

Jack Venrick

From: "Jack Venrick" <jacksranch@qwest.net>
To: <Senator@murray.senate.gov>
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2005 10:13 PM
Subject: Re: Response from Senator Murray

Dear Seanator Murray:

You and your staff need to do some independent study on global warming as it is evident that you have been seduced by the environmentalist junk science. i.e. unsubstantiated by scientific peer process review. "Global warming is an exaggerated issue, predictably blown out of proportion by the political and professional climate in which it evolved." Meltdown pg. 5. "No one can completely account for the remarkable distortion that has occurred concerning the issue of global warming. But we can try....pg. 7 "Meltdown" Global warming is all about generating press and funding and jobs and little about common scientific sense.

"Those who do not support the existing paradigm are therefore not likely to be funded sufficiently for promotion. Scientific papers are reviewed by scientific peers, who are functioning within the same dynamic. The canon of science, as represented by the refereed scientific literature, becomes increasingly skewed and resistant." pg 237 Meltdown

Get copies of the book "Meltdown" by Patrick Michaels for your staff. Temperature change over the last 100 years are within the normal variation of recorded temperatures. Recent temperature increases over the last 30 do not global warming make. There is NO scientific evidence that there is any long term climate change. e.g. There has been no warming trend in BC where populations are expanding over the last 75 years. Drought and precipitation patterns are normal in the US over the last 100 years. Hurricane patterns are lessening. Nevada's statewide average rainfall has increased. www.ncdc.noaa.gov Peru's surface temperature history shows a 1.5 degree F rise since 1900. But most of it took place during The Great Pacific Climate Shift in 1976. Temperature histories before and after 1976 show no statistically significant change. www.cru.uea.ac.uk

Your statement "Most scientist now agree that climate change is a real..." is also misleading. Read the "Meltdown" and find out why. Only those scientist, academia and journals trolling for notoriety and government funding misrepresent the climate facts to perpetuate themselves. "In most areas of science, especially in environmental science, the vast majority of funding comes from the federal government." "Remember also that the reward structure in academia in which tenure equals job security, is highly conditioned by the level of scientific funding that an individual can

garner. " pg. 137 sec 6.3.

As for the UN, Professor Michaels makes a strong case of "follow the money". The UN is one of the most corrupt, anti-American, socialist organizations in the world. They have wasted billions modeling global temperature ranging all over the spectrum of temperature increases. Professor Michaels addresses this too. It is a self serving industry NOT based on honest peer scientific review. You dont get funding if you theorize temperatures are within normal 100 year deviation. The UN is no organization to be proud of or respect or use that has the best interest of America. There are very credible US Representative and Senators, e.g. Ron Paul trying to get the US out of the UN.

"Deaths in American cities from hneat related causes are in decline, despite the UN predicting an increase in heat deaths. There is no predectable change in monsoon fainfall, despite what the UN asserts." Meltdown pg. 6
 "Federal climatologist produce volumes and compendia on the basis of computer models that they discover do not work, yet publication proceds.....pg. 6

"The policy director, Steve Sawyer of UN Framework Convention on Climate Change in New Delli Nov. 2002 claimed that a massive sea level rise brought on by global warming will inundate majmor world cities including New York City by 2080 if the world fails to reduce green house gas emmissons....Greenpeace predicted a massive sea level rise of 5-7 meters by assuming complete melting of Greenland ice sheet. But their presumption is wrong. Krabill's work demostrates it is preposterous to suggest that all of Green land's ice will disappear. Krabill shos a small net loss of ice in Greenland of about 51 cubic kilometers per year.By the year 2080 the current rate of ice loss would result in a total sea level rise of 10 mm or .4 inch, a bit less that greenpeaces. forecast...."pg 62

"Yet there wasn't one news story noting that the natural (pre-greenhouse) rate of melting in southern Greenland was higher than it is today! And overall , the largest portion of the ice is at best neutral....On average, the region has been in balance in recent decades." pg 57

Another point Professor Michaels makes is the green house gas effect has increased crop yield in the US because of the increase in the growing season. You have to read and study on your own and stop listening the the liberal mainstream media spin and the environmental gloom and doom lies. Nobody with a brain wants to follow the Kyoto Protocol

----- Original Message -----

From: <Senator@murray.senate.gov>

To: <jacksranch@qwest.net>
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2005 3:10 PM
Subject: Response from Senator Murray

Dear Mr. Venrick:

Thank you for contacting me about global warming. I appreciate knowing your views on this important issue.

