

(Mr. ROTHMAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FOLEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GREEN of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BILIRAKIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CYPRUS PEACE NEGOTIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, last week, peace negotiations finally resumed over the 30-year Cyprus conflict. After reaching the end of the road last March, thanks to what was described at the time by officials close to the negotiations as intransigence on the part of Turkish-Cypriot leader Rauf Denktash, the Turkish-Cypriot leader finally agreed to return to the negotiating table with Cyprus President Tassos Papadopoulos. The framework by which the two are now negotiating is a plan written by the U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan. While the Secretary General's proposal serves as a starting off point, it should by no means serve as the final agreement to finally unify the nation of Cyprus.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, I visited Cyprus for the first time. And while I believe it is critical for a unified Cyprus to join the European Union later this year, I also believe that the framework agreed to between the two sides must lay the foundation for a democratic government to thrive for many years to come.

□ 1830

Unfortunately, there are parts of the Annan plan that makes it virtually impossible for an established government to function. In fact, there are sections of the plan that would make the island country less democratic than it was after an agreement imposed against Greek Cypriots during the Cold War back in 1959.

Mr. Speaker, the Annan plan in my opinion is undemocratic. Under the plan, a parliamentary system would be created with two legislative bodies, a

Senate and a Chamber of Deputies. The Senate shall be composed of 48 members with a requirement that half of those Members, 24, come from Cyprus and the other half come from the Turkish Cypriot side. Keep in mind that the Turkish Cypriot minority only makes up 18 percent of the islands. The Annan plan gives that 18 percent equal footing with the 82 percent of the Republic of Cyprus population. How is that democratic?

Then in addition to that in the Chamber of Deputies, the Annan plan says it too shall consist of 48 members elected on a proportional basis, but both the Turkish Cypriot side and the Republic of Cyprus side are guaranteed a minimum of one-fourth of the seats. And the significant advantage for the minority does not end there. The Annan plan states that laws be enacted by a majority vote in each of the houses as long as at least one-fourth of the senators from each of the two component states comprises the majority vote in the Senate. This means that the 18 percent holds a virtual veto over any legislation being passed.

Mr. Speaker, if we compare the Annan plan to our own government here in the United States, let us say that the Democrats and Republicans each held 50 seats in the Senate, something that actually happened a few years ago. You remember how difficult it was for both sides to govern. If fact, it created a position in which one Republican, JIM JEFFORDS, actually left the Republican Party in order to become an Independent. Now, if just being 50-50 is not hard enough, imagine if the U.S. Senate could not pass any legislation without one-fourth of the Republican side agreeing with the Democratic side, or vice versa. There is no way we could govern under those conditions.

How can we expect Cyprus, a country which has been torn apart for almost 30 years, to govern under these same circumstances? I do not mean to be critical of U.N. Secretary Annan. He has done a fantastic job of trying to meet the unrealistic threats of Turkish leader Denktash. Furthermore, the government of Cyprus has consistently agreed to negotiate within the frame of the U.N. proposal.

The Annan plan is a good draft, but that is all it is. It is critical that not only the United Nations but also the Bush administration and the State Department realize that in its current form the Cyprus government would not be able to govern. These concerns, as well as several others, must be addressed before any real peace agreement can be reached.

I want to conclude by saying again, the Annan plan was supposed to be a basis for negotiations and everyone agrees that is certainly the case, but it should not be the final outcome. I am afraid that our own administration, the Bush administration, the State Department, are trying to put pressure on the Cyprus government that they have

to agree to the Annan plan just the way it is and that no changes can be made. That is not only unfair, I think it leads to an unworkable situation in the long run. We have to realize that as much as the Annan plan is a good basis for negotiation, it should not be the end result because if it were, I think in the long run it would actually be to the detriment to the future government of a united Cyprus.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. HARRIS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

GADDAFI DELIVERS HISTORIC 90-MINUTE SPEECH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a group of seven Members of Congress just finished leaving the airplane at Andrews Air Force Base from a 3-day trip to Libya, the second trip that I have led there in 30 days. This trip is one that will go down in history as one of the most historic events that was documented in that country that has been a problem for us over the past 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, I was asked by the chairman of the People's Congress of Libya to give a speech at the opening session 2 days ago, which I did. Senator BIDEN is giving a speech there today. Along with my speech and speeches from the French, the Egyptians, the head of the European Parliament, Colonel Gaddafi rose to the podium and spoke for 90 minutes. He gave what will go down in history, I am convinced, as a speech that will equal the tearing down of the Berlin Wall and the event that had Boris Yeltsin standing alongside the tank outside of the Moscow White House proclaiming that communism was dead because in this 90-minute speech Gaddafi, who has been someone that we have not had any type of relationship with, whose country has admitted to completing the bombing of Pan Am 103, Gaddafi, in front of the 600 people assembled in the auditorium and 100 nations that were in attendance, renounced the actions of Libya over the past 25 years.

