



January 27, 2010

## Testimony for Senate Hearing on SB 450

*This morning I testified before the State Senate Committee on Clean Energy regarding the Governor's global warming bill (SB 450). Below is a copy of my testimony:*

Good Morning Chairmen Miller and Plale and committee members. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify at today's hearing on the Clean Energy Jobs Act.

In the political world it's common to hide the true intent of legislation by calling a bill something that it really isn't. I would submit that SB 450, and its companion AB 649, is one such bill.

In 2007 Governor Doyle formed his Global Warming Task Force. It was not called the Clean Energy Jobs Task Force. In his mission statement he told the Task Force to come up with strategies to make Wisconsin a leader in the implementation of global warming solutions, because he apparently believes the Earth is overheating.

The Governor's concern over the warming was so great that he also told the Task Force to not bother doing a cost/benefit analysis and to accept what the Task Force Report calls the "substantial scientific consensus" that "climate change is occurring" and human use of fossil fuels is "major contributor to such change."

So how do you get the Clean Energy Jobs Bill out of the Global Warming Task Force Report? Why didn't the authors of this bill call it the global warming bill and why didn't the Governor mention the terms "global warming" or "climate change" even once in his State of the State address last night when talking about this bill?

Could it be the flawed science that's been reported lately, like the recent scandal involving the leaked e-mails from the Climate Research Unit in England, and the questions that have been raised in the last week regarding the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration eliminating colder weather stations from their global average temperatures?

If the man-made global warming proponents are so sure of themselves, then why do they feel a need to manipulate data to help make their point? Doesn't this raise a red flag? Maybe Wisconsin shouldn't be embarking on a major policy initiative like this bill, when its very basis appears to be seriously flawed.

The recent weather patterns alone should bring pause to anyone who thinks Wisconsin should move forward with the global warming bill. In the beginning of December almost a quarter of Wisconsin's corn crop was still in the field. That was because our summer was so cool the corn was late in maturing. A report just issued this morning shows that Wisconsin's apple harvest was down 31% this year and the cranberry harvest down 13%, also because of our unusually cool summer.

And reports of unusually cold-not warm-weather have been coming in from around the world. Earlier this month the citrus crop was damaged in Florida by a severe freeze. Reports from England tell of a shortage of natural gas supplies because of extreme cold and the ice off China's northeast coast is now the thickest and most extensive in the last 40 years. Ladies and gentlemen, if this is an overheating planet, I wouldn't want to experience a cooling one!

In fact, global temperatures have not risen in more than a decade and more recently they have shown a downward trend.

So a reasonable question is: How much colder would you like it to be? Remember, that's the purpose of fighting global warming-to make it colder.

But if the Governor and the authors of this bill want to talk about jobs-then let's do that. Yes, there may be some "green" jobs created, but many of these will be in the public sector, as in Department of Natural Resource positions to enforce the mandates of this bill. Last year, for the first time, government jobs now exceed manufacturing jobs in Wisconsin. If this bill becomes law, the spread between private sector manufacturing jobs and taxpayer supported government jobs will widen.

In reality, I believe the net loss of jobs in the private sector will be severe. That's what happens when you mandate dramatically higher energy prices for consumers and manufacturers, and that's exactly what this bill will produce. This bill will make it much more expensive to manufacture products in Wisconsin. Isn't that why manufacturers eliminate jobs or move to other areas-because they must make a profit to stay in business?

The public should also be aware of the intrusive regulations that this bill will mandate, on virtually every facet of our lives. How will mandating California emission standards in Wisconsin produce jobs for our citizens?

And what's the real purpose of this bill? To try to make it colder. And even that attempt will fail, since even if our state could reduce our output of greenhouse gases to zero, there would be no measurable effect on background levels of these gases, and therefore no effect on the climate.

**If you want to produce more jobs, repeal the nuclear power moratorium, make our state's tax structure more business friendly, and develop a sensible energy policy that will carry us into the future.**

This bill fails to do that by a long shot, and I urge committee members to vote against it.

Thank you.

Access all my reports online, at: <http://www.legis.state.wi.us/assembly/asm23/news/media.htm>.

---

*If you wish to remove yourself from the mailing list, please respond back to this email with the subject line "REMOVE".*

---

State Capitol • Room 317 North • Post Office Box 8953 • Madison, WI 53708  
(608) 266-0486 • District: (262) 240-0808 • Toll Free: (888) 534-0023  
Rep.Ottj@legis.wi.gov