

Dear Committee,

I strongly oppose SJR28, which is a regurgitation of Senator Golden's SJR 5 (2021) which would amend the Oregon Constitution to create "right" of people to a "clean and healthy environment," including . . . "a stable climate."

Given that Oregon is already subject to a myriad of environmental regulations and protections at the federal state and local levels, SJR 28 is a completely ineffectual bit of virtue signaling. It is also an extremely broad, vague and DANGEROUS proposal. It would place nearly unlimited power in the hands of the state government and could subject Oregon's businesses and industries to unending lawfare from environmental grievance groups. It is a dream for environmental extremists, as it would be a springboard for a myriad of ever more restrictive environmental regulations, which could be implemented without regard to cost or benefit.

It's obvious that the sponsors of this bill (Senator Golden, we're looking at you) think that we somehow have control over the climate, and that we can insure its stability. **THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO PROOF THAT GOVERNMENT CAN PROVIDE A "STABLE CLIMATE."** SJR 28 is a brazen attempt by climate "true believers" to codify their climate change dogma within the Constitution. The climate has never been stable – climate instability existed even before man was present on the earth. Where was Senator Golden during the last Ice Age – when ice sheets of up to 12,000 feet thick spread across the temperate zones of this planet? How on earth can anyone think that a paragraph in the Oregon Constitution will do anything to prevent similar changes in the future?

No reasonable person objects to the idea of being good stewards of the environment; however, SJR 28 seemingly makes government the sole arbiter of what constitutes "stewardship." This places far too much power in the hands of that government. This Resolution could facilitate the burdening of our already struggling businesses and industries with any manner of potentially damaging and unavailing environmental regulations. Thankfully, the designation of the atmosphere (climate) as a public trust asset as provided for in SJR 5 is not included in this Resolution. However, designating "a more stable climate" as a "compelling state interest" is just as dangerous! This will give government total control over carbon emissions – the emissions that are generated by every productive activity on this planet – emissions of an inert, trace gas which is essential to life itself. Very few people understand the danger that this little slice of SJR 28 represents.

The Chief Sponsor of this Resolution - Senator Golden himself – is very devoted to his climate change dogma. He wants "aggressive, effective action on climate," which is frightening, given the "climate action solutions" being proposed by our "leaders" at every level of government. He "believes in science," and won't hesitate to use it to bludgeon skeptics and non-believers. Senator Golden's climate alarmism was questioned several years at one of his town hall meetings. A local critical thinker whose opinions and commentaries I greatly respect asked the Senator to address his intransigence on this issue. In his response, Senator Golden made it clear that his mind is made up – no more time for discussion - the rest of us be damned. With that mindset as the foundation of this Resolution . . . what is the ultimate goal? It certainly has been left to the imagination.

The leverage that SJR 28 will provide climate alarmists is in my opinion the most dangerous aspect of this Resolution. However there is no less danger in the ratcheting up of environmental regulation in general. From what I've seen, nothing is ever enough for the true believers. Oh, hey – what are we doing about the hundreds of thousands of acres that burn in Oregon each year? Is that part of a “clean and healthy environment?” Forest fires seem to be more of an immediate threat to the environment than anything which will be addressed by SJR 28. How about we deal with those types of environmental issues directly (i.e., maintain the forests), and not through environmental virtue signaling?

As I mentioned previously, it is clear that SJR28 is intended to be a launch pad for endless new proposals related to the environment and climate. The climate alarmists and environmental extremists who typically sponsor these proposals are not willing to fully disclose the cost (both monetary and societal) of the radical measures being proposed to achieve their desired ends. Most of their proposals will make energy scarce and expensive, and will facilitate complete government control of energy production, our economy, land, people and resources. We suppose that when you're completely blinded by climate change dogma, and believe that our changing climate is an “existential crisis,” you probably wouldn't consider the effect of your actions on average citizens – most of whom don't share the same devotion to climate alarmism.

I'm imploring you to make sure that SJR 28 does not make it out of Committee.

Keith LaHaie
Central Point