

2ARMS 523

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR:Myron Ebell <mebell@cei.org> (Myron Ebell <mebell@cei.org> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-APR-2003 10:30:43.00

SUBJECT:: FW: Please consider signing joint letter to Domenici on climate title in e

TO:Myron Ebell <mebell@cei.org> (Myron Ebell <mebell@cei.org> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

BCC:Debbie S. Fiddelke (CN=Debbie S. Fiddelke/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
For your information:

> Dear Cooler Heads Coalition members and allies,
> Please consider signing this joint letter to Chairman Domenici on the problems in the climate title in his committee staff's draft energy bill. I hope to send it early next week, so please let me know as soon as possible. The simple message is, if this climate title is enacted, then we don't need the rest of the bill because America will be going on a forced energy diet. We are also in the middle of arranging meetings with staffers for members of the committee. If you are interested in participating in any of these meetings, please let me know and I'll send you the schedule. At this point, Chairman Domenici has not claimed ownership of his staff's draft, so we have an opportunity to get it fixed before it becomes the Chairman's mark. Committee mark-up of the climate title has already been delayed to after the long Easter recess. If you have any question, please ring me at (202) 331-2256 direct or e-mail me.

> Thanks,
> Myron Ebell.

> ___YES, Sign us up! [for 501 (c)(3) and (c)(4) organizations only]

> Organization_____

> Signature_____Telephone_____

> Print Name_____

> Title_____

> E-mail_____

> Please return to Myron Ebell: e-mail mebell@cei.org; fax (202) 331-0640; telephone (202) 331-2256.

> DRAFT Joint Letter on Senate Climate Title
> To Senator Pete Domenici, Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

> [Date]

> Dear Chairman Domenici:

> The undersigned organizations write to share our views on the climate title in the draft comprehensive energy legislation prepared by your committee> '> s staff. The draft bill in our view is better in

almost every respect than Senator Daschle's bill passed by the Senate last year. Unlike that misguided legislation, your committee's draft contains provisions to allow greater access to domestic energy resources and to create the conditions necessary for private enterprise to rebuild and enlarge America's inadequate energy infrastructure. Nearly as importantly, the draft does not contain the chief provisions in the Daschle bill that would limit energy supplies and raise prices; most especially, it does not contain a Renewable Portfolio Standard for electricity production.

>

> Because we share your commitment to policies that will promote continuing abundant supplies of affordable energy to American consumers and producers, we were surprised to find that your committee's draft contains a climate change title. We believe that this title is ill considered and, if enacted in anything like its present form, its effects will in the long run overwhelm the many positive elements in the bill. It would in our view create the institutional and legal framework and the political incentives necessary eventually to force Kyoto-style energy rationing on the American people.

>

> Even more disturbingly to us, it would set us on this path without engaging in a full national debate over its enormous consequences. Instead, including this climate title in comprehensive energy legislation seems to assume that the debate is over, even though that debate has never occurred. It seems to us that before we settle on the main provisions of this climate title, we would first have to agree that global warming alarmism is scientifically warranted, that there are benefits as well as costs to these policies, and that it is inevitable we are soon going to be living in a carbon-constrained world. We question each of these assumptions.

>

> We specifically call your attention to three main provisions in the climate title-1) requiring a national strategy to stabilize and over time reduce net U. S. emissions of greenhouse gases plus annual reports; 2) reviving the Clinton-Gore Administration's White House climate czar and bureaucracy; and 3) setting up a program to award credits for early actions to reduce emissions.

>

> 1) Directing the executive to produce a national strategy concedes the global warming debate and puts the U. S. on a dead-end path to future energy rationing. As the discredited National Assessment demonstrates, annual reports will be used to promote alarmism and attack government for not doing enough. And if the strategy's objectives were actually implemented, the costs would be colossal and the benefits nil.

> 2) Legislating a White House climate czar and office will institutionalize global warming as a problem, which it means that it will never go away, even after global warming alarmism has been discredited. Single mission agencies usually are captured by their clients, become lobbyists for their issue, and cannot objectively evaluate the costs of their policies.

> 3) Awarding credits for early actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions will create a powerful big business cartel to lobby for mandatory caps on emissions. This is because early action credits will not have value until an emissions cap forces energy users to buy credits.

>

> We would like to be able to tell you that we are going to be devoting our time and resources in the months ahead to educating the public on the many positive elements in your comprehensive energy legislation. Unfortunately, however, if the bill contains a climate title with these

three provisions from the draft, then we fear that our time and resources will instead be diverted to exposing the shortcomings of that objectionable concoction. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

>
> Sincerely,
>
> [Name]
> [Organization]
>