

Submitter: Kelly Mackin
On Behalf Of:
Committee: Senate Committee On Education
Measure: SB854

As a science journalism student in New York in the early 1990's, I was assigned to investigate climate change as a news item. I interviewed NASA scientists leading the "climate change" investigation at NASA, where the "climate change" hypothesis was first developed. They made more than a dozen predictions, which I dutifully recorded. The most stunning one at the time was coastline inundation, where they predicted that much of Southern Louisiana would be under water by 2020. Southern Louisiana is still there. But the religion of climate change with its messianic qualities lives on, although scientific clarity trails behind it way into the distance.

Here are some uncomfortable and actual facts for the Committee to consider:

One million years ago, CO₂ was at 2,000 parts per million. At 800,000 years ago, it had dropped below the current level. The Earth one million years ago did not burn up.

Greenhouse growers pump CO₂ into their grow-houses to raise the level of CO₂ to between 1400 and 1800 parts per million, because that is the goldilocks level that assures the most healthy plant growth and which also releases more oxygen. At 405ppm currently, CO₂ is 2/3 below the optimum range for a verdant Earth. Cutting CO₂ scientifically strangles the ecosystems of the Earth.

CO₂ is not a poison but the key precursor gas for all life on Earth. That CO₂ is converted by photosynthesis into oxygen, which feeds all animal life.

You might be thinking that all the scientific "models" have "proven" that "climate change" is a problem. Sadly, the information you have received is incorrect. Did your briefers inform you that none of these "climate models" including solar particle emissions into their calculations? This failure to include solar particle emission is material to any validity, since the Sun provides almost all of the energy that drives climate on the Earth. The models are bogus as a result.

I oppose this bill for two reasons. One, it is not the place of government to promote a scientific hypothesis, unproven, and laughably insufficient to be proven and less provable as time goes on. The students would be better off being taught how to attempt to show the falsity of the cherry-picked and misleading data used to gin billions from the public purse and disrupt the lives of every Oregonian, impoverishing them, as energy cost and efficiency is THE key factor in any economy.

The second reason I oppose the bill is that promoting "climate change" pushes

unscience on the students, causing them to make false choices, and lead more difficult lives. We live in a small r republican system that requires civilized debate and evaluation of evidence. But that open and serious debate on the veracity of "climate change" has never been had, and therefore the Senate is in no position to set any policy around it.

With Respect