

agree with them. I don't want the next generation to be burdened with the decisions that we make here today and I don't want to leave them with air they can't breathe, water they can't drink, and destroyed infrastructure up and down the coastline.

We need to address this issue now. I look forward to working with my colleagues on addressing global warming.

I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts again for his extraordinary work on global climate change issues.

#### CLIMATEGATE SCANDAL

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, it seems the science behind man-made global warming is melting before our eyes. Now there is a chance that even NASA will be pulled into the worldwide Climategate scandal.

□ 1845

For nearly 3 years, NASA has been stonewalling requests under the Freedom of Information Act for information surrounding their own temperature manipulations. Earlier, we learned that the University of Anglia in England where those global warming scientists house themselves had been hiding emails that contradict their theory of global warming.

So now Climategate has a twin sister, NASagate. Investors' Business Daily reported just yesterday on NASA being forced to change their climate records that the world has been using for years. They said, "NASA was caught with its thermometers down when James Hansen, head of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies, announced that 1998 was the country's hottest year on record, with 2006 the third hottest."

The last speaker, with all due respect, used these false statistics in his speech claiming global warming is a crisis. The fact is: "NASA and Goddard were forced to correct the record in 2007 to show that 1934, decades before the old SUV, was in fact the warmest. In fact, the new numbers show that four of the country's 10 warmest years were in the 1930s."

So how did NASA, the premier scientific agency of the United States, get such basic temperature calculations wrong? Did they cook the books too, just like the University of Anglia? We don't know. It turns out NASA has been blocking the Freedom of Information requests about that incident just like the scientists in Britain. What are they trying to hide? If global warming is a well-settled fact, why are these experts hiding the evidence to the contrary? And why isn't NASA following the Freedom of Information law? It's been 3 years since that information was requested. The public has a right to see the temperature data in these NASA emails. But there's more.

Earlier this year, the Environmental Protection Agency was caught suppressing dissenting views, just like the Climategate warmers in Britain and NASA. One of the EPA's own scientists wrote a report refuting manmade global warming science, using the latest, most current information that says the Earth is actually cooling right now. In fact, the Earth has been cooling for more than a decade. That's really an inconvenient truth for Al Gore and the global warmers.

But the people at the EPA buried the dissenting report, just like the Climategate warmers did and maybe NASA. The EPA bureaucrats said their scientist's own report wasn't helping their agenda, so they hid it and threatened the scientist so he would keep his mouth shut. The question is: Why can't the public see the dissenting view from other scientists? Isn't that what science is all about? The reason: It appears to me that careers are at stake, along with millions upon billions of dollars.

In the 1970s, Time and Newsweek predicted global cooling, that the world was all going to freeze. But when climates began to warm, scientists changed that name to global warming instead of global cooling. And have we noticed that the planet has actually began to cool again? Madam Speaker, it even snowed last week in Houston. It never snows in Houston. A snow in Houston is about as frequent as a hurricane in Iowa.

But the warmers, again, have changed the name of that catastrophe. It's now no longer global warming; it is climate change. That's a safe bet, because the climate does change almost every day. And why would they do this? What's the motivation for these scientists to apparently cook the books on global cooling or warming or climate change? It's money.

According to the leaked Climategate documents, the British university, the CRU at the center of the Climategate scandal, has received millions of dollars. NASA's climate change warmers stand to receive a billion dollars in funding this year alone. Global warming is big business. Fox News reported today that former Vice President Al Gore may be the world's first carbon billionaire. He makes money preaching fear in the name of global warming.

It's a great thing to make money in America. That's what capitalism is all about. But it's not okay to earn money from investing in green technology companies and, at the same time, forcing expensive green laws and EPA regulations on the American people based upon science that is not a fact. In the real world of science, if your calculations are wrong by data and observation, you have to throw out the hypothesis.

Some of the computer models using CRU data as a result are falsified. That includes the global warming claims. And these are the top warmer scientists. These scientists and their

dogma of fear is about control and obtaining taxpayer money. Ronald Reagan said it best: Government does not solve problems; it just continues to subsidize them.

And that's just the way it is.

#### GLOBAL WARMING OR CLIMATE CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I do think that I will use the 1 hour. I understand there's going to be a rule reported in the time, and we'll certainly yield to the person from the Rules Committee to file that rule.

Madam Speaker, I wish to rise to discuss a topic that's already been discussed on the House floor this evening. It's the issue of climate change or global warming. Next week, I am honored to be one of the congressional delegation attending the Copenhagen Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen, Denmark, that's going to be led by our esteemed Speaker, the Honorable NANCY PELOSI. I also attended Kyoto, Buenos Aires, and The Hague. I'm the ranking Republican on the Energy and Commerce Committee and formerly also on the Science Committee, and I have been a participant at the congressional level on the climate change debate for the last 20 years.

I'm going to start off by putting into the RECORD a suppressed report that Congressman POE just talked about that has never before this evening been made public in its entire, unexpurgated form. The title of the report is Comments on the Draft Technical Support Document for the Endangerment Analysis for Greenhouse Gas Emissions under the Clean Air Act. This report was compiled by Dr. Alan Carlin, who is a career scientist and investigator at the EPA. At one time, he self-described himself, I'm told, as a global warming believer. He prepared this report. He works in a group within the EPA that is responsible for conducting an internal review of some of these draft orders before they go public. And I'm not going to read the entire report. I'm going to read excerpts of the preface and the executive summary, and then I will put the entire report into the RECORD.

This is from the executive summary and the preface, and I quote, "We have become increasingly concerned that EPA has itself paid too little attention to the science of global warming. EPA and others have tended to accept the findings reached by outside groups, particularly the IPCC," which is the International Protocol on Climate Change under the auspices of the United Nations, "and the CCSP, as being correct without a careful and critical examination of their conclusions and documentation. If they

should be found to be incorrect at a later date, however, the EPA is found not to have made a really careful independent review of them before reaching its decision on endangerment, it appears likely that it is the EPA rather than these other groups that may be blamed for any errors.

