

I strongly favor the passage of HB 2020. I would like to counter two arguments put forward by opponents of this bill.

1) "Dealing with the climate crisis will be costly and will disrupt the economy". The Joint Committee must come to a decision: either the climate crisis is an existential threat to human civilization and to life as we have known it or it is the most extensive hoax ever foisted on us. There is no middle ground. If your recommendations agree with the first assessment, then the next question is: shall the legislature pass the buck on this issue or tackle it? If the latter then the conclusion is that this and subsequent generations are going to have to scale down, going to have to extensively change lifestyles, going to have to make sacrifices. All of us. In her op-ed in the Thursday, 2/21/19 Register Guard, Marie Bowers says "We are working to ensure that our farm continues to be viable and sustainable for the next 100 years". Unless the State of Oregon, and every other jurisdiction of planet Earth, makes immediate and extensive changes in energy and food production, human civilization will not be viable for 100 years. I'm not just referring to extreme weather. Resource shortages, mass immigrations and wars are already noticeable. Dealing with this crisis will be inconvenient for us all. Sure, legislation should try as hard as possible to make the plan as just and equitable as possible, it has to do the job or the suffering and cost will be severe and essentially irremediable.

2) "Making Oregon a leader in GHG limitation will not affect the global emission problem appreciably". If nothing happens, nothing happens. If an aware and environmentally educated state such as Oregon cannot do its part to deal with the climate crisis, then there can be no expectation that other states more controlled by the fossil fuel industry will agree to do their part. Etc, etc., etc. Parsing out "our" part of the problem vs. "others" parts, complaining that the U.S. shouldn't do anything until China or India or even some extremely poor but climate affected nation does their part is not only short sighted but un-American. Its as if, during the cold war nuclear build-up, each state, county, city assessed how much their own space would be affected by a nuclear exchange and then said, "We won't be affected as much as some other place, so we won't pay for dealing with nuclear war scenarios". We are all in this together. As Benjamin Franklin said, "we must all hang together or we will surely all hang separately".

Thank you for your consideration.

Jere C. Rosemeyer
1380 Hughes St.
Eugene, OR 97402