

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Well, reclaiming my time, and I think you're absolutely right, that the only way to solve the cost overruns, which would no doubt occur—and I do believe, as our friend from California suggested, that if the government was running the whole show, and eventually if we approve this government default plan, that's just a giant step, and it's just a baby step toward a single-payer system. And when you get into that situation, I can almost assure you, Madam Speaker, that under current leadership, you would have any and all, come one come all, just like they did in Tennessee. And Dr. ROE was describing the TennCare program and the problems they ran into.

□ 2250

And then the only way you could pay for it, as he points out, would be to start cutting reimbursement to the providers, to the health care providers, to the physicians, to those primary care docs that we so desperately need to be focusing and to be running our medical homes and to make sure that people are taking their medication, that there's an emphasis on wellness and keeping people healthy, keeping them out of the doctor's office, keeping them out of the emergency room, out of the hospital, and toward the end of life hopefully out of the nursing homes and in their own homes. That's why I think it's a mistake to even go in that direction of government-run health care.

I clearly feel, and I know my colleagues on the floor tonight agree with me, Madam Speaker, that the private marketplace works. And my two colleagues that are with me tonight weren't in the House back in 2003, but I know they were following the debate very carefully and very closely and maybe even felt that Medicare part D was something that we couldn't afford. Certainly it added cost, if you crunch the numbers statically, to the Medicare annual payments, Medicare part D did. But in the long run, in the long run, because of that program, if they can afford to take their medications for some of these diseases that I mentioned earlier, high blood pressure, high cholesterol, diabetes, and keep these things under control, then clearly what happens is you shift costs from part A, the hospital part of Medicare, and from part B, the doctor part, the surgeon part, the amputation part, the renal transplant part, and then also in part D keeping folks from having a massive stroke hopefully by controlling their blood pressure and you spend less on the skilled nursing home part. So I think that's a pretty good bargain and a pretty compassionate way of approaching things.

But our Democrat colleagues, Madam Speaker, who were in the minority at the time, stood up here and they symbolically, some of them, tore up their AARP cards because that senior organization had the audacity to support a

Republican bill. And then, of course, they said, well, why can't we have a government default plan and why can't the government come in and set the price and say, okay, this is the price, this is the monthly premium for part D, the prescription drug part, and these free market thieves will not be able to run up the price? And they even suggested, Madam Speaker, that we set that monthly premium at \$42 a month. Fortunately, my colleagues, that amendment was defeated. And when the premiums first came in from the prescription drug plans, the private plans competing with one another for this business, they came in at an average of \$24 a month. Now, 3 years later, that has gone up a little bit because of inflation, but it's nowhere near \$42 a month.

So if we don't learn from our history, we are going to repeat those same old mistakes. And it looks like the Democrats, with this idea of letting the government come in and run everything and saying that we can't trust the free market, I guess that's what they want to do with General Motors as well, and I'm very anxious to see how that one turns out.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Good points about the private versus the public sector. The private sector will always be more efficient and more responsive. And you have heard this story before, but when I began practice and when you did, Dr. GINGREY and Dr. FLEMING also, when a patient came to me, and I took care of nothing but women, and when they came to me with breast cancer—which I unfortunately saw way too much of and our practice diagnosed about a case a week. It was that common or is that common.

And we just had a relay this weekend. In 1977 or so, the 5-year survival rate was about 50 percent, maybe a little bit better, but about 50 percent. And the big argument came: Do you do a disfiguring operation of a radical mastectomy or a lumpectomy? Because the survival rates were the same. So what has happened over that time is that now a patient can come to you or me or any of our colleagues and we can tell them that because of early detection, because of education, because of mammography, you're going to have a 98 percent survival rate in new medications. That is a wonderful story to tell. And I know no matter how tough the times are for that patient, you can look at them and say, You're going to be okay.