Further down on the executive summary, Page 1, "Our conclusions do represent the best science in the sense of most closely corresponding to available observations that we currently know of, however, and are sufficiently at variance with those of the IPCC, CCSP, and the Draft TSD that we believe they support our increasing concern that the EPA has not critically reviewed the findings by these groups."

Further, "we believe our concerns and reservations are sufficiently important to warrant a serious review of the science by EPA before any attempt is made to reach conclusions on the subject of endangerment from greenhouse gases."

And on Page 2, "What is actually noteworthy . . . is not the relative apparent scientific shine of the two sides"—those that oppose and those that support the global warming argument—"but rather the relative ease with which major holes have been found in the greenhouse gas/CO<sub>2</sub>/global warming argument. In many cases the most important arguments are based not on multimillion dollar research efforts, but by simple observation of available data, which has surprisingly received little scrutiny. The best example of this is the MSU satellite data on global temperatures. Simple scrutiny of this data yields what to us are stunning observations. Yet this has received surprisingly little study or at least publicity. In the end it must be emphasized that the issue is not which side has spent the most money or published the most peer-reviewed papers, or been supported by more scientific organizations." This is very important, the next sentence. "The issue is whether the greenhouse gas/CO<sub>2</sub>/AGW hypothesis meets the ultimate scientific test—conformance with real world data. What these comments show is that it is this ultimate test that the hypothesis fails." That the hypothesis fails. "This is why EPA needs to carefully reexamine the science behind global warming before proposing an endangerment finding."

Now, this is from Dr. Carlin in the EPA. This is not some disgruntled Republican Congressman. This is a professional scientist, Ph.D., in an office within the EPA that is tasked with reviewing this endangerment document before a final decision is made. And in his words, the ultimate test is whether the greenhouse gas CO<sub>2</sub> hypothesis meets the ultimate scientific test conformance with real world data. These comments show that it is the ultimate test that the hypothesis fails.

Further, on Page 3 of the executive summary, there are several principal comments that they wish to raise in

their review. "As of the best information we currently have"—and this was in March of 2009—"the greenhouse gas/CO<sub>2</sub> hypothesis as the cause of global warming, which the Draft TSD supports, is currently an invalid hypothesis from a scientific viewpoint because it fails a number of critical comparisons with available observable data. Any one of these failings should be enough to invalidate the hypothesis; the breadth of these failings leaves no other possible conclusion based on current data." As Feynman said in 1975, "failure to conform to real world data makes it necessary from a scientific viewpoint to revise the hypothesis or abandon it. Unfortunately this has not happened in the global warming debate, but needs to if an accurate finding concerning endangerment is to be made."

The failings listed below why we should not have an endangerment finding in order of importance in our view:

Number 1, the lack of observed upper tropospheric heating in the tropics;

Number 2, the lack of observed constant humidity levels;

Number 3, the most reliable sets of global temperature data we have, using satellite microwave sounding units, show no appreciable temperature increases during the critical period from 1978 to 1997. Satellite data after 1998 is also inconsistent with the greenhouse gas/CO<sub>2</sub>/AGW hypothesis;

Number 4, the models used by the IPCC do not take into account or show the most important ocean oscillations which clearly do affect global temperatures;

Number 5, the models in the IPCC ignored the possibility of indirect solar variability;

Number 6, the models in the IPCC ignored the possibility that there may be other significant natural effects on global temperatures;

Number 7, surface global temperature data may have been hopelessly corrupted by the urban heat island effect.

Now, this one is the one that I was asking Mr. MARKEY about to see where he got his data set, because surface global temperature, if you take it in downtown Manhattan, for example, is going to be very different than if you take a surface temperature in a rural area. The actual urban effect, the concrete, the asphalt, the buildings raise the temperature, and there is some concern that this urban heat island effect has corrupted the temperature.

Those are just seven reasons in this draft document why this author had skepticism about going forward with an endangerment finding. And yet, this report was not made a part of the record. This report was not made public. In fact, this report was suppressed, and because of considerable anxiety on the part of people like myself and Congressman ISSA, Congressman SENSENBRENNER, the author was allowed to put a redacted version of this report on his personal Web site. Then we were able to get the unredacted version pro-

vided to us by the EPA, and that's the version that I'm going to put in the RECORD.

□ 1900

As this author says, Dr. Carlin, he was prophetic because we're now seeing that some of the climatologists—maybe more than some—have attempted to suppress certain data, to destroy data sets, to manipulate data sets, to not get a true scientific review, but to reach a preconceived conclusion.

Madam Speaker, I think that is wrong.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I will yield to the distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I know there are colleagues of ours who are anxiously looking forward to participating in this very important Special Order, and I want to congratulate all of you for the work that you're doing to demonstrate that there clearly is a wide diversity of views on this question of global warming.

And I was listening to the exchange that my friend had with the chairman of the committee from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), and I was thinking about the fact that one of the things I think would be very helpful for us to do is to try and pursue some bipartisanship. That's a buzzword that is used around here regularly. People talk about how important it is for us to be as bipartisan as we can. But I think with the controversy that exists from both sides, there may be a way for us to come together on an issue.

I wanted to come up and mention this very briefly. I have joined, Madam Speaker, with our colleague from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH.) I know that might come as somewhat of a surprise that Mr. KUCINICH joined in an effort to deal with this question in a bipartisan way—and it might come as a surprise that DAVID DREIER would join with Mr. KUCINICH in doing something that would address this issue. But it is a measure that I think is very important for us to look at.

There is recognition—and Mr. MARKEY said this—that we have the potential to create a couple of million green jobs here in the United States. And I think there is a desire to continue to do what we can to improve our environment. I come from the Los Angeles basin. We have air-quality problems there. Very serious. I believe that if we were to take what is our comparative advantage—and my friend from Georgia and I have worked regularly on the trade issue—and take advantage of our comparative advantage, which happens to be the development of a wide range of alternative energy sources—whether it's algae, whether it's wind, whatever—and provide a chance for those technologies to move to these developing countries which have not yet been able to comply—Bangladesh, India, China, other countries.

So Mr. KUCINICH and I have joined to introduce a resolution calling for the tariff-free export of all green technology. Now, I believe that that would create jobs in this country, and it would go a long way towards helping us in our quest to deal with overall environmental issues.

