

Perhach, William

From: Cooney, Phil
Sent: Thursday, July 08, 2004 7:47 PM
To: Fiddelke, Debbie S.
Subject: Re: Myron's email

Looking forward to talking to you... Thanks. Phil

-----Original Message-----

From: Fiddelke, Debbie S. <Debbie_S._Fiddelke@who.eop.gov>
To: Pearce, Heather S. <Heather_S._Pearce@ceq.eop.gov>; Hannegan, Bryan J. <Bryan_J._Hannegan@ceq.eop.gov>; Cooney, Phil <Phil_Cooney@ceq.eop.gov>
Sent: Thu Jul 08 19:10:25 2004
Subject: FW: Myron's email

fyi

-----Original Message-----

From: Eidshaug, Ronald [mailto:REidshau@USChamber.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 08, 2004 3:17 PM
To: 'Mormino, Brian (EPW)'; Eidshaug, Ronald; Shanahan, John (EPW); Fiddelke, Debbie S.
Subject: RE: Myron's email

I think that most of the offices were satisfied with my call. Most of the people I spoke with were annoyed only with Myron, the impolitic nature of his email, and all the factual inaccuracies in it.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mormino, Brian (EPW) [mailto:Brian_Mormino@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 08, 2004 3:09 PM
To: Eidshaug, Ronald; Shanahan, John (EPW); Debbie S. Fiddelke (E-mail)
Subject: RE: Myron's email

Very smart and helpful. Thank you for doing that.

Do these offices need anything else or do you think their possible concerns were satisfied with your call?

-----Original Message-----

From: Eidshaug, Ronald [mailto:REidshau@USChamber.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 08, 2004 3:06 PM
To: Shanahan, John (EPW); Mormino, Brian (EPW); Debbie S. Fiddelke (E-mail)
Subject: Myron's email

FYI: I have called almost every office included in Myron's email from last night to let them know that:

- 1) The Chamber had nothing to do with the email, and
- 2) Myron has not been a part of the coalition that has been working on this issue.

Most offices appreciated the call.

-----Original Message-----

From: Myron Ebell [mailto:mebell@cei.org]

Sent: Wednesday, July 07, 2004 4:32 PM

To: Myron Ebell

Subject: Action Alert: McLieberman bill edges closer to Senate vote

Senator John McCain and Joe Lieberman want to get another floor vote this month on some version of S. 139, the so-called Climate Stewardship Act. It may happen this week or later in the month or after the August recess or not in this Congress. We have all been working against it for months, but I think it's now time to increase our efforts. A story in Environment and Energy Daily this morning quoted Senator McCain: "McCain maintains he has more support now than he did in the last vote, but is still not yet at 51. 'It's an old strategy of mine: Force votes on the issue. Ultimately, we will win.'" It is not clear at all that he will get more votes than the 43 Senators who voted in favor last October 30th. But we need to work to make sure. On the other side, the environmentalists are working this vote very hard and spending lots of money that our side doesn't have. They are trying to flood offices with phone calls.

I encourage you to:

- (1) urge Senators to vote No on any version of S. 139 that is offered. A target list appears below, but even Senators who voted against S. 139 last year need support and encouragement.
- (2) send out action alerts to grassroots members. Ask them to call or fax their Senators. Again, even Senators who voted No need support and encouragement. Some talking points are attached below.
- (3) publish op-eds, do radio interviews, and send out press releases.
- (4) call or meet with Senatorial staff for wavering Senators. There is a target list below.

Target List

Senate Switchboard: (202) 224-3121 or (202) 225-3121

Robert Byrd, D-WV. Fax: 228-0002. Voted No last time. Do not talk to his staffer Franz Wuerfmannsdobler, who is a Green, but direct calls and faxes to Byrd's AA, Barbara Videnieks, or LD, Jane Mellow. It's incredible that Byrd might switch, but he hates Bush, is increasingly frail, and the staffer in charge is a true believer. Apparently, the WV economy no longer needs coal. Also, Jay Rockefeller voted Yes.

Mike DeWine, R-OH. Fax: 224-6519. Voted No. Sometimes a little wobbly, he has reportedly given no assurances this time.

Richard Lugar, R-IN. Fax 228-0360. Voted Yes. Our leading internationalist wants to send even more manufacturing jobs in Indiana overseas so that important diplomats at UN receptions will be nice to him.

Evan Bayh, D-IN. Fax: 228-1377. Voted Yes because Lugar voted Yes (he really said this in explaining his vote to a reporter) . As Governor, Bayh helped a once economically buoyant State become a laggard, so why wouldn't he want Indiana to keep declining.

Mary Landrieu, D-LA. Fax: 224-9735. Voted No last time. Landrieu would like to do something on global warming, but knows this bill will destroy jobs in Louisiana, so she will probably vote No again. But she needs encouragement.

Ben Nelson, D-NE. Fax: 228-2183. Missed vote last time. Nelson has announced that he will vote No, but he needs support.

Peter Fitzgerald, R-IL. Fax: 228-1372. Voted No last time. Fitzgerald leans Green and is retiring, which always encourages irresponsibility. So he needs shoring up.