In the English system, they quit doing routine mammography. And why did they quit doing that? Screening mammograms aren't done anymore. Why? Well, because it costs more than the biopsies. Sometimes a test will tell us we have something when we don't have it. That's called a false positive. And the phone call that I love to make

is to my patients to say, You do not have cancer. So this is one where they quit doing that because the cost of the biopsies was more than the screening. The best rates they had were 78 percent survivals, and those are going to go down if you use that technique.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will allow me, as we get very close to that bewitching hour of 11 o'clock, my southern drawl had better get a little faster than a drawl. But my mom, Helen Gingrey, who lives in Aiken, South Carolina, in a retirement community, a great community, Kalmia Landing, my mom had her 91st birthday on February 8 of this year. Well, when she was 90, about 5 or 6 months ago, 6 or 8 months ago, she had a knee replacement. And Mom had gotten to the point, Madam Speaker, where she could barely walk, in constant pain, on the verge of falling and breaking her hip at any moment. And now she is enjoying life and enjoying being with her friends, and maybe she's going to live another 10 or 15 years. I don't know. She seems to have the Methuselah gene. But do you think in Canada or the U.K. or one of these countries where they ration care that she would have had an opportunity to have that knee replacement? The answer we all know, Madam Speaker, is absolutely not.

I would say in closing, the one thing I would like to see is the equal tax treatment of the health care benefit for individuals who have to go out and buy them in the market on their own. They don't get it from their employer. Why should they not get a tax advantage health care plan just like everybody else? And you know what, Madam Speaker? I have not heard the Democrats in the House, the Democrats in the Senate, or President Obama talk about that. And talk about fairness and wanting to be equitable, let's hear some more about that. We will talk about it in future Special Orders.

I want to thank my colleagues Dr. ROE, Dr. FLEMING, and my good friend from California, Representative DANA ROHRABACHER, for being with me during this hour.

□ 2300

THE BIGGEST POWER GRAB IN HISTORY

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker, a thought came across me about 2 days ago. I was out on the water, surfing off of San Clemente, California. I was sitting there on my surfboard. The pelicans and the birds were jumping into the water and carrying fish out of the water, and the dolphins were swimming by. It was just a beautiful day. I

couldn't help but remember that many years ago when I was a young reporter, one of my first assignments was to cover a speech being given by Jacques Cousteau. He was a hero to me at that time, and I really relished the idea of going out and being able to interview him after a speech he was giving at UCLA. I got to the speech, and I found that Mr. Cousteau was being very pessimistic about the future of the oceans, and he was telling the kids there was no future in the ocean, that 10 years from now—this was in the early 1970s he was saying this—there would be no life in the ocean. "The oceans will be black, lifeless masses, black goo." I felt that it was a bit pessimistic; and when I had my chance to interview him afterwards, I turned on my tape recorder and introduced myself. He was ready for the interview. I said, Aren't there also some optimistic sides about the ocean, that perhaps we will someday be able to farm them, like with shellfish and regular fish perhaps, being able to ranch them, you might say, in the ocean? And that might be a great source of protein for the whole world that we would then have under better control. He came right up to me, and all these students were watching, and he put his face right up next to my nose, and he said, Didn't you hear me? The oceans will be dead in 10 years. Black goo. Dead.

I'll never forget that. I mean, that was something that was really pounded right into my memory because his nose was almost touching my nose. I could smell the garlic on his French breath, and I will tell you that it was an experience. I thought about that just 2 days ago while I was surfing. The fish were jumping, and the porpoises were swimming, and the pelicans were landing and picking up the fish in the water, the oceans totally alive, and I am totally alive and very grateful to have the oceans that we have. Obviously Mr. Cousteau was wrong. I can't tell you today whether he was lying or intentionally misinforming those students, but he was dead wrong.

Now students come to visit me a lot. I've been in Congress now over 20 years, and I try to see every student that comes from my district. I try to see them; and I talk to them, giving them a chance to ask me questions. But I always ask them a question too. So my students from Southern California, young high school students, I always ask them, Is the air in our congressional district, in our area of Southern California, is it cleaner or dirtier than it was 45 years ago when I went to high school in this very same area? And almost 90 percent of the students adamantly insist that the air back then was so much cleaner: Oh, you're so lucky to have lived in an age in Southern California where the air was so clean, and now it's so dirty and all of us are destined to die and to be infected with this pollution in our lungs.