And so while there is a wide range of views on this issue of global climate change, I do believe that it's important for us to know that improving our environment is something we can come together on. And I'd like to congratulate my friend and say that I hope that in a bipartisan way we can encourage entities like the World Trade Organization to negotiate a worldwide agreement that would allow green technology to be exported to all parts of the world.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the gentleman for bringing that to our attention, and it sounds like a worthy proposal.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I would like to yield such time as he may consume to a member of the committee from the great State of Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Thank you, Mr. BARTON.

I think what is important, Mr. BARTON, was your focus on science and your focus on data points and what we should be able to do in the Chamber in a bipartisan manner is to agree on the data points. We should be able to agree on what the science is, and that's in question. And for many of us it has been in question for a long time.

We're joined by JOHN LINDER who's been following this as long as anyone else has, and part of his search has been because the scientists would not give the data. They would never tell us what's the base by which they're making this extrapolation. And so I'm glad that you highlighted the scientific method that I didn't get on the chart but I brought down here.

It's very simple. I taught high school. You're an engineer. I went to an engineering school. This is irrefutable. This is how science is done. You ask questions. You do background research. Background research in this debate would be to get the temperatures.

We're already questioning the background research, one, based upon the request from the Freedom of Information Act, and of course now our friends at the IPCC are saying, We don't have them. The dog ate the homework. It is amazing. Scientists are really some of the most respected professionals. But they're respected because of this, this process, which should be objective. You should be able to follow it. You should be able to construct a hypothesis. The hypothesis is an educated guess. That is all it is. It's not truth. It's a guess based upon the data points. And then

you are—then you're to test it. And then you analyze the result and then draw your conclusions.

Based upon the scientific method, you can categorically say right now that those who say the science that solves are in error. The science does not solve. That is why all of this political activity is going on right now. That is why now the EPA administrator is saying, We're going to do endangerment findings. They want to do it before we are able to educate the public that the science is not solid. And they are not providing us with the data points, they're not complying with Freedom of Information Act requests. And so this process is skewed.

So when they tested it, they found out that the results didn't match their educated guess. And what did they do? These scientists are politicians. They went into—we call it in the military they went and holed up. They lowered the turrets; they got under ground. Don't ask questions. And here are some of the emails, in essence, to prove that.

Here's the first one.

"The fact is that we can't account for the lack of warming at the moment, and it is a travesty that we can't."

Mr. BARTON of Texas. When was that email? Was that 10 years ago? Was that a decade ago? When was that?

Mr. SHIMKUS. 12 October, 2009, at 8:57.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. So that was 2 months ago.

Mr. SHIMKUS. As of 2 months ago, we can't account for the lack of warming.

There's two things here. First of all, they say we can't account for the lack of warming. So their background research, he is already trying to skew the research. And he has an emotional response: "It's a shame. I'm saddened." Scientists shouldn't be emotionally attached to the data. This is the data. Let's test it.

What we would encourage our friends on the other side to say is, in a bipartisan manner, let's get the facts on the table, and let's get the scientists to look at the facts. The facts are being hidden. That is sad.

One is they don't have the facts; two is he's emotionally distraught because his hypotheses cannot be proven.

Here's another one to the ranking member. "I can't see either of these papers being in the next International Panel on Climate Change report. Kevin and I will keep them out somehow—even if we have to redefine what the peer-review literature is."

Here's another process on the scientific message. Analyze the results. Draw conclusions. They have got some—they've done some analysis that doesn't support it. So are they going to add that in a scientific objective fashion, say, This is what we believe, but there are some who disagree—they say that the facts don't speak for the hypotheses? No. These scientists say, We're going to bury it. We're going to

hide it. We don't want the public to know.

Can you imagine scientists doing that?

Again, the scientific community is one of the most respected communities because they go by the scientific method.

Here they admit that they're going to keep the analyses out of the report—two analyses that contradict what they want their hypothesis to be.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Now Mr. Phil Jones, he is the head of the Climate Research Unit at East Anglia University in Great Britain. Is he the gentleman that just resigned?

Mr. SHIMKUS. He is the person who just resigned.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. And is Michael Mann the professor at Penn State that is the proponent, initially, of the hockey stick theory, which has been shown to be discredited and was actually using data sets that were manipulated in a way that they shouldn't have done? Those are the two gentlemen, the author and the recipients of this email?

Mr. SHIMKUS. That is correct.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. And are these two gentlemen two of the leading proponents in the IPCC that climate is growing warmer because of manmade CO<sub>2</sub> emissions?

Mr. SHIMKUS. They are the foremost promoters of the theory.

And there's the followup. Are they receiving taxpayer dollars to promote this theory through the IPCC, which is the U.N. International Panel on Climate Change, or Virginia.edu, and you could speculate that there are DOE grants, EPA money, going. And another thing, these scientists are for hire. They're for hire.

Mr. LINDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHIMKUS. I will yield.

Mr. LINDER. We heard the gentleman from Massachusetts talk about Big Oil, and Saudi Arabia funding all of the opposition. I can't find the scientists that are getting those checks. But a recent study came out in the last several weeks that says that government money going to climate science on behalf of those who believe in human-cause global warming has been \$79 billion over the last 20 years. They have dwarfed anything on the other side of the issue. And they continue to do it.

Would you suggest that maybe that's why they are continuing to hide this situation because the money keeps coming?

Mr. SHIMKUS. I believe that those who seek taxpayer dollars—we know here that agencies and programs never go away. If that's why they're not providing the data, that's why they're hiding the fact of the last decade—can you imagine us in this environment of trying to get control of the deficit and the debt, and we're spending billions of dollars to scientists who are not using the scientific method?

Mr. LINDER. I believe the number this year is \$7 billion from the government.

Mr. SHIMKUS. So, yes, they're on the dole. They want to keep their jobs so they're continuing to promote and deceive the public. I don't know. I would say it's pretty damaging to their name, to the community, and also to the taxpayers.

Now, if I may, I have one more that I'd like to share. And there are tons. I mean, these are just a small sampling. The ones I picked out I kind of wanted to address the scientific method.

