

House Committee on Energy and Environment

RE: Opposition to HB 2468

Do you consider it 'best practices' to push legislation that economically is a failure and internationally admitted to be a ploy? Of course not, but that is exactly what is happening in Oregon for several years with its green energy agenda.

HB 2468 increase the reduction of carbon emissions after 2020 to a level that is fiscally irresponsible to impose the weight of the world on Oregonians. These levels exceed national standards and imposes a heavy burden on those that elected you. We don't need a standard to adopt prudent practices that will reduce emissions, such as reforestation.

The National Hydropower Association and the Heartland Institute, a conservative think tank, argue that if states want to meet their carbon emission goals, all hydropower should count. "If lawmakers want to lower energy costs, encourage innovation, and reduce emissions, they should repeal all mandates and subsidies and create a level playing field for all energy sources," Taylor Smith, a policy analyst at the institute, recently wrote. "Government should not pick winners and losers, especially in the energy arena." If states included all renewable sources in RPS mandates, these groups say, they would essentially create competitive pressure on wind and solar to reduce costs and scale up.

If we learn from others, we must look at how the European Union has fared being far ahead of the U.S. in solar and wind-energy development. If anyone could make it competitive it would be Denmark with its high electricity prices. But, recently the Danish government has abandon their program as too expensive and discovering that "the green energy plans mandated to reduce EU emissions of carbon dioxide will not achieve reductions and in some cases, make matters worse."*

Dr. John Bates, a top NOAA scientist with an impeccable reputation has shown irrefutable evidence that "the world's leading source of climate data rushed to publish a landmark paper that exaggerated global warming and was timed to

influence the historic Paris Agreement on climate change” held in 2015. When he objected, the facts were hidden by NOAA superiors in what he describes as a “blatant attempt to intensify the impact” of what became known as the Pausebuster paper.*1

Tom Karl’s study, issued about the same time just prior to the Obama Administration’s Clean Power Plan submission to the Paris Climate Conference, has also come under scrutiny for failing to disclose critical information to NOAA. The evidence discloses that Karl manipulated the datasets to maximize warming and minimize documentation, and when asked for the datasets, the computer software suffered a complete failure - a tongue-in-check response to cover the lack of documentation.*2

Success is what you look for in ‘best practices’ but you also want to see solid science. So why not give us the scientific facts? Why all this deceit and manipulation of data?

Recently Christiana Figueres, executive secretary of U.N.’s Framework Convention on Climate Change, admitted that “the goal of environmental activists is not to save the world from ecological calamity but to destroy capitalism.”

“This is the first time in the history of mankind that we are setting ourselves the task of intentionally, within a defined period of time, to change the economic development model that has been reigning for at least 150 years, since the Industrial Revolution.”

She even restated that goal ensuring it was not a mistake:

“This is probably the most difficult task we have ever given ourselves, which is to intentionally transform the economic development model for the first time in human history.”

How much of the information being fed to the public is manipulation and how much is science? If we are to have ‘best practices’ that are in the best interest of Oregonians, some consideration should be given to how the science is being distorted and be willing to step back and find the true science.

Physics Professor William Happer discredits the negative effects of CO2 on the planet and that climate change is man-made. He says CO2 would be good for the

earth and that CO2 levels are very seldom as low as they are now, which is causing plants to not grow. In the past CO2 levels have been four times as high and plants flourished all over the earth. He can prove that CO2 isn't a 'warmer' and models have been adjusted to suppress that fact. Further, CO2 is not a pollutant, and because we are erroneously paying attention to CO2, we are ignoring real man-made air pollutants that can be controlled. *3

Oregon can't afford to waste dollars and be the butt end of the U.N. scam. Legislators have the responsibility to employ best practices. You owe the citizens of Oregon to halt the carbon agenda and research the truth. We know that the carbon standards passed last session were without proper research. We know that those standards will not reduce carbon and cannot be called 'best practices' in the best interest of Oregonians.

The cap-and-trade credits being discussed is a furthering of the scam on Oregonians. The establishment of that study was biased in its directive as it was not directed to find the truth, but only to further the scam.

If you love Oregon, push for 'best practices' and study what are the pollutants that have warming components and make Oregon flourish by halting the suppression on Oregon's economy and vote NO on HB 2468.

Donna Bleiler
Oregon

*http://www.oregonlive.com/opinion/index.ssf/2016/08/facts_are_stubborn_things_opin.html#incart_2box_opinion

*1 <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-4192182/World-leaders-duped-manipulated-global-warming-data.html>

*2 <https://judithcurry.com/2017/02/04/climate-scientists-versus-climate-data/>

*3 http://www.thenewamerican.com/tech/environment/item/24900-alex-newman-william-happer-princeton-professor-discredits-anthropogenic-climate-change-theory?utm_source=iContactPro&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=JBS+E-Newsletter&utm_content=JBS+Weekly+Enewsletter+192017