Well, the fact is, that is dead wrong as well. Someone continues to mis-

inform our young people, perhaps for political reasons, whatever. But the fact is, when I tell them that they are 180 degrees wrong, that, in fact, the air is so much cleaner now that there's almost no comparison to what it was when I was a young person in high school, they are incredulous. Many of them don't believe me when I say that. But they know afterwards when they check up on it that they have been lied to.

Well, whatever the reason, whatever the motive behind this misinformation that's being provided to young people, whether it was Jacques Cousteau or whether it's the educational establishment or if it is any of the other people we're talking about who have ties to the radical environmental movement, whatever the reason they are misinforming our students, it's not just the students. It's our general population as well.

For decades, phony, frightening predictions, false climate assumptions and inaccurate information fed into computer climate models have been foisted on the American people, including our young people, and people throughout the world. Even worse, honest discussion on these issues of climate have been stifled, and critics have been silenced in order to create an illusion of a consensus that the climate is going haywire and that we're in for a global warming calamity. So why is this? Why do we have this specter of man-made global warming being portrayed as a global calamity in the making? Well, it's being used to stampede the public and, yes, stampede officials into accepting what appears to be the biggest power grab in history. One doesn't have to be a conspiracy nut to realize there are a significant number of people who really believe in centralizing the power of government into the hands of elected and even unelected officials, centralizing that power in Washington and elsewhere. And these unelected officials, who now will be given so much power, are expected to be competent and expected to be well motivated. They are expected to prove that by doing the things that are consistent with the goals and the values of the people who are pushing to centralize power in their hands.

That we have a group of leftists who believe in centralizing power should not surprise anyone. But what we have here is the leftist politicians in this country who believe in centralizing power anyway have been willing to go along and exaggerate and, yes, play fast and loose with the facts in order to promote this notion of man-made global warming. But we didn't expect these people who have a motive of trying to centralize power, or whatever the motive is of these alarmists in the radical environmental movement, we didn't expect them to act any other way. But we need to ask ourselves, why did it take prominent members of the science community so long to step forward to be counted in the face of this massive, heavy-handed campaign of deceit?

Well, I trace the reluctance of our scientists to step up back to the abrupt dismissal of Dr. William Happer, who was then the top scientist at the Department of Energy back in 1993. Happer was too professional, too objective for what Vice President Gore had in mind. So off with his head. Immediately that was one of the first actions taken when the Clinton administration took power. Out the door with Dr. Happer. This man, this prominent and very well-respected Ph.D., his dismissal in that way was a message to the science community: If you want a grant, you toe the line. And what followed was a one-sided drum beat, one-sided promotions, one-sided research grants, and one-sided thinking. Those were the order of the day for the 8 years of the Clinton presidency. The media bias, which of course went along with that, played hand in glove, has never let up with that bias. We just had a major conference here in Washington with hundreds of prominent individuals, many of whom are great scientists, Ph.D.'s, and heads of major university science departments. Yet that conference, which was skeptical of man-made global warming, didn't get any publicity. Very, very few news articles came out of this. Yet these were very prominent and important people.

This kind of repressive atmosphere where the press doesn't report that and that we had years and years where people were not being able to get grants unless they toed the line that Vice President Gore wanted, in this repressive atmosphere, many leaders of the scientific community just remained silent. They sort of became turtles. They tucked their heads in and figured they'd hunker down and live through it. But the ignoring of a campaign of deceit that was utilizing the prestige of the science community has taken its toll, and it's taken a long time to get these scientists out of their shell and to step forward with integrity, as is expected of the men and women of science.

So here we are on the edge—laws, taxation, controls, regulation, mandates are about to be enacted; and we've had 15 years of stifled debate. Even my GOP colleagues are afraid to take on the phony science that is at the heart of the man-made global warming propaganda juggernaut. Again, these people in the GOP, they oppose this theory; but they just want to say that what is being proposed by the Democrats will cost too much and will have too little impact on climate or temperature for it to justify this huge cost. Well, they're right. What's being proposed will have a huge cost and very little impact; but if, indeed, we are facing a global warming calamity that's being caused by human activity, the costs shouldn't matter.

□ 2310

So I have to argue that principle and basic science is the important element of the discussion of the manmade global warming theory and the laws and

regulations and controls and taxation that we are now on the verge of passing here in Washington, D.C.

