

Global warming has become a religion for many back here in Washington. To this crowd, there are no greater or more urgent problems anywhere. They worship at the alter of carbon generation and reduction. To them, the great crime of Al Gore Jr. was that at 100 mph, the electric engine on his Prius was...

Global warming has become a religion for many back here in Washington. To this crowd, there are no greater or more urgent problems anywhere. They worship at the alter of carbon generation and reduction. To them, the great crime of Al Gore Jr. was that at 100 mph, the electric engine on his Prius was not operating and he was laying down the carbon footprint of at least a 6-cylinder engine.

What I am about to say will be blasphemy to the religion of global warming. I do not think we should spend money solely to address this issue. Now, before you excommunicate me from the ranks of human beings, allow me to explain.

The consensus of scientists around the world is that the earth has warmed about 1 degree in the last 100 years. They also agree that human activity is "very likely" to have "contributed" to this phenomenon. Fine.

We have lots of issues today where we are 100% certain that human activity is the sole cause of the problem. For example, Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid will collapse within 30 years if they are not significantly reformed or tax rates are more than doubled. That is a significant problem. There are Islamic radicals around the world who are bent on the death of western civilization or its conversion to Islam "by the sword." That is a significant problem. In an age where we can produce as much food as we want and medicines are available to cure many diseases, people are still starving and dying by the millions from treatable illnesses. These are significant, manmade problems.

The question is this: How much of our limited financial and political resources should we divert from these critical 100% manmade problems to try and deal with a problem in which our efforts are "very likely" to make some contribution? Put another way: Reducing greenhouse gases is going to be a very expensive proposition. So expensive that many progressive European countries are already scaling back their greenhouse gas reduction plans as the real costs and economic effects become known. If we could take the many trillions of dollars that may be spent

on reducing the growth in greenhouse gases, and instead cure AIDS around the world, which would you do? In a heartbeat, I would choose to cure AIDS and be assured of saving many, many millions of lives. That's the kind of decision we as a society face.

Before you global warming zealots relegate me to carbon hell, let me say that I do not think we should ignore the issue of global warming. I just think we should only do what has an additional societal benefit other than just reducing greenhouse gases. For example, if we are also achieving energy independence and/or are reducing smog emissions while seeing a reduced carbon footprint, fine. But let's not spend trillions just to reduce production of gases that human beings expel while speaking when there are so many more immediate and more solvable problems before us. OCM