

Dear Mr. Huggins:

Thank you for your recent correspondence regarding climate change. As a father of four and a grandfather of 12, I am extremely concerned about the issue of global warming. What concerns me the most is that imposing certain measures to limit greenhouse gas emissions would lower the quality of life and economic well-being for future generations.

There have been many bills introduced in the Senate this year that would set a cap on the amount of greenhouse gases that can be emitted in the United States. Those who champion these bills fail to realize the dire economic consequences from imposing such a program. We are living in a time where energy demand is constantly growing while supply remains flat, and as a consequence, prices are rising rapidly. If these bills were to be adopted, conservative estimates indicate that electricity prices alone would rise between 35 and 65 percent, and 1.2 to 2.3 million jobs would be lost by 2015.

Another problem associated with imposing such climate legislation on the American people, in addition to higher prices and lost jobs, is that it would do nothing to reduce global concentrations of greenhouse gases. China has already passed the United States as the leading GHG emitter and continues to build a new coal plant every three days. India is not far behind them. Without equivalent efforts to limit these gases among China and India, the United States stands to lose many hundreds of thousands of jobs to these countries, which will profit from unilateral action by the United States. In short, unilateral action would result in increased emissions globally, not decreased, because efficient manufacturing in our country would be exported to less efficient countries, thus increasing carbon emissions.

Even if global warming was a result of anthropogenic (man-made) gases, which has been challenged by many international scientists, recent attempts to curb greenhouse gases would fail miserably to accomplish anything. Studies have found that if the Kyoto treaty had been fully implemented the amount of averted global warming by the year 2050 would be 0.07 C.

My job as a United States Senator from Oklahoma is to represent the interests of American workers and families, and most importantly those workers and families of Oklahoma. Aside from losing American jobs to other countries, American families would suffer under a cap-and-trade system. An economist from the respected Charles Rivers Associates International recently stated that welfare losses alone would be \$4 trillion to \$6 trillion dollars over the next few decades under a cap-and-trade system. From rising electricity prices, to decreased purchasing power, and a loss of millions of jobs, the average American cannot withstand the burden of such a program.

While the science of climate change is unsettled, the economics of enacting climate legislation is not. I can state with certainty that the economic consequences stemming from such a law would be devastating to the American people. I want only the best for the jobs and families in Oklahoma and in all of America. Passing legislation purely for

symbolism will hinder that effort. I will not sacrifice our way of life for a climate plan that neither can, nor is designed to, work.

Thank you again for taking the time to write to me, and I hope you find this information useful in your evaluation of the climate change debate. If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me again.