The bottom line is that the science behind the manmade global warming proposals in Congress and the draconian laws which will follow are based on faulty science. The science is wrong. What has been presented to us by Vice President Gore and the radical environmental community and liberal leftists who want to centralize power in government, the facts that they have presented us have not been accurate. This has either been an intent to deceive, or perhaps just a benevolent intent to save the world.

So it is not just a cost analysis of current legislative proposals that show that the proposals claiming to thwart manmade global warming would obliterate jobs. We know that.

All these proposals that say, well, we are going to try to thwart global warming that way or this way, or this regulation, this taxation, this requirement of cap-and-trade, we have had major economists warn these things will destroy the American economy. But if they claim it is about saving the planet, people are going to listen to them.

But it will destroy the economy, and the irony of it is, this will have nothing to do with saving the planet, but will in fact perhaps make the environment of our planet worse, rather than better. That is why they have tried to stifle the debate.

The real scientific justification for their power grab is science, and an honest discussion of that science will show that the science being presented to justify this power grab is at best inaccurate, and, at worst, a total lie.

You have all heard it, and everyone knows about this. People in Washington, we don't need to be told that there has been an attempt to stifle debate. But I would ask that the American people think about what they have heard about the manmade global warming theory over these 15 years, but especially over these last 4 years.

How many have heard the words "case closed?" Isn't it ironic that all of a sudden everybody started using the words "case closed?" What does that mean? That means no more debate. The words "case closed" was a clumsy, and, I might add, a heavyhanded attempt to shut off discussion even before we had a chance to have an honest discussion of the issues. Because, as I said, the scientists in the 8 years beforehand had been denied research grants unless they were wanting to toe the line on global warming. How many have heard "case closed?" We all have.

When Mr. Gore speaks about global warming, he never takes questions. Why would it be that someone who believes in something so adamantly refuses to debate the issue on TV and refuses to take questions? I have certainly a lot less invested in this issue than Vice President Gore. I give speeches and always take questions,

and I have certainly been willing to debate this issue in public and on television.

So why do we hear the words "cased closed," stifling debate, and Mr. Gore, one of the prime advocates of this issue, not willing to take questions? Why is it that people who have, you know, skepticism about manmade global warming, why is it that they complain, like Robert Gray, former chairman of the American Meteorological Association? Why do we hear from them that they were turned down for grant applications so many times? Why do we hear that from a man who mentioned that he had received 13 such research grants prior, prior, to the Clinton administration, and then been totally cut off?

Doesn't that say something, when someone of that caliber, a Ph.D., the president of the Meteorological Association, can't get a grant to study the frequencies of hurricanes? And even today this man points out contradictory information. His view is—a man with decades of experience and credentials, Ph.D.'s and credentials in meteorology, says no, the idea that mankind's human actions is causing hurricanes is false, and there is no evidence of that.

Well, and then what else do we hear? We hear name-calling. I was on a television show recently where they called me a troglodyte, I guess troglodyte, that is the word, that I am anti-science, and I am bigoted in some way. I kept presenting scientific arguments about manmade global warming, but all I got back was name-calling.

Case closed. We are not going to answer any questions. No grants for skeptics. And, yes, anybody who disagrees with us is a low-life who doesn't believe in science. Yes, you don't believe in science.

Can you imagine moving forward to have an honest discussion about manmade global warming and being dismissed before you get to the discussion as being anti-science, and then after insisting on four or five issues on science, not having those arguments even answered, but instead having my religion questioned?

Well, dismissing rather than answering legitimate challenges to the manmade global warming theory is par for the course. This is standard operating procedure. Case closed, standard operating procedure. No questions, standard operating procedure. No grants for skeptics, standard operating procedure.

These people have been trying their best to basically steamroll over anyone who would get in their way without having to have the honest discussion of an issue of this magnitude. All of it is simply a Herculean effort not to discuss the scientific assumptions that are at the basis of the manmade global warming concept.

So what is that all about? Why are they not willing to discuss the science? All it is about is not discussing the science, shutting down anybody else

with any other ideas without combating the ideas.

