

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 CO₂ 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

life to remake America whether we like it or not. This isn't about green power; it's about raw political power exercised over our lives.

A few decades ago, the globalist radical environmental alliance latched onto an apocalyptic theory to justify their power grab. The theory is that the world is dramatically heating up because of how we human beings live, especially us Americans. So controlling us must be the answer to saving the planet from heating up and up and up.

When they geared up their crusade, our planet was in one of its many warming cycles. But the illusion that they were trying to create began to disintegrate about 9 years ago when the Earth quit warming and now may be in a cooling cycle. Undaunted, the fanatic claims and their predictions of global warming have now been transformed into a new, all-encompassing warning. So "global warming" was the phrase that was yelled and screamed at us for almost a decade, but now that has miraculously been changed into "climate change."

Do they think that the American people are stupid? Do they think that we'll just forget about their predictions of rapid rises in temperatures and that those predictions have been proven 100 percent wrong?

Even the much-touted melting of the Arctic ice cap has reversed itself in the last 2 years and is now refreezing and enlarging. The warming has ended, but the power grab continues. What we now are finding out is exactly how ruthless and, yes, how deceitful this power grab has been. It is becoming ever more apparent that during the 1990s, many scientists who refused to go along with the global warming paradigm were denied research grants. Prominent scientists like Dr. William Gray, former president of the American Meteorological Association, found themselves repeatedly rejected for research grants despite their careers of distinguished research excellence and accomplishments.

The liberal press ignored those transgressions, ignored that repression of opposing views. Yet the same press made it a huge controversy when during the Bush administration NASA asked Richard Hansen, who was NASA's most vocal global warming activist staffer, simply to note when being published that the opinions that he was publishing were his opinions and not necessarily endorsed by NASA. Well, the press made that into a horrible attack on his rights.

This was censorship. There were hearings in Congress about that, simply asking this man to acknowledge that it was his opinions and not the official opinions of NASA. Well, how does that compare with the coverage and the outrage over outright repression and denial of research grants to prominent scientists? How does that compare with Vice President Gore's firing of Dr. William Happer as the lead scientist at

the Department of Energy? This because Happer was open minded on the issue of global warming. Not that he opposed it, but that he was open minded about it. The double standard in the reporting of this issue has been appalling.

Zealots can usually find high-sounding excuses for their transgressions. This abusive attack on Happer and so many others, so many other prominent scientists, of course, was perpetrated in the name of protecting all of us from a climate calamity: man-made global warming that we were repeatedly warned was going to fry the planet.

We can still hear alarming claims of a disastrous upward jump in temperatures, rising sea levels, Arctic meltings, forest fires, hurricanes, acid seas, dying plants and animals. Every climate-related disaster that a Federal research grant can conjure up we're hearing about because that's how they get their government grants. That's how they qualify.

Professional figures in white coats with authoritative tones of voice and lots of credentials repeatedly dismissed specific criticism of what they were proposing by claiming that their so-called scientific findings had been peer reviewed, verified by other scientists. Rather than honestly discussing the issues that were being raised, they portrayed themselves as beyond reproach. They've been peer reviewed. So why even discuss any specific criticism? Just dismiss it.

They gave each other prizes as they selectively handed out research grants. Those who disagreed no matter how prominent were treated like non-entities, like they didn't exist, or they were personally disparaged, labeled deniers, you know, like Holocaust deniers. How much uglier can you get?

But such tactics won't work forever. It's clear their steamroller operation is beginning to fall apart. We know that, because we hear scientists who have been clamoring for subservient acceptance of their theory of man-made global warming, we now can find out and we now understand that those very same scientists, they themselves were making a sham out of scientific methodology and were indeed repressing dissent and destroying peer review.

I'm speaking, of course, about the over 1,000 emails and 3,000 other documents that were purloined from one of the foremost global warming research institutes in the world, the Climate Research Institute at East Anglia University in the United Kingdom. Let me acknowledge, yes, a hacker or possibly a whistleblower may have been responsible for making this information public, but contrary to the frantic attempt to distract attention away from the clear wrongdoing and arrogance that was exposed in these communications, contrary to that, how those documents were obtained is not what's relevant. It's the truth of these emails that counts, not how the information was obtained.

