

I am against CLCSA.

I do not speak as a climate expert, only from what I've learned reading *Apocalypse Never, How Environmental Alarmism Harms Us All* by Michael Shellenberger and *The Moral Case for Fossil Fuels* by Alex Epstein. Mr. Epstein recently wrote *Fossil Future* which I have not read yet.

There have been Malthusian-like predictions of overpopulation and environmental disasters for centuries, yet the ingenuity of business to solve a problem seemingly always comes through.

It is not wise to follow Germany's example, now very dependent on Russian oil and gas, because they've reduced nuclear power generation. This is not a reason to use solar and wind, it is a warning to use what we already know and rely on: nuclear, oil and gas.

Last autumn, people around the North Sea paid more than triple to heat their homes because the weather was cloudier and less windy than normal.

The prospect of brownouts in California should focus everyone on the unreliability of green energy.

Epstein made the point that hundreds of millions no longer live in extreme poverty because of cheap and reliable fossil fuel.

Shellenberger proves that nuclear power is the densest (most efficient) source, takes up the least amount of land and resources.

Inflicting green energy, including electric cars on a country not ready for it will hurt industry and residents alike, as in fewer and less prosperous.

Do we really want to lose another Congressional seat, as CA did? Do we really want to accelerate the exodus of companies large and small from NY? Do we really want our most talented and energetic entrepreneurs to leave?

I believe CLCSA also distracts from far more serious issues.