

please give us this defense. It seems to be more of a political defense in this country.

Certainly there are some weapons manufacturers who see hundreds of billions of dollars of future contracts out of this. But as you search around the world, have you seen any indication of support in other parts of the world for this kind of system? I know the current Lone Star approach as carried here and somewhat misguidedly to Washington is that it no longer makes any difference what the rest of the world thinks, but what does the rest of the world think about this?

Mr. KIND. It is interesting. The President is abroad right now in Europe trying to sell at least partly on this trip the merits of his missile defense program. It was interesting to read some comments from some of the military experts within France who kind of chuckled at the thought. They are not obviously enthusiastic supporters of the program. They said, well, we kind of tried that, too, after the First World War. It was called the Maginot Line, trying to deal with a perceived threat. Obviously we saw how well that worked during the Second World War. Once the enemy saw what type of defense system was deployed, they figured out a way to get around it. That is the concern really for a lot of our allies, our European allies whom we are going to have to rely on and work with in order to bring greater stability across the globe. That I think is a very, very important issue.

I think all of us here in the House have seen the defense reviews from CIA, from the Defense Department, ranking the real threats that we face today, from the greatest threats to the least threat. Missile defense, a launch of a nuclear missile basically airtailed to us because we will know exactly where it was launched from and who sent it, is one of the least likely threats we face right now in our national security basket. More likely it would come from biological terrorism or shipping a nuclear device in a boat up the Hudson or up the Potomac River, for instance, than someone would just airtail a nuclear weapon towards us. Yet what is most troubling with the Bush administration's approach to this is they are defunding a lot of the important nonproliferation programs we have in place at the Department of Energy right now and the nuclear collaboration programs that we need to be pursuing and funding in order to reduce the threat of nuclear proliferation or terrorism across the globe. Yet in the budget that they submitted, there were serious funding cutbacks in an area that we should be encouraging and investing wisely in. That I think is another serious issue.

Again, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for claiming some time this evening to talk about this very important issue. I have a feeling we have not had the last word on this subject.

Mr. TIERNEY. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin. We certainly have not, I hope.

For the last word I would like to recognize the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague from Massachusetts for putting together such an assembly of experts on the subject, including yourself, who have presented so many important facts. We have scientific expertise and budgetary expertise.

I have two reasons primarily that I oppose the national missile defense. I wish I had a poster. It would be one of Isabel Hart, age 3, and Eve Schakowsky, age 1, my granddaughters. More than anything in the whole world, I want them to be safe. If I thought that I could be part of this United States Congress to create a safety shield for these children, believe me, I would. But the more I have learned from my colleague from Massachusetts and others and reading about it and talking to the experts, I am convinced that far from creating a safety shield, that this plan actually endangers my granddaughters.

Today, a number of us participated in a press conference where Peace Action, Women's Action for New Directions, Physicians for Social Responsibility announced their plan to deliver thousands of petitions to Members of Congress from people across the country expressing opposition to Star Wars. I had visitors from the North Suburban Peace Initiative from my district who delivered that same message to my office.

I am proud and grateful that my constituents understand the risks and realities involved with President Bush's national missile defense plans. I hope that all of my colleagues had an opportunity to review the important materials that they and other committed citizens distributed on the Hill this week.

National missile defense is a program that is destined for failure on so many levels.

□ 2200

#### NO NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, since the Reagan administration, we have been urged by wishful thinkers to deploy a system for which workable technologies does not exist, and now many years and billions and billions of dollars later the Bush administration is still pursuing what I view is an irresponsible, unnecessary and unrealistic policy.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that it does not work and we have heard experts talk about how much it does not work is actually not the most important thing to

me. The most important thing is that it really should not work, because I fear that moving forward with national missile defense will actually undermine our security by igniting Cold War II and will reverse the diplomatic progress we have made over the last decade. It will make us less safe and less secure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for yielding to me.

Let me just end this hour-plus, with the courtesy of our colleague, by saying that this administration, as I started off by saying, has a ready, shoot, in-their-name approach to this whole policy. This is much like what has been going on with a number of the policies of this administration. They have unilaterally claimed that the Kyoto Protocol was dead. They have started to retract on that and are now talking about limitations on carbon dioxide and talking about cooperating with our international friends.

They have asserted that a pull-out of forces from the Balkans was imminent and now they are talking about cooperating and being sure that they do not pull out unilaterally.

They have talked about an express intent not to engage in the Middle East but reality has struck there and they have not only one envoy by two over there. They have talked about halting diplomatic initiatives in North Korea and now, in fact, they are starting to engage, or at least in all of these respects they are using semantics in talking about that. I hope they are being truthful in their attempt to move forward in that regard, although I fear that they may be just sort of smoothing and massaging what is going on while the President is abroad.

Today, their administration policies have always been leap before you think, leap before you look, whether it is domestic policy on the tax cut that cuts enormous amounts of money without deciding what we have for needs first or for obligations, and now we are talking about a national missile defense system which decidedly has not been proven to work, decidedly has not been tested and decidedly does not have tests planned to move us forward in that regard.

Now I understand that the Department of Defense is going to tell us that they are pulling back and in fact they are going to start a testing regime, with a white team and a blue team and a red team that are going to throw up countermeasures and test against them and have somebody evaluate that.

The fact of the matter is, Secretary of Defense Mr. Rumsfeld is still talking about deploying and moving forward at tremendous cost, not only financially but in terms of relationships and diplomatic relationships with other nations, even before we determine whether or not the system can work, even before we determine whether or not it fits

within our priorities, given all the other needs that we have in national security and otherwise, and even before we determine whether or not it is going to fit into the plans of stability for this Nation and the world.