What do these formerly private and now exposed communications say? One email is from Kevin Trenberth, head of the Climate Analysis Section at the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colorado. In it he describes his utter frustration with studies that reach conclusions contrary to his clique's predictions of a looming global warming disaster. Even more frustrating, the temperatures being recorded, contrary to his august observations and predictions, contrary to them, things were getting colder, much colder than usual.

And here, folks, is the clincher: Trenberth laments in this email, in this formerly secret communication, "The fact is we can't account for the lack of warming at the moment, and it is a travesty that we can't." Rather than reconsidering his position, he is complaining. He can't find a cover thick enough to hide his errors.

So what do you do if those gosh darn numbers show that there is no warming? Well, you fudge the numbers of course. There is a 1999 email from Phil Jones, the center's director, talking about a "trick" in the presentation of data intended "to hide the decline." What does "decline" mean when he says "hide the decline"? A decline in global temperatures, of course. These people who are touting global warming are talking about hiding the decline in temperatures that would prove that there is no global warming going on at this time.

To those who have followed this issue closely, this is nothing new. We have seen it before. There was a famous graph produced by Michael Mann, one of the most prominent global warming advocates. His famous graph, as well as his highly touted lectures, deleted the existence of a warming period in the Middle Ages and the 500-year decline in the Earth's temperature, which ended in about 1850, known as the Little Ice Age. Those very real temperature cycles were left out of his graphs. And many of the newly revealed emails detail that this was intentional deception.

Mann's graph indicated centuries-long stability instead of two distinct climate cycles going up and down. And then after presenting a graph that just had centuries-long stability, then we were shown a jump in temperature that looked like a hockey stick, the end of a hockey stick. Stability and then a big jump forward. That graph was a fake, and the jump in temperature he predicted didn't happen.

So now the climate elite has simply deleted the hockey stick graph from their presentation even though it was a distinct part of their presentation for years, just as Mann had deleted the preceding warming and cooling cycles when he analyzed modern temperature trends and put them into his graph.

As more honest and level-headed scientists from around the world raised serious questions, well-funded global warming alarmists were hard pressed

to answer critics. So what is a true believer to do when you hear criticism? Well, shut up the opposition of course. No, don't consider what the opposition is saying. Don't try to have an honest dialogue. No, shut them up.

Here's Phil Jones again, this time about censoring criticism: "I can't see either of these papers being in the next IPCC report."

Let's stop right there. So here he is trying to leave out of the IPCC report papers that were contrary in view; yet they tout over and over again that the IPCC is the basis for their credibility. It's all the time talking about the IPCC report. Yet here we have a quote talking about how they're trying to censor what goes into that report.

Quoting further: "Kevin and I will keep them out," meaning this information out of the IPCC report, "even if we have to redefine what the peer-review literature is." And these are the same people who were proclaiming that their credibility came from the IPCC and peer-reviewed research.

Well, let's look at what happened next when an editor of an academic journal does not buckle under to this kind of pressure and actually publishes the work of a skeptical scientist. Here's what Jones says: "I will be emailing the journal to tell them I'm having nothing more to do with it until they rid themselves of this troublesome editor." This guy is conspiring to get the editor of a research publication fired. And what was it for? For publishing a contrary review.

Is this science? These emails are filled not with answering critics but with the effort to stifle the right to question what these people were advocating.

Significantly, man-made global warming alarmists have continually countered criticism by arrogantly dismissing tangible questions and asserting that peer reviews backed them up. Well, now we can see the evidence that these self-righteous snobs who saw themselves as above criticism were manipulating, if not destroying, the peer review process so no one with other points of view could actually participate. Get that?

□ 2015

They say you can't question our material because ours has been peer reviewed and your criticisms haven't, but they themselves were undermining the ability of those critics to have their criticisms published in a peer-reviewed publication. Have they no shame? But there's more than this.

Jones again, this time to Professor Michael Mann of Pennsylvania State University, the same guy with the phony hockey-stick graph, is talking about hiding information from critics:

"If they ever hear there is a freedom of information act now in the U.K., I think I'll delete the file rather than sending it to anyone."

Let's read that again:

"I think I'll delete the file rather than sending it to anyone."

