

Reducing oil and gas emissions is the right way to go

You're right, and you're wrong.

You're right: sellers of oil and gas are right to resent the way Governor Baker is cutting emissions. Baker chose the politically easy route in order to comply with emissions laws. He seeks emissions cuts first from electricity because fewer people are directly impacted by the policy. However, rational business practices would also depend on gasoline tax increases, and an emissions tax on heating oil and natural gas to cut heating emissions. Combined with RGGI's efforts cutting electricity emissions, these policies would equitably cut emissions in our biggest emissions sectors. But Baker is avoiding voter backlash over taxes.

You're also wrong. Despite all the complaining from oil and gas associations about unfairness to electricity producers and their suppliers, none of them have publicly acknowledged the harm their products have done to the public. For decades, oil and gas products polluted our air and water, and contributed to sea rise which causes coastal flooding. The best way for them to have their complaints heard is to first acknowledge the harms they've caused, including unintentional harms.

And the complainers just complain about unfair policies but don't publicly push for any effective and equitable emissions reducing policies.

Moreover, many reasonable people -- not deserving the label enviro-zealots -- have patiently written to you about the fairness of carbon taxes.

You've never editorially endorsed national or state carbon taxes, or increased gas taxes or heating taxes. What policies for cutting emissions do you support?

JUDY WEISS
Brookline

[LINK](#)