Again, as an engineer, give us the facts, give us the data, test the data, prove if it's right or wrong. If it's wrong, get an analysis, and then maybe try again. Retest it. Let's retest the data point.

□ 1915

Here is another one: I've just completed Mike's Nature trick of adding in the real temps to each series for the last 20 years, i.e. from 1981 onwards, 20 years, for Keith to hide the decline.

So now, not only are they not providing the data, they are keeping the analysis from being reported in the IPCC report, and they are jimmying the numbers. They are actually using tricks.

These are scientists. Now, we are politicians. I think people would have some skepticism. We don't claim to be—you claim to be an engineer; I went to engineering school. I understand it, but if you were building a bridge, or if you were designing a building, and you jimmied the numbers on the tensile strength of the steel, you would be in real trouble because the design would be faulty, and the building would collapse.

Their design, Administrator Jackson's design to remake the United States is on faulty data. It is on data that has been jimmied. And this house of cards will collapse, and it will be jobs in the wake on faulty data.

Now, bring us real data. Go through the scientific method. Test it, but don't hide it. Don't trick us. Don't deceive us. Don't discourage your profession of scientists by staying on the public dole to receive taxpayer money to continue to promote a fraud, a fraud on the American public. So that's why I real appreciate, Congressman BARTON, that you've taken this time to help address this. There's a lot of education. And this education has to go on now because they are going to be making decisions in Copenhagen. They are going to try to bind us to stuff on faulty data.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Now my assumption, and this is an assumption, is that the gentleman that wrote those emails and that received them by and large are in the inner circle of the climate change community; and in all probability, they are in Copenhagen right now.

Mr. SHIMKUS. You bet they are. The International Panel on Climate

Change, they are the U.N. designees to continue to provide the information to the folks who attend the conference upon which they make the decisions.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. And if the President were to commit the United States to a legislative path that these scientists support, and if we were to adopt as law the climate change bill that passed the House that requires a reduction of 83 percent of emissions from CO<sub>2</sub>, manmade sources, 2005, by the year 2050, and we implemented that, we would have a CO<sub>2</sub> emissions level in this country that we last experienced in 1910. And if we do it on a per capita basis that we last experienced per person in 1875, is it the gentleman's position that if we were to do that, our lifestyle in the year 2050 would be anywhere comparable to where it is today?

Mr. SHIMKUS. Our lifestyle would be dramatically different.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. In a negative way.

Mr. SHIMKUS. We rely on jobs and our environment on cheap energy. And as you know I'm from the coalfields of southern Illinois, and I spent this whole year and last year fighting for our coal reserves and the importance of that. And I usually bring another poster of miners who lost their jobs during the last cycle, 1,200 miners in one mine. The State of Ohio lost 35,000 coal miner jobs. That is just a fraction of what we will see in this country if we roll back the carbon emissions, and if they could prove it, but they can't.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. They can't even prove it apparently with tricks.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Carbon dioxide is not a toxic emission. And that is what Administrator Jackson just said.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If it were, the floor of the House would be a toxic waste dump because there is more CO<sub>2</sub> created here than in any other size room in the country, with the exception of perhaps the Senate floor.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I would encourage you to keep up the great work. Thank you for letting me join you.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I would now like to yield to one of the most informed Congressmen on the issue of climate change, the Honorable JOHN LINDER of the great State of Georgia.

Mr. LINDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I first got interested in this 5 or 6 years ago on a trip to New Zealand. It was a congressional delegation. We had a visit with the leader of the NOAA point there where they leave to go into Antarctica for their expeditions and come back to this scientific center. And they put a PowerPoint presentation together for us and a big chart on the wall that showed that at that time they had dug into the Vostok ice core for 400,000 years back, and that from 400,000 years back to today, temperature increases and decreases and CO<sub>2</sub> increases and decrease were in consonance. They moved with each other.

And I asked him, Who was burning fossil fuels 400,000 years ago? He took

that as a rude question, and it took me a year to get a copy of that chart. But I studied that chart. And then I looked at the studies about the Vostok ice core. And what you discover when you don't have it on a, 8½-by-11 piece of paper and expanded is that temperature changes precede CO<sub>2</sub> changes by about 1,000 years.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. That means that temperature is the dominant variable, and that it drives the dependent variable, which is CO<sub>2</sub>. Temperature goes up and then CO<sub>2</sub> goes up.

Mr. LINDER. That's correct. One study says 800 years, one study says 2,800 years, but people average it at about 1,000 years.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. So Vice President Gore is only off by 180 degrees?

Mr. LINDER. That's right. And so is the entire IPCC report. CO<sub>2</sub> is a trace gas. It is a plant food. It is beneficial to all of life. CO<sub>2</sub> is a modest gas. Methane is 23 times more powerful at trapping heat. Sixty-five percent of the heat-trapping gases come from water vapor.

We are not going after them because we are going after people. What you learn when you discover that CO<sub>2</sub> levels follow the temperature changes is that there's a reason for it. And the reason is this: we go through ice ages and global increases and declines in temperature. And as the temperature declines globally, the trees at the top of the mountain start to die for lack of photosynthesis, and then the bushes, and then the grasslands. And the dust that blows in the winds that are always here blows out across the oceans. And part of that dust is lead. And when that lead settles to the bottom of the oceans, it catalyzes growth in the largest biological mass we have in this planet, the plankton. And that growth demands CO<sub>2</sub> to keep going.

Now the oceans contain 70 times as much CO<sub>2</sub> as the atmosphere does. And as the plant life, the plankton, pulls that CO<sub>2</sub> out of the oceans, homeostasis, or equilibrium, causes more CO<sub>2</sub> to come out of the atmosphere and into the oceans. The reverse happens when the planet warms up through more solar activity. So colder oceans hold more CO<sub>2</sub> than warm oceans. And when the planet cools off, the CO<sub>2</sub> winds up in the oceans and out of the atmosphere. We have 388 parts per million today.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. And we believe that the Atlantic and Pacific are in a cooling period.

Mr. LINDER. They have been in a cooling period.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Something called a PSO and an AMO or something?