Madam Speaker, this is not only arrogant, it's criminal. We have been and continue to be the victims of outright lies, and victims of an effort to focus our people on some kind of created and mythical scientific findings in order to scare and force our people into accepting draconian economic and regulatory policies.

Senator JAMES INHOFE of Oklahoma has called for an investigation in the Senate. There should be one in the House as well. Certain scientists receiving Federal research grants are betraying the standards of their own profession. And, yes, as I say, perhaps breaking the law. Countless numbers of our own people will suffer job losses and a decline in their standard of living if policies based on phony science, bad practices, the suppression of dissent and outright lies are put in place and enforced. Before any action is taken by this Congress on cap and trade legislation, a full inquiry into this horrific abuse of science should be conducted.

Wake up, America. They are trying to steal our freedom with lies and scare tactics. The Good Book says, "The truth shall set you free." A caveat might be, "And a lie can destroy your freedom." Perhaps the most perplexing of all, the global warming elite continues to herald their projections of man-made gloom and doom. They try to ignore the uproar that we've had with these emails. They ignore it, or they just change the subject. But this recent revelation of these emails seriously calls into question the basic science that these man-made global warming fanatics claim to be irrefutable. Well, let's look at this so-called "irrefutable science" that is the basis of the man-made global warming advocates.

I in fact—and I would make this very clear at this moment—would challenge any Member of Congress to come here and debate me in the future on the science of this issue. Let me make that clear. This Congressman, I am a senior member of the Science Committee, I challenge any of the advocates of man-made global warming to come here and debate me on the science of the issue. We shouldn't be dismissing our opposition's arguments any more than those scientists should have been. We are here to make policy and to determine truth. Let's have an honest debate on this.

First, let's talk about the so-called global warming cycle that's being used as an excuse, or as a reason to look at human activity, the global warming cycle that's being caused by human activity. That's fundamental to this whole issue. We know that there have been weather and climate cycles throughout the long history of our planet. That's going back to prehistoric times. There has been cycle after cycle. One of the more recent of these cycles, the one ignored by Dr. Michael Mann, a cooling cycle that reduced temperatures on this planet for 500 years. That was between 1300 and

about 1850. It's called the Little Ice Age. Amazingly, with a straight face, the global warming alarmists are using the low point in a 500-year cooling cycle as the baseline for determining if humankind is making the planet hotter at this time. Get that. We should declare an emergency because, according to the alarmists, the Earth is a tiny bit, perhaps 1 degree warmer than it was at the bottom of a 500-year decline in temperature. Professor Mann can't wipe that out. He may try to delete it from his graphs and pretend it didn't happen, but this has been well documented. I remember there was a History Channel report going through the entire time of this mini Ice Age.

Our current climate cycle is no different than the other numerous cycles that preceded it. It is dishonest to create hysteria by using the end of a cycle known as the Little Ice Age at a 500-year low in the Earth's temperatures as a baseline for apocalyptic claims that it is now getting extraordinarily warmer. On top of that, as people, the alarmists are claiming that it's our fault. It's the people's fault. It's us. We're the bad guys. We're the ones making the climate go up so much warmer than it normally is and they're using as a baseline a 500-year low in the Earth's temperatures.

So science question challenge No. 1: Are man-made global warming advocates using an unrealistically and unreasonably cooler moment as the baseline for their analysis? Question No. 2: What are the causes of the climate cycles that we've been talking about? The alarmists claim it's us. It's people. There were such cycles, of course, in the Earth's temperatures and climate even before prehistoric man existed. If there were such cycles, then there must be some explanation other than human activity, because this was before humans existed, there must be some other explanation for the weather and temperature trends of those days.

Well, then what is the other explanation? Many scientists believe cycles of climate have resulted from solar activity. After all, the sun is the biggest source of energy on our planet. The biggest. Everything else pales in comparison. Some of the revealed emails are specifically aimed at debunking this explanation by altering graphs and distorting data. The solar explanation is consistent with the fact that climate cycles on Earth parallel cycles taking place on other planetary bodies. That's right; like Mars, or the moons of Jupiter which have similar and simultaneous cycles to those on our Earth. But the global warming gang is intent on blaming us.