Well, the reason why they have tried so hard to have "case closed" and all of these things that I have just mentioned, it is because their basic theory, the science theory behind manmade global warming is wrong. It is dead wrong, and that is why they won't discuss it. And if they won't discuss it, we can discuss it.

I would suggest that if there is anyone in this Congress who would like to debate me on this issue for an hour sometime between now and the time this Congress has to vote on cap-and-trade legislation, I will gladly meet them for an hour and discuss this issue.

So let's start discussing it tonight, and then maybe sometime in the next few weeks someone from the other side will take advantage of that offer to have an honest discussion with me and with the public about this issue. If it is so important, let's have an open and honest discussion. So let's look at some of the real science-based challenges to the predictions of an oncoming manmade global warming calamity.

Okay. In briefing after briefing—I am a senior member of the Science Committee—and over the years in briefing after briefing on global warming, I couldn't help but notice that the charts that showed that we have increased the temperature of the planet by 1 degree, here is the chart, it is going up like this, I couldn't help but notice where they started, down here. And down there was 1850.

1850 is actually the line, the baseline that is used for temperature comparisons by the global warming community, by the people who believe in manmade global warming. But 1850 has some significance. 1850, in that era, those few years there, that was the end of the little ice age. That was the end of a 500-year decline in world temperatures.

Okay, so why is it that people who want us to be concerned about a 1 degree temperature increase are making the baseline of comparison the bottom of a 500-year decline? Well, if it is at the bottom of a 500-year decline, if it is that low point they are comparing it to, what is all the hysteria about if we are talking about a 1 degree rise in temperature? What is that all about, or even a 2 degree rise in temperature?

The fact is we know that there have been weather cycles and climate cycles throughout the history of the world. They are now trying to use a low point of a cooling cycle to compare it to say we should be upset when there is even a 1 degree change.

What about those other weather cycles? Number one, let's ask, how can you use that as a baseline? Number two, what about the other weather cycles and that weather cycle? How about the weather cycle that went down for 500 years?

The fact is that over 500 years ago, actually 1,000 years ago, the weather

was very warm. It was a lot warmer than it is today, a lot warmer than the 1 degree that we have.

□ 2320

The fact is, there were big areas of Greenland that were green. They actually had agriculture and a green part of that area. Iceland was an area that had plants and crops. Vineland, which the Vikings said, people thought, well, they were claiming that there were vines there but there really weren't. No, the temperature was different. It was warmer 1,000 years ago.

So there have been numerous weather cycles that have had nothing to do with human activity, unless you believe that the Vikings, of course, there was something that they were doing that was changing the weather. And, if there was a warming cycle, and again, if we've had a warming cycle since that time, it's only been 1 degree.

But these past climate cycles, there's one thing that we have to try to pick up. Why is it then that we've had these cycles? Why is it then, and why is this cycle we are claiming which is a 1 degree rise in temperature from a 500-year low, why is this different? Why are we trying to change the rules of the game and centralize power and look at this as some sort of crisis when it's just another cycle? And why, what is causing the cycle then?

Well, it seems that cycles of climate follow solar activity. The cycles we've had before mankind even emerged can be traced back through ice cores to solar activity. Now, we've seen it here on Earth and we've seen it on other planets.

Let's note this. When I was in this debate the other night, a Member of Congress, a good friend, went on about how horrible it was, of course we're having manmade global warming. Look what's happening in the Arctic. In the Arctic, the polar bears are being destroyed. Well, of course that's not true. There's a polar bear explosion in terms of their population. There are two types of polar bears that are losing, that are not able to keep up with the changes in the climate there. But most other polar bears, because it's warmer, actually are living better than they were before, and the population of polar bears is going up. How ironic that we end up putting them on an endangered species list at a time when their numbers are increasing.

But let's get back to the central point. Something's going on in the Arctic. And my friend and colleague is saying, oh, how horrible it is and going into great detail to touch people's hearts about a polar bear on a piece of ice. And then I said, you're saying that this is caused by human activity and, thus, we have to have all these taxes and controls and things to save the planet from this?

