

February 5, 2020

Chairman Dembrow and members of the Committee;

I am strongly opposed to Senate Bill 1554, "Relating to oceans."

The claim, "ocean acidification," is mentioned in the preamble to Senate Bill 1554 fourteen times. This is unadulterated rhetoric. The ocean is not acidic. Nor will it ever become acidic. The ocean is alkaline (base); 7.0 is neutral; above 7.0 is base; below 7.0 is acid. At best, one could say it is becoming less base. When CO² dissolves in sea water it slightly neutralizes it. How much? Well, by 2100 (if one believes the models) it is predicted to move the pH from around 8.0 all the way down to 7.9 – in other words, a slight neutralization.

For this reason alone I am against this legislation.

Then why do the sponsors of this bill refer to ocean acidification instead of ocean neutralization? Because *acidification* sounds scarier. By framing the issue this way, it conditions people to think of carbon dioxide - the alleged cause of this "acidification" 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 other phenomenon such as tropical deforestation, biodiversity loss and, of course ocean "acidification" all woven together under the narrative of climate change. Using acidification helps convince people that impossible things are happening.

This is a narrative that has been widely accepted, even among skeptics. A tendency easy to understand with the prevalence of public and policy discourse heavily influenced by the way it is represented, particularly by media, campaigning organizations, advertisers, green energy vendors, other vested interests—even our legislators. The prevailing messages use a repertoire of an inflated language, using terms such as "catastrophe", "chaos", "havoc" and of course.... "acidification."

If the promoters of legislation such as this cannot even get basic science correct it begs the question, what else are they not getting correct? But it seems the deal is done and now the various entities are merely asking for money from the General Fund. Money which could be better spent elsewhere. Lastly, an "emergency clause"? Really?

Respectfully,



Richard Wisner,

Lincoln County