In recent years, for example, human activity has been declared the culprit causing the melting of the Arctic ice cap. Who hasn't seen pictures of sad-looking polar bears stranded there on an ice floe, obviously a victim of man-made global warming? Such nonsense plays on our emotions, but it is presenting a distorted and dishonest picture of reality. Yes, until recently the

Arctic ice cap has been retreating. There is no doubt about that. But what about the ice cap on Mars? Yes, at the same time our Earth's ice cap was retreating, the ice cap on Mars was retreating; mirroring, paralleling what was going on on Earth. Does that indicate that the cycle that we're talking about might have been caused by the sun and not by too many people driving SUVs or using modern technology? So maybe it's the sun that has affected the habitat of the polar bears, just as other cycles have affected the habitat of the plants and animals living in the time when those cycles kicked in.

By the way, there's something to keep in mind when one hears for the umpteenth time that the polar bears are becoming extinct. The polar bears are not becoming extinct. In fact, the number of polar bears on this planet has dramatically expanded. There are four to five times the number of polar bears in the world today than there were in the 1960s. And I have spoken before groups of students and they have been given this lie over and over again and they are crestfallen to hear that maybe what they've been told are lies. Yes, lies. The extinction of the polar bear is about as real as the film footage of dissipating ice caps in former Vice President Gore's movie *An Inconvenient Truth*. That, too, was a scam. A special effect made of Styrofoam was presented to us, especially to our impressionable children, to create the illusion that this was documenting the melting and breaking off of the Arctic ice cap. It was Styrofoam. Styrofoam. It was phony, just as many of the arguments presented in that movie were phony; were false.

So here's another scientific challenge, challenge No. 2: If there have been many other cycles and if the ice cap is melting on Mars just as it is here, how can this climate cycle be a result of human activity rather than solar activity? Which brings us to the theory of just what man does that supposedly creates global warming. Well, this allegation is based on the well-promoted theory that greenhouse gases—and according to the alarmists CO₂ is by far the worst culprit—these greenhouse gases and, thus, CO₂, the worst one of all, are trapping heat in the atmosphere and the increase of CO₂ levels is thus leading to a disastrous jump in the Earth's temperature.

So let's look at this theory. I don't dismiss it. Let's look at it. Let's answer it. I wish the American people and the rest of us were paid an equal amount of respect by those people, the alarmists, who are advocating the man-made global warming theory. So let's look at this. Let's look at their theory now and give it an honest look. With all the hoopla about CO₂, nonscientists might believe that it is a huge part of the atmosphere. I want everyone here, my colleagues and everyone listening, to ask themselves: What percentage do you think that CO₂ is of the atmosphere? Well, most people think

it's a huge part. Some people I've asked have actually suggested it was between maybe 40 and 60 percent of the atmosphere.

Well, that's wrong. Wrong. People have been given a false impression. CO₂, carbon dioxide, is a minuscule part of our atmosphere. And, as I say, most of the people I've talked to, even the highly educated ones, have thought that CO₂ makes up maybe 25, maybe 40, one guy even said 60 percent of the atmosphere. In reality, CO₂ is less than .04 percent of the atmosphere. So CO₂ is not even one-half of one-tenth of 1 percent of the atmosphere. Not even one-half of one-tenth of 1 percent. This is a minuscule part of the atmosphere that we have been led to believe is having this dramatic impact on weather patterns.

And where did the minuscule amount of this CO₂, even though it's as small as it is, one half of one-tenth of 1 percent of the atmosphere, where did that minuscule amount come from? With all the hoopla, one would assume that most of the atmosphere's CO₂ can be traced to human activity. No. At least 70 percent of the CO₂ in our atmosphere has a natural source and has nothing to do with human activity.

□ 2030

I have been in Science Committee hearings where very prominent scientists have suggested that it might be 80 or 90 percent of the CO₂ in the atmosphere coming from natural sources. But let's say, okay, at least 70 percent.

So the part of the atmosphere that is CO₂ generated by man is even less than minuscule. It is a minor part of a minuscule component, and if we suppress our standard of living enough to eliminate even one-tenth of man's contribution, then one big volcano, or maybe some forest fires could totally undo this supposed reduction in CO₂. And to get a 10 percent reduction means a dramatic attack on the standard of living of our people and the reallocation of trillions of dollars. We are to give up our own freedom and prosperity, and hand over such power as I have just mentioned to a global government or even to a centralized Federal Government here in the United States? All for that, for something for a step forward that could be erased by a big volcano or perhaps a series of forest fires? That's insane.