Well, yes, that's what he's saying. Well, I said exactly what I've said to Arnold Schwarzenegger. I said this to myself on the program. Yes, the ice cap

is retreating. There's no doubt about that. But when I say that, I'm not talking about our ice cap. That's clear to us. But what about the ice cap on Mars? There is an ice cap on Mars, and just by coincidence, it is retreating at exactly the same time as our ice cap is retreating. Doesn't that indicate that it might be the sun and not us driving SUVs or modern technology that's creating these many, many cycles that we've had, including the one that we are already in?

Yes, an ice cap is retreating on Mars and it's retreating in the world. Is that just a coincidence? Well, that's a scientific challenge. Let's have an answer to that. So, we have polar ice caps melting on Mars, and it's not just a coincidence, I believe. So tell me why this doesn't indicate to us that what we're really talking about is solar, what we are facing today in the climate changes that have taken place today, just as it has in the past is that it has to do with solar activity.

So now remember, by the way, ice caps may have been melting in the Arctic, but one thing people miss, the ice caps are not melting everywhere, just the northern ice cap. In Antarctica, to the south, ice is actually accumulating. And so in the north, yeah, there is a polar bear population, I think two species of polar bears are suffering. Most every one, the rest of them are expanding their population.

And by the way, I understand now, even in that area, the ice is beginning to return. But the ice has always been accumulating in the Antarctic over these years. That's never told to us. It's as if the whole world is increasing in temperature, but they don't bother to mention the areas where the ice is actually accumulating.

Well, the manmade global warming theory has been focused on CO₂. This is, of course, and again, let's talk about the science of these issues. CO₂ is a miniscule part, a miniscule part of our atmosphere, and if you ask the ordinary person, they think it's 20 percent of the atmosphere. Well, actually it's .023 percent, I believe, so that's less than 1 quarter of 1. It's less than 1 quarter of 1 percent of the atmosphere is CO₂. And of that, at least 90 percent of the CO₂ in the atmosphere is not traced to human activity.

I've been in hearings where most people claim it's more like 5 percent of the CO₂ in the atmosphere is traced to human activity. You know, and by the way, one huge volcano or even massive fire like they've had in various countries would dwarf everything that we're trying to do to reduce CO₂ into the amount of CO₂ that that would put into the atmosphere, because CO₂ is not a significant part of the atmosphere. It's a miniscule—it's like a thread being put across the line on a football field, and that's what you're changing by focusing not just on the CO₂, which is .023 percent, but it's also, of that, 90 percent of that is not man-made. It's made by nature.

So the most important discussion in terms of manmade CO₂, which, as I say, the manmade part of it is just a small contributor, it's a small contributor to a very tiny element in the atmosphere, and suggesting that that is changing our climate is ludicrous. In fact, it is warming and has released CO₂ and there have been—it is warming a little bit. There has been, over the years, until recently, and over the years, there has been times when CO₂ was going up dramatically and down dramatically but had nothing to do with the climate of the planet. For example, manmade—if manmade—here's a basic can question. Here's another science challenge. If manmade CO₂ causes warming, why, as CO₂ levels were rising dramatically in the 1940s, fifties, sixties and seventies, why, if the CO₂ was rising in those decades, why was there actually a cooling of our climate in those decades?

Okay. Let's hear the science. Come on. I just had a science. I've had five or six points now. Why is everyone afraid to take on these scientific answers? If indeed CO₂ causes it to warm, well, then how come, when we had massive increases in CO₂ in the forties, fifties, sixties and seventies that it got cooler and not warmer? Well, the calculations on global warming have been based on fraudulent numbers.

And here's another scientific challenge. A recent study shows that over 80 percent of America's temperature and weather stations which have been the source of temperature readings that supposedly indicate a warming trend, supposedly, these very same monitoring facilities have been compromised and are faulty in the information they're providing.

□ 2330

The numbers have been skewed. They are suspect because the monitors that have been relied upon do not meet the basic scientific standards that are required of them for us to believe in the numbers that they're giving us. In other words, the equipment is compromised; the figures coming out of the equipment cannot be relied upon. And our system, with 80 percent of our monitors who do not meet the standards, the scientific standards for us to rely on their numbers—our system has been heralded as the best in the world. So think about that. What's going on in the rest of the world when we're talking about one little rise, a one-degree rise in temperature since the end of the little ice age which was a 500-year low of temperature?