Judd Gregg, R-NH. Fax: 224-4952. Voted Yes. I don't think we can turn his vote around this time, but he's a possible long-term project.

Tim Johnson, D-SD. Fax: 228-5765. Voted Yes. We can't change his vote, but it's fun to see him squirm back home. While you're at it, there's also Tom Daschle, D-SD. Fax: 224-6603.

Others who voted No last time, but need encouragement and support:

Blanche Lincoln, D-AR. Fax: 228-1371.

David Pryor, D-AR. Fax: 228-0908.

Gordon Smith, R-OR. Fax: 228-3997. Oregon is a Green State.

Norm Coleman, R-MN. Fax: 224-1152. Ditto Minnesota.

Lamar Alexander, R-TN. Fax: 228-3398. He supports the Jeffords multi-emissions bill, which is as bad as or worse than S. 139.

Arlen Specter, R-PA. He likes to surprise us, although seldom in the right way.

Max Baucus, D-MT. Fax: 228-3687.

Byron Dorgan, D-ND. Fax: 224-1193.

Kent Conrad, D-ND. Fax: 224-7776.

Jeff Bingaman, D-NM. Fax: 224-2852.

Talking Points

1. S. 139 is energy rationing. It will set a permanent cap on greenhouse gas emissions, and around 85% of our energy comes from fuels that produce carbon dioxide, the main greenhouse gas. It would require lowering emissions to 2000 levels by 2010 and to 1990 levels by 2016. The amendment defeated on the Senate floor last October 30th only included phase one, but Senators McCain and Lieberman have said that once it was enacted into law, they would be back for the next round.
2. Honesty in advertising would require that S. 139 be titled the "High-Paying Jobs Outsourcing Act." It would do nothing to address the potential problem of global warming, but it would force energy-intensive industries to move jobs to countries that don't have energy rationing. Industrial and manufacturing jobs are high-paying jobs.
3. If you like high gas prices, you should love S. 139. It will raise gasoline and electricity prices for consumers. For economic impact estimates, please consult studies by DOE's Energy Information Administration and the Charles River Associates study done for the American Council on Capital Formation. Here are the web links: EIA's analysis of S. 139 is at http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/s139_analysis.html and their analysis of phase one only is at http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/analysispaper/sacs/pdf/s139amend_analysis.pdf; the Charles River Associates study may be found at www.accf.org or at www.UnitedForJobs2004.org. Senators who are complaining about high gas prices should not support raising gas prices.
4. Senators Lieberman and McCain have lowered the cost estimates by offering only the first phase of greenhouse gas reductions. But there is no point in starting down the path of energy rationing in the name of solving the global warming problem unless you are prepared to take the succeeding necessary steps. The first step is by far the cheapest because everyone will be trying to find the least painful ways to cut CO2 emissions. Each succeeding step will be more costly. It's like peddling an expensive new product by only mentioning the \$19.95 down payment. There's sixty more payments after that and each one is higher than the last.
5. S. 139 is only one small first step, but it creates the institutional infrastructure and incentives necessary to make sure that more steps toward energy poverty will be taken. When did the Congress ever abolish a program? And S. 139 would create a small but powerful new class of dependents who can profit from not producing energy, who would then lobby for further cuts in emissions. S. 139 directs the Commerce Department every two years to assess the adequacy of the target to the goal of stabilizing greenhouse gas concentrations at safe levels.
6. S. 139 may just be one small step, but it is a colossal waste of time and money and effort to start moving in the wrong direction. The Kyoto approach of addressing global warming through incremental cuts in emissions is a dead end. It cannot possibly work. Even if you believe in global warming alarmism, you should be against S. 139 and its big brother, the Kyoto Protocol. The EU has ratified, but according to the EU Commission, 13 of 15 EU members are not on course to meet their Kyoto targets. Japan will also miss its target. There is a big difference between those countries and the U. S. The Kyoto Protocol does not include any enforcement mechanism. There are no penalties for missing the targets. Japan and the EU do not have citizen lawsuit provisions to allow private individuals to compel the government to enforce the law. So Kyoto is just a game in those countries. If S. 139 is enacted, it does include severe penalties and citizen lawsuits could compel enforcement.

7. There is no short-term technological alternative to using less energy. The U. S. economy derives approximately 85% of its total energy from burning coal, oil, and natural gas. The main non-CO2-emitting alternatives are nuclear and hydro power, but both are politically incorrect as well. There are several niche technologies, such as wind power, but they are expensive and have so many disadvantages that they cannot possibly replace in the near term more than a tiny fraction of the hydrocarbon energy we currently depend on.

8. Politics involves a certain amount of grandstanding and symbolism. But S. 139 is grandstanding of the worst sort because it involves enormous costs that will have to be paid by people through higher energy prices and lost jobs. The people who are pushing S. 139 are by and large not the people who will have to pay the costs. Energy is so tied up with everything we do and everything we produce that it is impossible to put a cap on energy use without slowing economic growth. This is even more true in a country like the U. S. that is still growing rapidly in population.