Mr. LINDER. That's correct. They have been in a cooling period. And we have now 3,400 instruments that go into the oceans. And every 10 days they pop up, and they give satellites information of what is on those instruments about the temperatures. And there has been no warming in the oceans.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I know it's dangerous for Congressmen to actually

think. We are not accused of doing that very often, but there are sometimes some Congressmen, you and I, I think, are two, not that others don't, but we actually think.

Now I want to build on what you just said. These ice core samples that you got the data that show temperature goes up, and then CO<sub>2</sub> goes up. And if temperature were to go down, then CO<sub>2</sub> would go down.

Mr. LINDER. That's correct.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. We are in a situation right now where it appears, it depends on the data that you believe; but if the data points that we think are correct are correct, we are in a cooling period. Temperature has gone down at least 8 years in a row and probably 12 years in a row, and we appear to be in a cooling period. But at the same time, we have to admit that CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations are going up.

Mr. LINDER. That's correct.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. So I would hypothesize that the CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations going up are going to prevent as much cooling, and it will keep the planet warmer than it would be otherwise, but still cooler overall, which would be a good thing for mankind. We don't want another ice age, do we?

Mr. LINDER. No, we do not. In the last 2 million years, we have had 20 ice ages, 20 glaciations, the last on average about 100,000 years, interrupted by about 10,000 years of warming. It has been 11,400 years since the last glaciation. It is likely the planet is looking toward going cooler again. We have had less sun activity in the last 11 years than we've had in many, many years.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I'm told this, you probably know, that there are more glaciers in the world that are growing than there are that are in decline.

Mr. LINDER. Than are receding, that's right. But 388 parts per million is not even high. It's at the low end of the comfort scale. Roughly 65 to 135 million years when the dinosaurs roamed this Earth, CO<sub>2</sub> levels were five and 10 times as high they are today and produced a tremendous amount of greenery that fed those animals.

542 million years ago was the Cambrian period. It came to be known as the Cambrian explosion because in a very short period of time, 5 to 10 million years, which in a 4½ billion-year-old planet is the blink of an eye, in that short period of time, all of multicellular complex life that has ever existed on this Earth was deposited in the fossil evidence.

How did that happen? That happened because temperatures were warmer. The CO<sub>2</sub> levels were 7,000 parts per million, 20 times what it is today. The entire planet was covered with greenery and had immense amounts of oxygen and all of complex life as we know it, 96 percent of which is no longer existent.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. But it would have been a little warmer than it is today. We might not have been comfortable wearing a woolen sweater back then.

Mr. LINDER. But it would have been better than a glaciation. I always like to ask people who tell me the temperature is growing too much to say what should the current temperature be. Tell me. Should it be the temperature 1,000 years ago when Greenland was settled for agriculture? Or when the people in Scotland were growing wine grapes? Or should it be 879 A.D. when the Thames froze over? Or should it be a little ice age when Greenland was empty of life again?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. All I know is when people retire, they move to Florida and Texas.

Mr. LINDER. They don't move to Greenland.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. They don't move to Iceland or Greenland.

Mr. LINDER. CO<sub>2</sub> is a beneficial trace, helpful gas that feeds plants. And this whole notion that we should control it somehow is nothing but vanity. We are not going to change what is put on this planet for 4½ billion years. Now we are told, and we heard from the gentleman from Massachusetts, that there is a scientific consensus. He said 98 percent of the scientists, tens of thousands, agree with his position. Well, I would like to ask him to produce that list. Because only 600 of them shared the Nobel Prize with Al Gore. A scientist from Australia has said only 35 people actually wrote the IPCC reports, and they were controlled by 10 people.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. One of whom just resigned from his position in East Anglia.

Mr. LINDER. He did? What is not popularly known is that 32,000 scientists, including Edward Teller, 9,000 of whom are Ph.D.s and the rest masters, have signed a statement that says there is no evidence that humans are causing any impact on the global warming that occurred between 1975 and 1998, none whatsoever. In fact, five scientists who contributed to the first IPCC report said in their papers there is no evidence that humans are contributing. Those five statements were removed by the top bureaucrat at the IPCC and replaced with one statement that said there is no doubt that humans are causing this. He was asked about that under oath in a legal action. Why did he remove those statements? He said under immense pressure from the top of the Federal Government of the United States.

□ 1930

Now, "consensus" doesn't mean much in science. "Consensus" is important in politics. In science, we have to be seeking truth and fact. Indeed, in science, only two conditions are ever obtained. One is theory and the other is fact. You put forth your theory. You release your underlying documents and sources and methods, and you let your peers review it and try and replicate it.

That is the point at which I got very nervous about this science because I tried to get underlying documents from

Jim Hansen, who had the first computer model. He first testified before Congress in 1989, I believe, in the Senate. He recently attested, recently spoke in England. He said, We have 4 years to save the planet. He doesn't release his source documents because he says they are proprietary. Well, he is an employee of the Federal Government. The Federal Government ought to own those documents. They ought to be released. When somebody is hiding something, when somebody is hiding things, you begin to wonder why he is hiding it.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. It would be similar if we held an election and if we just said, Assume that I won—

Mr. LINDER. That's right.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. But we didn't release the documents, and we didn't release the ballots, and we didn't let them be audited, and we didn't have a canvassing committee.

Mr. LINDER. That's correct.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. We just said, We'll assume that, since Congressman LINDER says he won, he did win.

Mr. LINDER. What we are learning from East Anglia—and I want to make a point that the gentleman—

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Then we want to go to Mr. SCALISE.

Mr. LINDER. I want to make a point that those are not stolen documents. Those documents were released from inside by a whistleblower.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Well, they should be in the public domain anyway.

Mr. LINDER. Of course.

But somebody working inside that organization realized they were destroying documents that were being asked for in the Freedom of Information Act, and someone released those documents. I believe that we ought to be thinking about releasing everything. Let scientists pour over it and establish whether the theory is actually a fact and move on.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I agree.

We want to now turn to the Congressman from New Orleans, Louisiana, a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Congressman SCALISE.

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding and the gentleman from Georgia for opening up this discussion.

Of course, what we are talking about and the reason this is so important is that many of the different world leaders are getting ready to meet in Copenhagen, Denmark, to start discussing a Kyoto II-type treaty—a treaty for many countries, including the United States, to literally change the way our entire manufacturing base operates.