Well, undaunted, the alarmists point to increases in CO₂, which they label as alarming, of course. That's why they're alarmists; they call it alarming. Starting from such a minuscule level, however, it's like using a phony temperature baseline, like they did with the end of the mini ice age. But using that as their baseline, with the minuscule level of CO₂, this can distort the importance of, when someone says that there's been a rise in the amount of CO₂, because it's, to begin with, it's a very, very, minuscule amount or part of our atmosphere. So if there's an increase in that, it's not going to have

the same impact as what most people have led to believe, the people who believe that it's 40 percent of our atmosphere.

But this increase, of course, no matter, has been described to us in such sinister terms that we are supposed to believe that it is making the world hotter, and so it's mankind, by increasing CO₂, making the world hotter. When trying to pull this off, they don't mention that in recent times, CO₂ levels, yes, have increased, but contrary to the alarmists' theory, the Earth's temperatures have gone down. Remember, we are being told that the rise of CO₂, which is a minuscule part of our thing, but the rise of the CO₂ in our atmosphere is causing the atmosphere to warm. Again, there are clearly times when CO₂ has been going up but the temperature has gone down.

So science challenge number 3, if manmade CO₂, which is a minuscule part of a minuscule element of the atmosphere, if that causes warming, then why is it that when mankind has been emitting more and more CO₂, like in the 1940s, the fifties and the sixties, and at a time, at that same time when CO₂ levels in general were rising, why was there an actual cooling going on in our climate? This is true today, too. We have an increase in CO₂, but there's been a cooling going on, or at least there hasn't been a warming for the last 10 years. Remember, no matter how they've tried to hide it—and that attempt to hide it is very clear in the emails that have just been exposed. No matter how they try to hide it, global temperatures have not gone up for almost a decade.

It should be noted that scientific ice core specialists now tell us that historically, over a course of 500 years, CO₂ increases followed temperature increases. It would appear that when it gets warmer, the Earth produces more CO₂. The alarmists have it totally backwards, and they're using that as an excuse to dramatically increase their power to control our lives. It is a flawed theory. It is the warmer Earth that creates the CO₂ increase, not the other way around. But that would mean, of course, human beings, if they accept that it's the Earth and it's the warming of the Earth that creates more CO₂, that would mean that us human beings, that we're off the hook, and the globalists would have no excuse for their power grab and no excuse to control us, to tax us, and to regulate away our livelihood.

Well, it's not getting any warmer, and contrary to those trying to frighten us into giving up our freedom, CO₂ is not a threat to the planet and is not a pollutant. It is not harmful to human beings or animals. It is food for plants which then give us oxygen. Throughout the world, greenhouses, sometimes they're called hothouses, are growing vegetables by pumping CO₂ to feed the plants. And they end up, after pumping CO₂ into these hothouses, they end up with bigger, juicier tomatoes, berries, and other crops.

CO₂ is not a threat to human health or a threat to the planet. During ancient times, before human beings, there were much higher levels of CO₂ in the air, and life on this planet flourished. Even in the oceans, which were, yes, more acidic, ocean life was robust and abundant at that time. All of this makes the announcement yesterday that the EPA will treat CO₂ as a pollutant all the more astounding and, yes, repugnant. It is an example of the heavyhanded power grab we are up against.

By declaring CO₂ a pollutant, a threat to human health, they have empowered the EPA to issue orders, mandates, regulations, controls, and fines which will be put in place and enforced even without a vote of Congress, unelected officials declaring themselves as having this enormous power over us. This bypassing of the authority of Congress is a manifestation of tyranny. I don't care if they think that they are saving the world. This is tyranny. If there are changes in the law that are required by some climate theory, let us debate them, have an honest debate. Let's not impose this on the American people without having elected officials be held accountable for that decision. And, of course, we know now the theories that we're talking about are all based on the cooked books and phony science, which makes it all even worse.

So now on to challenge number 4, which focuses on the accuracy of the statistics being used to justify manmade global warming. Importantly, the alarmists who are raising all of this ruckus, they're doing it about less than 1 degree of an increase in the global temperature. So we hear all of this ruckus, but it's only increased, even by what they're claiming, less than 1 degree, or just about 1 degree over 150 years. So small inaccuracies can have huge implications to this process.