<<http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d108:SP2028:>> S.Amdt. 2028 to
<<http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d108:SN139:>> S. 139 (Climate Stewardship Act of 2003)
Vote Date: October 30, 2003

Grouped by Home State - Yea votes are bolded

Alabama:

Sessions (R-AL), Nay

Shelby (R-AL), Nay

Alaska:

Murkowski (R-AK), Nay

Stevens (R-AK), Nay

Arizona:

Kyl (R-AZ), Nay

McCain (R-AZ), Yea

Arkansas:

Lincoln (D-AR), Nay

Pryor (D-AR), Nay

California:

Boxer (D-CA), Yea

Feinstein (D-CA), Yea

Colorado:

Allard (R-CO), Nay

Campbell (R-CO), Nay

Connecticut:

Dodd (D-CT), Yea

Lieberman (D-CT), Yea

Delaware:

Biden (D-DE), Yea

Carper (D-DE), Yea

Florida:

Graham (D-FL), Yea

Nelson (D-FL), Yea

Georgia:

Chambliss (R-GA), Nay

Miller (D-GA), Nay

Hawaii:

Akaka (D-HI), Yea

Inouye (D-HI), Yea

Idaho:

Craig (R-ID), Nay

Crapo (R-ID), Nay

Illinois:

Durbin (D-IL), Yea

Fitzgerald (R-IL), Nay

Indiana:

Bayh (D-IN), Yea

Lugar (R-IN), Yea

Iowa:

Grassley (R-IA), Nay

Harkin (D-IA), Yea

Kansas:

Brownback (R-KS), Nay

Roberts (R-KS), Nay

Kentucky:

Bunning (R-KY), Nay

McConnell (R-KY), Nay

Louisiana:

Breaux (D-LA), Nay

Landrieu (D-LA), Nay

Maine:

Collins (R-ME), Yea

Snowe (R-ME), Yea

Maryland:

Mikulski (D-MD), Yea

Sarbanes (D-MD), Yea

Massachusetts:

Kennedy (D-MA), Yea

Kerry (D-MA), Yea

Michigan:

Levin (D-MI), Nay

Stabenow (D-MI), Yea

Minnesota:

Coleman (R-MN), Nay

Dayton (D-MN), Yea

Mississippi:

Cochran (R-MS), Nay

Lott (R-MS), Nay

Missouri:

Bond (R-MO), Nay

Talent (R-MO), Nay

Montana:

Baucus (D-MT), Nay

Burns (R-MT), Nay

Nebraska:

Hagel (R-NE), Nay

Nelson (D-NE), Not Voting

Nevada:

Ensign (R-NV), Nay

Reid (D-NV), Yea

New Hampshire:

Gregg (R-NH), Yea

Sununu (R-NH), Nay

New Jersey:

Corzine (D-NJ), Yea

Lautenberg (D-NJ), Yea

New Mexico:

Bingaman (D-NM), Yea

Domenici (R-NM), Nay

New York:

Clinton (D-NY), Yea

Schumer (D-NY), Yea

North Carolina:

Dole (R-NC), Nay

Edwards (D-NC), Not Voting

North Dakota:

Conrad (D-ND), Nay

Dorgan (D-ND), Nay

Ohio:

DeWine (R-OH), Nay

Voinovich (R-OH), Nay

Oklahoma:

Inhofe (R-OK), Nay

Nickles (R-OK), Nay

Oregon:

Smith (R-OR), Nay

Wyden (D-OR), Yea

Pennsylvania:

Santorum (R-PA), Nay

Specter (R-PA), Nay

Rhode Island:

Chafee (R-RI), Yea

Reed (D-RI), Yea

South Carolina:

Graham (R-SC), Nay

Hollings (D-SC), Yea

South Dakota:

Daschle (D-SD), Yea

Johnson (D-SD), Yea

Tennessee:

Alexander (R-TN), Nay

Frist (R-TN), Nay

Texas:

Cornyn (R-TX), Nay

Hutchison (R-TX), Nay

Utah:

Bennett (R-UT), Nay

Hatch (R-UT), Nay

Vermont:

Jeffords (I-VT), Yea

Leahy (D-VT), Yea

Virginia:

Allen (R-VA), Nay

Warner (R-VA), Nay

Washington:

Cantwell (D-WA), Yea

Murray (D-WA), Yea

West Virginia:

Byrd (D-WV), Nay

Rockefeller (D-WV), Yea

Wisconsin:

Feingold (D-WI), Yea

Kohl (D-WI), Yea

Wyoming:

Enzi (R-WY), Nay

Thomas (R-WY), Nay

Myron Ebell

Director, Global Warming and International Environmental Policy

Competitive Enterprise Institute

1001 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., Suite 1250

Washington, D. C., 20036, U. S. A.

Telephone: (202) 331-2256 direct

Mobile telephone: (202) 320-6685

CEI telephone: (202) 331-1010

E-mail: mebell@cei.org Web site: www.cei.org <<http://www.cei.org/>>

CEI 1984-2004: Celebrating Twenty Years of Advancing Free Enterprise and Limited Government