Although there are still disagreements in the scientific and policymaking communities as to the effects of global warming, I believe the problem still warrants greater attention. I support an international climate change treaty that respects the legitimate concerns of the U.S. and addresses the impacts that human activities -- such as burning fossil fuels and deforestation -- have on the earth's climate. Most scientists now agree that climate change is a real phenomenon, and that greenhouse emissions have contributed to global warming.

There is less consensus about the extent to which these emissions are driving climate change. Also, there is uncertainty about how global warming will actually impact human health, ecosystems, agriculture, species extinction and weather severity. However, I believe we know enough about the causal relationship between air pollution and climate change to begin taking significant steps to reduce emissions. As the world's greatest emitter of greenhouse gases, the U.S. should take an aggressive leadership role in reducing this type of air pollution. I am confident that by using market-oriented strategies and relying on new technologies, American ingenuity can find ways to reduce emissions without harming the economy.

In 1992, the U.S. signed the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Under this agreement, the U.S. would be required to voluntarily reduce its emissions by an average of 7% over 1990 levels by 2012. Among other strategies, the agreement allows for emissions trading and pollution credits for forest conservation. The 1997 Kyoto Protocol to the UNFCCC went even further, committing the 38 major industrialized nations to legally binding emissions reductions.

The U.S. signed the Kyoto Protocol in 1998, but Congress has not ratified the treaty. Shortly after taking office, the Bush Administration rejected the Kyoto Protocol, declining to take part in further international negotiations. Under the leadership of the Europeans, other countries have since decided to continue climate change negotiations and to pursue ratification despite U.S. absence. Over 140 nations have ratified the Kyoto Treaty.

Unfortunately, the Administration's approach to global climate change has been to focus on reducing the ratio of emissions to gross domestic product, rather than reducing total overall emissions. Our nation's leaders should instead propose and support effective policies to mitigate our impacts on the global climate.

Throughout my Senate tenure, I have supported efforts to address climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. During the 108th Congress, I cosponsored the Climate Stewardship Act, a bi-partisan bill that would have imposed mandatory caps on greenhouse gas emissions such as carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide. I am again a cosponsor in the 109th Congress, and I voted to include the bill in the comprehensive energy legislation passed by the Senate in June. Unfortunately, the measure failed. The Senate did, however, approve an amendment that expresses the importance of implementing a system of mandatory emissions caps in order to combat global warming. Although no specific framework is laid out, a formal acknowledgment of the need for aggressive action is an important first step.

As a U.S. Senator, I will continue to advocate that the Administration place a higher priority on combating climate change and re-engage in international dialogue. I will also continue to support increased funding for improving our understanding of climate change. Recent studies by the National Academy of Sciences suggest that climate changes occur rapidly rather than gradually, which may mean global warming will pose even greater challenges and cause much more damage sooner than we think. We must continue to study this phenomenon in order to find the most efficient and appropriate solutions.

In addition, as a member of the Senate Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Caucus and as Ranking Member of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, I am a strong supporter of energy conservation and renewable energy research and development. Supporting alternative energy technologies is a critical step in addressing the problem of global climate change. The Pacific Northwest stands to lose much from climate change due to increasingly severe storms, rising sea levels, and negative impacts on forests, coasts, salmon and agricultural lands. These resources define our quality of life and help sustain our economy.

Please be assured that I will remain a persistent voice in the fight to address climate change. Once again, thank you for contacting me. Please stay in touch.

Sincerely,

Patty Murray

United States Senator