try to schedule the dates, so for those of you who want to explore more the ideas that Jim put forward, please come back.

And I want to thank the panel, but I want to particularly thank Rena and Tom and Doug for putting this book together. It really is an important first step, and for putting CPR together. It's really a tremendous network for scholars around the country. I think that we took a few work orders from Jim here today that we'll get our scholars going on, and I think that's a very good thing.

I see Lisa Heinzerling, who's another CPR leader, in the front row, so we've got our work to do. But I want to thank them and please thank – help me in expressing appreciation for Rena and for the panel.

(Applause.)

(END)