Of course, here in Congress, we've been debating the proposal by Speaker PELOSI and others to codify that type of treaty in the form of the cap-and-trade national energy tax. They are trying to bring a national energy tax to our country to tax businesses, to tax not only businesses but also individuals in their household electricity use for using fossil fuels. It's all in the

name of stopping manmade global warming.

So what brings us to this debate that you are focusing on is the fact that we have found out recently through Climategate that the science that they are using is corrupt. In fact, behind much of the data that has been used to try to sell a cap-and-trade energy tax, that has been used to try to sell the Kyoto Treaty and now this new meeting in Copenhagen to have a Kyoto II-type agreement, all of it was based on corrupted data.

If you go back to former Vice President Al Gore, who said, The debate is over, he was trying to imply that all of the scientists are in agreement. Of course, as my colleague from Georgia pointed out, the scientists are not in agreement.

What is even worse is now we have found out and have uncovered this scandal where some of the scientists who have been collecting data through the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the IPCC, which is the respected body worldwide on all of this data—it turns out, as the clearinghouse, they were actually corrupting the data that is being used.

In some of the examples through these emails, Phil Jones, who just resigned, said, I've just completed Mike's nature trick—he goes on—to hide the decline in temperatures.

We go back to the infamous hockey stick graph that Al Gore used in his film, "An Inconvenient Truth." I guess the most inconvenient truth for the former Vice President is that these emails have now come out and have exposed the scandal.

If the gentleman from Texas will allow me, I want to read a few other of the emails. I know my colleague from Illinois earlier highlighted some of the other emails.

Yet, just to show how deep this is, first, Phil Jones in an email last year said, Mike, can you delete any emails you may have had with Keith regarding the AR4 data set? Keith will do likewise. He says, Can you also email Gene and get him to do the same? I don't have his email address. We will be getting Caspar to do likewise.

So here he is talking about deleting data, deleting the emails which show that some of this manipulation and corruption of the data was going on. This is the person who is the director of the University of East Anglia's Climatic Research Unit. He is a scientist who should not only understand the importance of following the facts, of following the data, but who should also understand that, as others try to verify this data, that is something that he should be openly and freely willing to share.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. The AR4 data set is the data set that was used in the IPCC report in 2007, so it's a seminal document that has been used for policymaking decisions, not just in the United States but all over the world.

Mr. SCALISE. Exactly.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. What you are saying is they went to some lengths to manipulate the data that that report is based on.

Mr. SCALISE. They went to lengths to manipulate the data, and then they went to lengths to actually delete, to try to destroy the evidence, in essence—some of that data—as you know as the ranking member of Energy and Commerce and when we were having that debate here in committee and on the House floor on the cap-and-trade energy tax.

Many of the people who have been promoting that national energy tax—Speaker PELOSI and her liberal attendants and others—are using that IPCC data to say, Look, we need to act quickly because the data shows. Of course, now we know that the data was corrupted.

Then he goes on—and we are all familiar in this country with the freedom of information. This administration came in saying they were going to be the most transparent administration ever. Yet you look at these emails further, and he says—this is an email—The freedom of information line we are all using is this. So he is telling this to some of the other scientists who were involved in this corruption. He says, The IPCC is exempt from any country's Freedom of Information Act. The sceptics have been told this. Even though we possibly hold relevant info, the IPCC is not part—and then he goes on to say—therefore, we don't have an obligation to pass it on.

So he is trying to lay out this groundwork so that he doesn't even have to turn over his data. This is, I think, before he destroyed it.

Then he says, If the Royal Meteorological Society is going to require authors to make all data available—raw data plus results from all intermediate calculations—he says, I will not submit any further papers to the RMS Journal.

This is Phil Jones—again, leading scientist—whose data is used by many of these people all throughout the world to try to pass Kyoto-type agreements in the cap-and-trade energy tax that's getting ready to be debated over in the Senate.

Mr. LINDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LINDER. Sadly, that data that the IPCC uses from East Anglia is also the basis of the data that NASA uses in Huntsville, Alabama, and all of the other future models that have been built have been somehow shaped by that data. So there is no place to go now, since all of the source documents have been thrown away, to reconstruct all of that.

Mr. SCALISE. It is really frustrating because there are scientists who have different opinions, who have tried to present alternative data to this corrupt scientific data, and they have been blacklisted. In fact, I won't go into de-

tail on this here, but that information will continue to come out. In some of the emails, they actually go on to describe how they are going to try to blacklist other scientists who try to propose data which shows something different than theirs—in fact, even saying that they are going to withhold some of their journal writings so that they won't even publish some of this information.

I go on to say this because they are trying to use this corrupt data, this corrupt scientific data, to pass not only a cap-and-trade energy tax which will run millions of jobs out of this country, but they are also trying to use it now in conjunction with the EPA and their latest ruling to try to literally threaten Congress by saying, Well, okay. If you don't pass cap-and-trade here in Congress, then the EPA will in a de facto way try to pass its own cap-and-trade by using these radical environmentalists in the EPA, again using the corrupt scientific data, to try to pass it even if Congress won't pass it because the American people have realized this will run millions of jobs out of our country.

Many groups, one being the National Association of Manufacturers, on the low end, says, We would lose 3 million jobs in our country if the cap-and-trade energy tax were passed, and every American family would pay over \$1,000 more per year in higher electricity rates. All of this is based upon false scientific data that has been corrupted, and we know it from the Climategate emails.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. May I ask the Chair how much time we have remaining in our Special Order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. There are 12 minutes. Okay.

At about 10 minutes to go, I have got some documents I want to put in the RECORD.

Mr. SCALISE. I yield back.

Mr. LINDER. I want to make one point.

The data that you are talking about and that we are acting on in this country with cap-and-trade is also the data being used in Copenhagen today, as we speak, to begin what Al Gore called the ultimate reason for all of this: global governance, turning over the sovereignty of the United States to an unelected bureaucracy and the United Nations.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I want to thank Congressman SCALISE, Congressman LINDER, and Congressman SHIMKUS for participating in this Special Order.

