

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-APR-2003 16:59:19.00

SUBJECT:: A few reasons to remove the climate title.

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:

1. If you think that the most you can get is half the loaf, then don't give away half the loaf before the bargaining starts.
2. It has been argued that putting in this climate title is the pragmatic thing to do, but as Stan Evans always says, "There is nothing wrong with political pragmatism except that it never works."
3. Regardless whether the current climate title or the Bingaman substitute goes to the floor, the vote that will be rated by the LCV and Sierra Club is the more extreme amendment offered by Kerry, Lieberman, et al. That is, supporting the current climate title will be rated as anti-environmental.
4. The process should not be short circuited. This issue is too big and too important to just throw in some ill-considered rubbish originally put together hurriedly to try to stave off worse in the Daschle bill. It deserves careful drafting, wide consultation, public hearings, committee mark-up, and full floor debate.
5. If conservative members of the committee sign on to this climate title in hopes that the House will demand that it be taken out in conference, then they are exposing House allies to being attacked as anti-environmental for opposing a climate title that even conservative Senators support.
6. It may be that the Bingaman substitute will be added, whether or not the current title is in the chairman's mark. The Bingaman substitute would be preferable to the current climate title because it would allow unified opposition on the floor from conservative members and conservative advocacy groups.
7. The climate title may look modest and therefore innocuous, but it puts the U. S. on a slippery slope to a high-cost, energy constrained future. There are many examples of past legislative carelessness that have proved ghastly mistakes. Let's not do it again without much more thought.