Well, an investigation has found accuracy problems with 80 percent of America's National Weather Service stations which collected the data here in the United States. And worse, our system, even with 80 percent of the stations not meeting reliable standards, we've been heralded as the best in the world.

But what about the statistics gathered in the rest of the world, in the developing countries and in other countries? What about the statistics that were gathered here and abroad 100 years ago or 150 years ago? Does anyone have faith in those figures? Remember, that's what was fed into the computer. Let's remember also, garbage in, garbage out is a truism when it comes to computers. The whole basis for this so-called irrefutable evidence of global warming rests on computer models that were based on data collected from faulty systems.

Perhaps just as troubling, the data fed into these computers is no longer available for reassessment. Yep, the data was deleted by the research insti-

tutes. Deleted, just like they talked about in these hacked emails. And a close reading of the recently exposed emails reveal that alterations were made in the raw data being fed into computers. They were called adjustments of the data. In short, they cooked the books, and that data is no longer available. It was deleted by the research institutes and can not be looked over again for accuracy. Oh, well, I guess we should just trust them.

Fortunately, the ground-based sensors that fed those infamous computer models are not the only source of temperature data. Information is also available from research and observation satellites and weather balloons, and, you guessed it, that source is in conflict with the ground-based data. Of course, no one is certain of that, because all of this we're talking about was the data before adjustments were made and before it was all deleted.

So how is this for a scientific challenge? Defend the scientific integrity of the manmade global warming data collection process. It's got more holes in it than a spaghetti strainer. And this manmade global warming theory is the greatest scam in history. This, of course, is only one of many scams designed to frighten us into draconian solutions for fictitious problems.

I remember when I was a kid, they said cranberries cause cancer. Two years later, after the cranberry industry was decimated, Oh, sorry, we made a mistake. Then you remember cyclamates were supposedly causing cancer. That cost the American industry hundreds of millions of dollars. It destroyed a sugar substitute which was perfectly fine, and it ended up getting America and perhaps the rest of the world hooked on high fructose corn syrup, only to be found out later on that cyclamates are not carcinogenic at all. And, in fact, Canada never banned them at all, and now its cyclamates are free to be consumed here in the United States.

Well, then we remember Dr. Meryl Streep, a prominent scientist and movie actress who warned us about Alar, only to find out that that was fictitious. We remember Three Mile Island and Jane Fonda, a presentation which stopped the building of nuclear power plants and made us even more dependent on foreign oil. So what did we do? We now depend more on oil and coal for our electricity because Jane Fonda created the impression that nuclear energy was not safe.

And then during the Reagan administration there was a furor about acid rain, which was presented to us, again with a phony baseline. They said that the lakes in the Northeast and everything were becoming more acidic, and they used as their baseline the time immediately in the years that were after a massive number of fires in that area turned those lakes into a base and, thus, the acidity was not the natural acidity that they normally were at. And they were going back to the

natural acidity. It was a phony baseline, and it totally distorted the so-called problem.

The topper of them all, many of the very same gang now agonizing over manmade global warming, they were the same people who were warning us with similar intensity about the coming ice age. And then, of course, we have to remember, there's a big price to pay for all of this, big price to pay for lies. Like, for example, the report that bird shells were thinning, which resulted in a global ban on DDT. Millions of children in the Third World have subsequently lost their lives to malaria because of that ban. Apparently, birds were more important to those who made policy than those millions of poor and struggling children in the Third World who lost their lives to malaria, a disease that we had controlled before we banned DDT.

The cap-and-trade bill, rammed through the House by deceit and alarmist propaganda, awaits the U.S. Senate. If it becomes law, as I said on the floor, the debate, our economy will go to hell and our jobs will go to China. And yes, it will affect all of us big time. And that's what this is all about, changing our lives big time.

What are some of the long-term changes these steely-eyed fanatics behind cap-and-trade and global warming and behind the Copenhagen gathering want to make in our lives? It's a long run, but here's some of the things they want.

They want gas to at least double in price, probably triple, maybe more. Parking prices need to go up. Parking permits need to go way up. Air travel will be out of reach for ordinary people by elimination of frequent flier miles and discount tickets and simply dramatically raising the price of airplane tickets. Only the rich and powerful in their private jets and limousines will be free to travel as they please.