What we are attempting to do is to actually use the scientific method to determine what steps, if any, the United States Government should take policy-wise if, in fact, climate change or global warming is a major problem that needs to be addressed. It does appear, in my opinion, that there is reasonable doubt about whether we should

take some of the radical steps that have been espoused in the climate change bills which have passed the House and which are pending in the Senate.

I want to take the remaining time and go through a series of emails that have just become public—we've alluded to them—and go into a little more depth.

The first email which we have already alluded to is from Michael Mann. Michael Mann is a climatologist at Penn State University. He is one of the leading scientists in the IPCC. He is the author of the original hockey stick theory that is kind of the genesis, the seminal document, for the theory that manmade CO<sub>2</sub> is the cause of the climate warming in the world. This is a document from him to Phil Jones, who was, until recently, the head of the Climate Research Unit at East Anglia University in Great Britain.

Now, Dr. Jones resigned in the last week or so, but in it, he says, Can you delete any emails that you've have had with Keith—Keith is Keith Briffa—regarding AR4?

AR4 is a U.N. IPCC fourth assessment document from 2007. It's one of these policy documents that is used around the world.

You can see that he says, I am going to contact Gene about this.

Okay. Gene is actually Eugene Wahl. He is at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's office in Boulder, Colorado. That's with the U.S. Department of Commerce.

He said, I am going to contact Gene about this. Can you delete any emails that you have? I'll get Caspar to do likewise.

Caspar is Caspar Jones—I mean Caspar Ammann. He is at the National Center for Atmospheric Research, or NCAR, in Boulder, Colorado. It's a federally supported consortium.

So, in this email, we have collaboration between NOAA, NCAR—both in the United States—the Climate Research Unit, which is CRU in East Anglia, Great Britain, and many prominent IPCC contributors coordinating document destruction. I think that is something that policymakers here in the United States should be concerned about.

Now let's go to the next document, email No. 2. Now, the first one was from Michael Mann to Phil Jones. This is from Phil Jones to a gentleman named Tom Wigley. Its subject is: Schles suggestion. This is last year, December of 2008. It says, I am supposed to go through my emails, and he can get anything I've written about him. About 2 months ago, I deleted loads of emails, so we have very little, if anything, at all.

So what this is showing is, or one could say, they have conspired to delete data. This is of Ben Santer, who is Santer 1, who is a prominent climate modeler at the Department of Energy's Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and of Tom Wigley, who is a sci-

entist at the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colorado.

□ 1945

The gist of this is he has already deleted a lot of emails from 2 months ago. What are they trying to hide here?

Now, let's go to email number 3. Email number 3 shows an unprecedented data purge at the CRU in East Anglia, Great Britain. Here is a public index of documents on one day and then here is the public index on the next, very quickly, after they have gone through and purged all, purged all of this. It says the next day, on July 28, Phil Jones deleted data from his public files, leaving online a variety of files from the 1990s. This morning, everything in Dr. Phil's directory had been removed.

It's not just the emails that have been deleted, in a widely reported event. Steve McIntyre, who is a Canadian researcher who testified before Congress several years ago when I was chairman, and who has been attempting to get these data sets, to get these documents, he has been trying to get, through the Freedom of Information Act, the public documents that some of these studies are purported to be based upon. Instead of releasing them, they purged them. They took them away in what is reported to be an unprecedented data purge.

They have deleted files pertaining to station data from the public directories. Why? Where are the data now if they are still in existence? What is it they are trying to hide? If the temperature data records really proved their theory, they would want to publicize them. At least I would think that they would.

Let's go to number 4. This is an email from Phil Jones, who we know well now, to a gentleman named Neville Nicholls. Mr. Nicholls, let's see, Mr. Nicholls, I am not sure who Mr. Nicholls is, but here it says, I hope I don't get a call from Congress. I am hoping that no one there realizes I have a U.S. Department of Energy grant and have had this with Tom W. for the past 25 years.

This is back in 2005. This is when I was chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and we were conducting the investigation into Dr. Mann's hockey stick proposal, hockey stick theory, and we had asked for some documents from Professor Mann, or Dr. Mann, and this gentleman is saying we hope the Congress doesn't realize that we are getting Federal money; we don't want them to be asking us about documents.

Of course, as we now know, they have destroyed many of those documents or apparently have destroyed many of those documents.

Let's go to number 5. Now, this documents shows the lengths to which they will go to suppress information, says if they ever hear that there is a Freedom of Information Act now in the UK, I

think I will delete these rather than send them to anyone.

Now, Congressman MARKEY, who is a good friend of mine and who is a believer, a proponent of manmade global warming, has got data sets that he says justify some of the policies that he supports. But here we see that some of these documents and some of these data sets that Mr. MARKEY and others have—who sincerely believe that there is a problem—appear to be very suspect. In fact, they are so suspect that if they have to release them publicly, they would rather delete them than to comply with the Freedom of Information Act.

Tom Wigley had sent me a worried email when he heard about it. He thought that people might ask him for his model code. My heavens, you know. Keep in mind that this theory that mankind-made CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is driving the temperature upwards, it's just that; it's a theory. These researchers have built these models to try to replicate the planet's temperature mechanism, and all these models show the temperature going up.

But that's the conclusion that the modelers want. It is not factually correct to say the temperature is going up; it's factually correct to say the modelers, who want to prove that the temperature is going up, are putting variables and assumptions in these models that drive them up, but they apparently don't have the data to back that up.

Let's go to number 6. This is again from Mr. Jones, a gentleman named Gavin Schmidt, concerning the revised version of something called the Wengen paper, W-e-n-g-e-n. It says all of our Freedom of Information officers have been in discussions and are now using the same exceptions not to respond—the advice that they got from the information commissioner. The Freedom of Information line that we are using is that the IPCC—now keep in mind the IPCC is the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change—is funded primarily by the U.S. taxpayer, not exclusively, but primarily, is exempt from any country's Freedom of Information, because the skeptics have been told this. Even though we possibly hold relevant information that the IPCC is not part of our remit, i.e., mission statement, therefore we don't have an obligation to pass it on.

