

February 01,

Senate Committee on Environmental & Natural Resources

Dear Senator Dembrow, Chair, Senator Olsen, Senator Roblan, Senator Prozanski and Senator Findley.

I am opposed to Senate Bill 1530. Climate change can no longer be approached as an environmental problem demanding technical solutions. Climate change is not like lead in gasoline or asbestos in construction or, undesirable physical substances such as methane in the atmosphere to be eliminated or regulated. Climate change will not be 'solved' by science or technology - although science will continue to yield new insights about our changing climates, and technology will continue to offer us new ways of living within them. Neither will climate change be 'solved' by politics or economics.

Calling carbon dioxide "carbon," or worse "carbon pollution," reinforces the incessant propaganda which portrays carbon dioxide as being a pollutant. Perhaps this particular way of framing climate change has led us down the wrong road. By constructing climate change as the mother of all problems—the greatest, defining, most serious long-term problem, it conditions people to think of it as something dirty and thus important to restrict; that it is indeed the culprit, a poison, something toxic, and the cause of a myriad number of phenomenon such as unsustainable energy, endemic poverty, weather hazards, food insecurity, hyper-consumption, tropical deforestation, biodiversity loss—woven all together using the narrative of climate change.

Nevertheless, it is the narrative that has been widely accepted, even among many sceptics. A tendency easy to understand with the prevalence of public and policy discourse heavily influenced by the way it is represented in the media, by campaigning organisations, by advertisers, by green energy vendors and other vested interests. Particularly in this day and age this legislative body should, if anyone does, understand that the media do not, in fact, act as neutral conveyors of information. The predominant media's messages about climate change have no starting point and no ending point. Their repertoire uses an inflated language, using terms such as "catastrophe", "chaos" and

“havoc” and its tone is usually urgent. Alarmism runs rampant. No wonder people are confused about the climate.

Closer to home, take for example, the claims of “ocean acidification.” This is pure alarmism. The ocean is not acidic. Nor will it ever become acidic. It is alkaline (basic). At best, one can say it is becoming less alkaline. When CO² dissolves in the ocean it slightly neutralizes it. How much? Well, by 2100—if you believe the models—it is supposed to move the pH from around 8 all the way down to 7.9. In other words, a slight neutralization. So why is that referred to as ocean acidification instead of ocean neutralization? Because acidification sounds scarier. Using acidification rather than neutralization helps convince people that impossible things are happening.

Someday, politicians, journalists, bureaucrats, educators, and ordinary citizens will notice that the predictions of doom and gloom about the climate are flexible and that it is nonsense to say the science is settled and that the only way to protect the planet and survive is to hand over millions of dollars to the state of Oregon so it can pretend to control temperatures, sea levels, and storm activity—*forever*.

Senate Bill 1530 should be stopped in its tracks. There are many more pressing problems for the citizens of Oregon than an unproven hypothesis and there are no valid reasons for spending even one dollar on it.

Lastly and most significantly, this legislation should not be brought up in the so-called legislative “short session”. That is not what the short session was passed for in 2010. Reminder; passing a comprehensive carbon tax bill *alleged* to affect the entire planet is not “tweaking the budget”.

Respectfully,



Richard Wisner

Lincoln County, Oregon