So even that we can't figure out—even with that one degree we don't know, because the monitors have been placed in faulty ways or have not been kept and maintained in the right way.

And so what we have had is a lot of people who have been making predictions over the last 20 years, especially Vice President Gore. But if the science community had been given these grants—but only if they're going

to come to the conclusion about global warming that we want you to—these people in the science community and these other political people who have got their own motives behind this bulldozer approach and this steamroller approach to accomplishing what they're out to accomplish, those people have been telling us that we're facing a man-made global warming climate calamity and it was in the making. And we were told that the temperatures were either going to continue to go up and up and it would reach a certain point and then there would be some sort of tipping point and then it would jump up by a number of temperature points. So it would be five or six points, or whatever they were predicting. It was a huge jump in temperature at some point.

Well, that's not what's happened. I heard that for 10 years, 10 years for the people who were giving out all of the grants, 10 years from all of the people who were shutting out any type of real debate, 10 years of "don't ask any questions, case closed." And those people are on the record, and they have been warning us of man-made global warming that was about to get out of hand. But for over a decade, it has not gotten any warmer.

Yes, 11 years ago in 1998 it was a very hot year, and that was the year—since then, every year has been cooler. It has not gotten warmer since then. And they say, Well, that was a very hot year. Well, so was 1931 was a very hot year, and it was followed by decades, I might add, of cooling. So that doesn't mean anything. That was just an anomaly that we had a hot year in 1998, because ever since then the temperature has not been going up.

The global warming alarmists' predictions were wrong, all right? Come and debate that. There is a scientific challenge. I keep giving scientific challenges, and what I get back in this debate is, You're a bigot; you're anti-science; you're stupid. Name-calling. I mean, the people on the other side who always are willing to call people names rather than confront their arguments are very easy to spot. You just take a look. You listen to what's being said. Who is offering an argument that needs to be discussed? Who's calling names? They have been trying to shut down this debate by calling anybody who disagrees with them horrible personal names.

Well, let me repeat this one point: it has not gotten any warmer for over a decade and we're still—it looks like we're even still getting cooler. That is totally contradictory to the predictions that were aggressively made to us, as they only gave their grants to the people who would agree with that over the years.

This is why global warming alarmists have now, en masse, changed the wording that they use. They were wrong, so let us just change the way we talk about things. Now it's climate change, okay? Everybody think about it. All of

these same people were talking about global warming 20 years ago, spending billions of dollars on research that was bogus research, you know. It was intended to come out with what they were buying from the scientists. They were telling us it was going to get warmer, and they kept using the term "man-made global warming." And now they call it "climate change," and all of a sudden, they all change and it all became climate change.

Well, every time you hear that word used by an environmental radical, by one of these alarmists, it is an admission that they were wrong and that they refuse to admit that they were wrong. Refusing to admit you're wrong after you've been so aggressive in promoting something is certainly not an honest debate and an honest discussion.

If I am proven wrong on a point, I will apologize and change my position. I won't try to change my wording so it sounds like I was never wrong in the first place.

These people were wrong. Remember it. Every time the word climate change is used, remember these were the same people who were talking about global warming, and they want to have it both ways. No matter if it gets warmer or colder, they want to blame it on human activity when, in fact, all of the evidence suggests that cycles come from solar activity.

Expert after expert is now pointing to the flaws in the central argument.

And the other thing you hear is, of course, that all of the scientists agree. There is your other way of shutting down debate. All of the scientists, all of the prestigious Ph.D.s and scientists agree. That is not true. And it hasn't been true for years.

So Al Gore's scientific mumbo-jumbo was wrong, all of the scientists agreeing with him is wrong, the temperature predictions have been wrong, and the man-made CO₂ premise is wrong.

Now we find out that the monitors used to collect the data were placed next to air-conditioning exhaust vents—which made the temperature higher—and in parking lots, and on top of buildings, and near other heat sources which, of course, made all of their statistics totally unreliable. We hear that.

We also know the methodology of using computer models has been questionable from the very beginning. We all know the saying: garbage in, garbage out. But no one was permitted to hear the questions; no one was permitted to ask follow-up questions as to—no one has been permitted to totally understand the software that went into that questionable computer modeling.