So I hope that this tonight was a start in a conversation on this. I hope that we can impress upon the Secretary of Defense to allow us to release to the public Mr. Coyle's report from the OT&E office so that we can discuss that and debate it openly. It talks about some serious reservations and some serious concerns about moving forward and deploying before, in fact, we should be.

I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for joining us on that and all the other Members who participated tonight and I look forward to an open debate so the American people can really understand what is involved here and what is at stake and the dangers and responsibilities attendant to it.

#### GLOBAL WARMING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I will be discussing global warming tonight but I would like to just say one or two words and I would hope that my colleagues in the next presentation about the strategic defense initiative will have a debate. I would be very happy, along with others here, to participate on the other side of that issue.

Let me just say I could not disagree with my colleagues more on the issue of missile defense. I am the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics and we do have the capacity and the capability of knocking down an enemy missile that might have a nuclear warhead that would murder millions of Americans.

Should we have a defense to prevent millions of Americans from being incinerated if the Communist Chinese would launch a rocket at us? I think that it is prudent that we try to develop the system.

The answer to many of the questions that were brought up tonight is that if the system does not work and cannot be made to work, we will not buy the system. It is incumbent upon us, incumbent upon us, to spend the money that is necessary to see if that system can be developed. I believe it not only can be developed but we have already knocked out of the sky several missiles that were launched from other locations without a previous flight plan, I might add.

What we have today, we knew they were coming but not exactly what the flight plan was. Let me just say this, in the future I would hope, especially the young lady with two grandchildren, that she does not face a situation where an American President is told

the Chinese have just launched a missile; there is nothing we can do, nothing we can do but let it incinerate a part of the United States. I hope her children are not there or her grandchildren are not there. We have to look at this as a real possibility.

The Communist Chinese have dramatically expanded the capabilities of their missile offense, and mutually assured destruction means nothing to that enemy. Those Americans who are listening to this might think it would be prudent that America in the future would have a system to defend itself in case the Communist Chinese would threaten the United States with an attack that would murder millions of its people unless we give in. I think it is a very prudent course of action.

I will be very happy to debate with my colleagues in the weeks and days ahead if they want to have a debate rather than a presentation here on the floor.

Now I do have my presentation tonight, which I have on global warming, especially considering that President Bush has come under severe attack for his refusal to bow before the pressure of a very well-organized effort that they are trying to pressure him to accept the idea that the world is in peril because it is becoming more and more warm because of industrialization. It is vital that the public understand that what is going on in this attack against President Bush is about a political agenda; that global warming is not a scientific imperative. It is a politically-driven theory.

Those espousing global warming are building on public fear and apprehension. Young people in particular are being lied to about the environment and about global warming. Global warming, of course, is one of the worst falsehoods that they talk about. When I meet with student groups, it is clear they are being told false things about a lot of areas of the environment.

In fact, I meet every student group from my district that comes to Washington, D.C. I always ask them the same question: How many of them believe that the air today in Southern California is cleaner or worse than it was when I went to high school in Southern California 35 years ago? Consistently, 95 percent of these students who live in Southern California who are coming to my office say they believe that the air quality today is so much worse than it was when I went to high school and how lucky I was to live in an era, in the early 1960s, when we had such clean air in Southern California.

This, of course, is 180 degrees wrong. These young people have been systematically lied to about their environment. They are being told they are being poisoned by the air. But, in fact, the air quality in Southern California is better than it has ever been in my lifetime. They cannot believe it when they hear it.

They also cannot believe that the quality of the Potomac River, the

water quality around us, is better, even the quality of the soil. Even the number of trees and forests that we have have increased. They have been lied to time and again about the environment, and again the global warming theory is the worst of all.

These lies are being used to justify to Americans of all ages, to justify a centralization of power in Washington, D.C. and a centralization of power in global government through the United Nations and other institutions that are run by unelected and unaccountable authorities.

Let us get into what global warming is all about. Global warming is a theory that carbon fuel, coal, oil, gas, et cetera, that this carbon-based fuel is putting CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere, and CO<sub>2</sub> is causing the temperature to rise, which will cause a drastic change in the weather, the ice flows, animal life, plant life on our planet.

First and foremost, let us recognize this: All of the recent scientific reports agree that there may, or may not, be a minor change in the planet's average temperature over this last 100 years. There is no conclusive proof that man is the cause of that perhaps minor change.

That is not what we are being told. The American public is being told all of these scientific reports are claiming that global warming is absolutely a fact and there is no arguing with it. One reads those reports and they will find that there are weasel words and there are all sorts of caveats in these reports that suggest the scientific community cannot say this.

Climate science seems to be a very recent entry into the pantheon of scientific study. Prior to 1980, there was only a handful of climatologists. Now they seem to be everywhere. Try to find a researcher on global warming who is not in some way tied to some sort of research contract by the Federal Government. Now, could it be that the reason for the increase in the numbers of global warming advocates has something to do with the access to government funding for research?

Eight years ago, when President Clinton took over the executive branch, he saw to it that there would be no one getting scientific research grants from our government unless they furthered the global warming theory.

We were tipped off to this when the lead scientist, and I would say the Director of Energy Research for the Department of Energy, Mr. Will Happer, was precipitously fired from his position because he did not agree with the global warming theory and did not believe that it had been proven. He wrote a little article about it, and Vice President Gore came down on him like an iron fist and he was out of that job.

Dr. Happer, I might add, is now a professor of physics at Princeton University. But his removal as the director of research at the Department of Energy sent a message, clearly heard throughout the scientific community, you do