To me that's just irresponsible to say that the IPCC, which is a total governmental agency, admittedly through the U.N. and a large number of nations, but the U.S. as the primary funder, is above Federal Freedom of Information laws, not only in the United States but in every other country. This information that has been collected and paid for by U.S. taxpayers and funded by U.S. scientists is now out of reach of the U.S. taxpayer? I think that's just flat wrong, Madam Speaker.

My last email is number 7, and this shows, while they accuse people like myself of trying to be bullies and to ostracize people, here is an email where

again this Professor Mann, Michael, it's to Michael Mann from a gentleman named Malcolm Hughes, just a heads up; apparently the contrarians now have an in with GRL.

GRL, which is the Geophysical Research Letters, a prominent climate journal—this guy Sayers has a prior connection with the University of Virginia Department of Environmental Sciences that causes me some unease. Then later on—this is truly awful. If you think that Sayers is in the greenhouse skeptics camp, then if we can find documentary evidence of this, we could go through official ATU channels to get him ousted. They are trying to ostracize those that are honest enough to say that they have some doubts about the theory.

I will end with this: The theory of global warming caused by mankind is just that, it is a theory; it is not a fact. As U.S. taxpayers and as the guardians of the U.S. taxpayers, we should demand that the facts be made public so that we can make a relevant policy decision.

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4213, TAX EXTENDERS ACT OF 2009

Mr. PERLMUTTER, from the Committee on Rules (during the Special Order of Mr. BARTON of Texas), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-364) on the resolution (H. Res. 955) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4213) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4173, WALL STREET REFORM AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 2009

Mr. PERLMUTTER, from the Committee on Rules (during the Special Order of Mr. BARTON of Texas), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-365) on the resolution (H. Res. 956) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4173) to provide for financial regulatory reform, to protect consumers and investors, to enhance Federal understanding of insurance issues, to regulate the over-the-counter derivatives markets, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

MASSIVELY EXPENSIVE AND ECONOMICALLY DESTRUCTIVE CAP-AND-TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Let me agree with the distinguished ranking member

that global warming is something other than what has been presented. He said it's a theory. I would suggest that as we go on with my speech, you will learn that it is a fraud.

Madam Speaker, not too long ago I stood here on the floor of the House and remarked that I have expected Rod Sterling to appear from behind a curtain and announce, "This is the twilight zone."

Well, since then this body has continued on an agenda fit only for the most bizarre episode of that program. In the last month, Congress has passed bailouts, rescues and stimulus packages, dumping trillions of dollars of debt onto the backs of the American people and, yes, onto our children's backs, and their children's backs.

Congress passed a massively expensive and economically destructive cap-and-trade bill, moved toward a government takeover of our health care system, and now Congress appears ready to support President Obama's request to dig ourselves even deeper into the mire of Afghanistan. Optimism over the election of a new President promising change has turned into despair as the American people are realizing what kind of changes being imposed on our country. It's going from bad to worse.

This week marks the beginning of the United Nations framework convention on climate change in Copenhagen. It started yesterday, December 7, Pearl Harbor Day. How very appropriate. President Obama and Democrat leaders of Congress are planning to attend.

This conference could well bind the American people to a series of international agreements that will be a boon to globalist bureaucracy, and, yes, their power-elite allies, while at the same time picking the pockets of the American taxpayer and shackling us to restrictions, mandates, and controls inconsistent with our free society and enforced by governing bodies we have never voted for.

According to the conference's Web site, the conference in Copenhagen is a turning point in the fight to prevent what they claim will be a climate disaster, and I quote. "The science demands it, the economics support it, future generations require it," proclaims the Web site.

Well, Madam Speaker, I am here to explain why that aggrandizing postulation is complete and utter nonsense, and to warn of the danger that lurks behind this high-sounding rhetoric. The Copenhagen conference is the culmination of efforts that began in earnest back in 1992. That was the year our "New World Order" President, George H. W. Bush, submitted the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change to the Senate. It was quickly adopted by a voice vote.

For the most part, that 1992 framework treaty was filled with grandiose yet vague principles. It asked for long-term CO<sub>2</sub> reductions from the 192 nations which signed that contract, yet few of the obligations were spelled out,

and there was no enforcement or penalties written into that treaty. It stated objectives, and that was step number one.

Step two came in 1997 when the Kyoto Protocol established enforceable mandates, mandates stating those objectives that were started in the earlier network agreement that was sent on to the Senate by President Bush. The 1997 protocol was different than the earlier one because it had enforceable mandates to meet the objectives that were stated earlier. This clearly would have meant a fundamental altering of our economy, with a dramatic negative impact on the lives of our people. With the Republicans in control of the Senate at that time, President Clinton never submitted the Kyoto treaty for ratification.

Then in 2001 President George W. Bush said that we would not sign the Kyoto treaty due to the enormous cost and economic dislocation associated with complying with the Kyoto mandates, and that was the end of what would have been step number two.

Here we are at step number three, and while a Kyoto-like agreement is not likely, Copenhagen may well lay the foundations for the future that the globalists who are pushing this agenda envision for us, what they envision for the United States, U.S., us. The threat to us is there, and it is real.

A few months ago, H.R. 2454, the so-called cap-and-trade bill, passed the House and is now awaiting action in the Senate. That far-reaching legislation seeks to put in place taxes and regulatory policies that exactly parallel what the Copenhagen crowd would mandate and can be traced back to that same alliance between our domestic, radical environmentalists and a globalist elite.

This unholy alliance has already had an impact. It is no accident that for over the past 20 years America has built no hydroelectric dams, no nuclear power plants, no oil refineries and has brought into production a pitifully small amount of new domestic oil and gas.

□ 2000

In essence, our economy has been and is now being starved of traditional energy development. Even the much acclaimed solar energy alternative has been strangled in its cradle. The Federal Bureau of Land Management, which is unduly influenced by radical environmentalists, has prevented the building of solar-powered electric generating facilities in America's vast deserts. This supposedly to protect the habitat of lizards and insects, which are obviously more important to these elitist decision-makers than the quality of life of human beings. Our quality of life, us.

Again, the forces behind the undermining of America's domestic energy development know exactly what they're doing. Treaty obligations or not, they want to change our way of