Yes, and there will be restrictions on our diet. Embedded in the manmade global warming movement is a contingent of power freaks who want to restrict our meat consumption by limiting production. This is based on the idea that methane from cow flatulence threatens the stability of the planet's climate. This is insane. So hamburgers are out, much less backyard barbecues.

The prices of electricity, just like every energy source, would be pushed sky high, as will the price of almost everything that we consume because everything manufactured or farmed depends on energy. The goal is to put limits on human activity, especially human consumption. To these fanatics, anything used or consumed that is not essential is a waste of resources.

□ 2045

Ronald Reagan used to say about this crowd, They won't be satisfied until we're all living in a bird's nest.

So why is Congress on the verge of passing this monstrous legislation which will bolster the competitiveness

of China and India while undercutting our own economy and our way of life? This is a product of a radical environmentalist-globalist coalition. They want to build a whole new world based on benevolent control by people like themselves. They have a vision of a harmonious and balanced world, and they don't mind scaring us into accepting it or imposing it upon us.

And that is where the real threat comes in. This is not just the EPA pushing democracy aside to centralize power and controls in Washington, D.C., which is, in and of itself, contrary to what America is supposed to be all about. This is about centralizing power into the hands of global government. That is what Kyoto and Copenhagen are all about. That's what the radical environmentalist and globalist alliance is all about.

Wake up, America. We still have time to turn this around. We must fight the globalist clique that is trying to shackle future generations of Americans to a burden of economy-killing debt. They are chains that will be hard to break, but we must have the strength and the commitment to do so.

We will not give up our freedom, and we are not powerless. We will stand together, Americans of every race and religion, of every ethnic group and social status. We will fight as united patriots, and we will win. Members of Congress need to hear from angry constituents, and I predict they will.

Yes, we need to overcome this power grab. We need to overcome this alliance between radical environmentalists and the globalists. But most of all, in order to win, we need to overcome apathy among the American people. It is when the American people rise up in a righteous rage that our freedom will be secure. This is a power grab that is aimed at destroying our freedom.

Wake up, America. We should not be giving more power to United Nation panels or anybody else or any other institution internationally that is composed of governments that are controlled by gangsters and thugs that we would never dream of electing here in the United States, countries that don't have any freedom of press. We're going to give authority to enforce environmental laws and rules that we've never voted on to bodies like that? Or we're going to go along with the EPA and push the Congress aside and elected officials aside and let that be imposed upon us by people who have never been elected to anything? No. We must stand up and defeat this power grab.

Wake up, America. Your freedom and prosperity are at stake.

I have three children at home: little Christian, Anika and Tristan. We owe it to them and the children of this country to pass on freedom and opportunity that has been passed on to us. The sacrifice, the sacrifice of generations of Americans to provide us the democracy that we have, the democratic way of fighting these battles that we have. We will not see that destroyed.

We will instead use the democratic process in this fight and hold true to the principles, and what was passed on to us by generations of Americans, and we will also be true to future generations of Americans. But now it's up to us. If we don't act, this conspiracy of lies, of distortions in the scientific community coupled with an alliance with a globalist who would centralize power in global government. No. We must defeat them, or we will not be living up to our responsibility, not living up to what we should be asked to do as Americans, and that is to pass on this freedom.

We are united patriots, and we will win.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2322

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) at 11 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3288, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. OLVER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 3288) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes:

[Book II of the House portion of the RECORD containing the Conference Report on H.R. 3288, dated December 8, 2009, will be published at a later date.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today until 3 p.m. on account of travel.

Mr. REICHERT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of supporting the law enforcement community and the families of four fallen officers from the Lakewood Police Department at a memorial service in Tacoma.

Mr. ARCURI (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of official business in district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEFAZIO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DICKS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SESTAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MASSA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. AKIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, December 10 and 11.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, December 15.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, December 15.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, December 14 and 15.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OLSON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KUCINICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1422. To amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to clarify the eligibility requirements with respect to airline flight crews.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OLVER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 9, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4916. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Whistleblower Protections for Contractor Employees (DFARS Case 2008-D012) (RIN: 0750-AG09) received November 12, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4917. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of