He admitted to his people that they had been involved in funding terrorist organizations from the IRA in Ireland to the PLA, to the Sandinistas, to other terrorist groups around the world. He admitted that they were involved in crimes, and they had done things for other groups. He rose to the occasion to tell his people that he had come to the conclusion it was time for Libya to abandon these people who no longer were needing of the support of

the Libyan people, and whom the Libyan people only suffered from, becoming isolated from the rest of the world.

He spoke of the United States and the Pan Am 103 bombing. He said it is a part of history that they want to put behind them after I had said in my speech that we were happy that the Libyans had admitted to that bombing and being responsible for it. We told them that we would never forgive nor forget the actions of their country, but here was Moammar Gaddafi changing not for the international community, but in front of his own people saying it was time for Libya to renounce weapons of mass destruction, and calling for complete and total transparency, calling for other terrorist nations to abandon their weapons of mass destruction, telling them that it is no longer a valid position for countries to take, to encourage and support terrorism throughout the world.

Then he said about the United States, the United States does not want to bomb Libya. We are not Libya's enemies. If we wanted to take over their country, we would have done that 27 years ago when they asked us to get out of the military bases we had in their country. He said to his people, America did not fight, they simply left our country as our friends. He said it was only in recent times that we have become an enemy, and he said no longer will Libya be an enemy of the United States; Libya wants to return, to become a friend, they want to attempt as much as possible to join the family of nations and join those multinational groups in Europe and around the world. They want to become a part of arms control regimes. He even agreed, as I met with the Gaddafi Foundation, that they should look to rejoin efforts like the Vienna Conference that oversees the Helsinki final act guaranteeing basic human rights for all citizens. We talked about human rights, and the fact that Libya was now on a course to set out for their people an effort to clean up the human rights records of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this speech was not to the world community. The external media was not invited. It was broadcast live throughout Libya. Every television in Libya had this proceeding on for 90 minutes in front of 600 delegates, 100 nations and 7 Members of Congress. Moammar Gaddafi issued the message to the people of the world that Libya had changed dramatically and completely, that Libya was ready now to begin a new chapter.

He was very thankful that our delegation was there because he said it showed the Libyan people that America was ready to respond. Senator BIDEN's speech today will reinforce that. I congratulate my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who traveled to Libya. We will be putting a complete report into every Member's office before the end of this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SCIENCE INVESTIGATES HUMAN CONTRIBUTION TO CLIMATE CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments this evening on an issue that remains somewhat controversial. The issue is climate change. Is the Earth warming, and is there such a thing as global warming?

I would like to present a few findings affirmed by National Academy of Science, at the request of George Bush, and which the American Geophysical Union also agrees with.

Basically the conclusion of the scientific community is that the Earth has been warming for the last 10,000 years. We left the Ice Age, and for the last 10,000 years, the Earth on average has been warming 1 degree centigrade every 1,000 years, and this is detectable through various tree rings, ice cores and a number of other techniques used to determine the kind of climate we have had over the past 400,000 years. But the last 10,000 years, the trend is the natural range of fluctuation, it is a little warmer 1 year, a little colder the next year, but the natural range of fluctuation clearly shows that we have been in a warming trend over the past 10,000 years about 1 degree centigrade every 1,000 years.

What we have seen in the last 100 to 150 years is that natural range of fluctuation appears to have abruptly changed. The question is that abrupt change, which actually is a jump in surface warming, is that a natural fluctuation or is it as a result of mankind burning fossil fuel and adding greenhouse gases to the environment.

What I am going to show tonight is the fluctuation that we have seen, the abrupt fluctuation, is not a natural fluctuation. If it is not a natural fluctuation,

the environmental variables from this point on are not going to be predictable as far as the climate and the weather is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, this chart has two parts to this graph. The first part, which is the color gray, deals with the computer models that are telling us something about the climate and how it has changed over the past 100 years. One part of this chart shows the input in the model. The other part of the chart, the color red, shows actual observations on the ground where you go out and you actually take temperatures all around the globe. The first part of the chart, the gray line, is what you put into the computer. The second part is what you actually observe. There are three charts up here.

The first chart deals with the natural fluctuation in the climate over the last 150 years with solar energy, with ocean currents, with volcanoes, with a number of things that have caused the climate to change, the geologic forces which have caused the climate to change over the last thousand years. We see if we just take the variables in the natural forcing, the climate will stay fairly steady. In other words, there would be no increase in the last 150 years. The actual temperature, though, shows that there has been an increase over the last 150 years. So there is a question, where is the increase in temperature coming from?

The next chart shows only measuring human activity, anthropogenic forcing only. That means we only measure the kind of temperature increase we would get from burning fossil fuel or cutting down a forest or a variety of other things. When we do that, we show that the temperature, as we see over here, is the same. There is an abrupt increase in the temperature.

The third chart shows the natural fluctuation or the natural increase in temperature that we have seen over 10,000 years, but it also shows mixed in with that if we add to that natural increase, if we add human activity, we see that the blend shows that there has been about a 1 degree temperature rise in the last 150 years.

□ 1845

You cannot account for the increase in temperature over the last 150 years with just natural forces but you can account for it when you add in human activity.

Those are just a few interesting facts, Mr. Speaker, I thought that the Members would like to know.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HENSARLING addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)