The observations have been wrong. The attempt to stifle debate and shut up those people who disagree by calling them names, denying grants, and making personal attacks has been wrong. Thus, I would suggest the biggest power grab in our history is wrong, and

the public should wake up. The public should understand that what we are seeing is a brazen power grab that is wrong.

So, let's review the scientific challenges to the man-made global warming theory. See if anybody ever tries to come and have an argument about the science.

Baseline comparison is at the bottom of a 500-year decline in temperature. That is not the scientific way of determining whether a slight rise in temperature is significant. The science measurements were partly or severely flawed by a monitoring system that was—did not meet the standards necessary to have accurate information. Past climate cycles were frequent even before the emergence of mankind. Cycles like the retreating polar ice caps are parallel to similar cycles on Mars suggesting solar activity, rather than human activity, is the culprit. Increasing CO₂ levels did not cause warming, which can be shown in the 1940s, 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s where there was an increasing level of CO₂, but yet it was getting cooler.

So let's have an honest debate. Let's quit calling names. Let's quit dismissing legitimate science-based questions.

□ 2340

Address the scientific issues being raised rather than sloganeering about a consensus of scientists that does not exist. Again, the so-called "consensus," case closed—that consensus does not exist. More and more, thousands of scientists are signing on as skeptics to this manmade global warming theory.

This leads to an important point that needs to be made. Perhaps the biggest lie the public must deal with is that all the prominent scientists in the world totally agree with the manmade global warming theory. That's probably the biggest lie, as I mentioned. Instead of answering scientific questions, alarmists have simply claimed all the scientists agree. I've been interviewed on this at least half a dozen times, and every interview begins with, well, all of the scientists agree that manmade global warming is a reality, how can you disagree with all of them? It is just another tactic aimed at repressing an honest discussion of something that should be a scientific issue and discussed with all sincerity.

I will now submit the names of 10 prominent scientists, 10 of the thousands of scientists who have signed on to suggest that manmade global warming is far from accepted by all scientists. These are the heads of science departments, the presidents of scientific and academic associations, people with doctorates in the areas of study, and they are coming forward at last, they're coming out of their shell at last after all of these years of intimidation. This is only a list of 10, but there are thousands more who are stepping forward to voice honest skepticism, if not total rejection, to the

claim that human activity is creating a global warming climate catastrophe.

The first one is Dr. Richard Lindzen, top scientist from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Dr. William Gray, Colorado State University, former president of the American Meteorological Association. Dr. David Nowell, former chairman and NATO meteorologist from Canada. Dr. Gerhard Kramm, University of Alaska in Fairbanks. Dr. Yury Izrael of the Russian Academy of Sciences, a senior member of the Russian Academy of Sciences whom I met and spoke to, and also a member of the IPCC United Nations report, who now makes it very clear that he does not believe in that report or manmade global warming. Dr. Ian Pilmer of the University of Melbourne. Dr. Diane Douglas, climatologist and paleoclimatologist. Dr. Harry Lins, cochairman of the IPCC Hydrology and Water Resources Working Group. Dr. Antonio Zichichi, president of the World Federation of Scientists. Dr. Ivar Giaever, Nobel Laureate and physicist.

So this idea that all the scientists are lockstep in favor of the theory of manmade global warming is a lie, not just a lie, a damnable lie aimed at cutting off honest communication. And who's doing that? Who's making this adamant statement that all the scientists are in agreement with this? Well, we've had people who say these things and said things all along. There's the global warming alarmists now who are making these statements. But let us just remember, these scares have happened in the past. I remember when my mother wouldn't serve cranberries at Thanksgiving because they caused cancer. I remember when Professor Meryl Streep warned us of alarming cancer, which just about ruined the apple industry for 2 years. That also was wrong.

We heard about cyclamates causing cancer, which cost the industry billions of dollars and disrupted very healthy patterns of nutrition that could have been based on cyclamates rather than high fructose corn syrup. That, too, was wrong.

We remember the nuclear power catastrophe at Three Mile Island, when Dr. Jane Fonda, that Ph.D. genius, taught us that nuclear power was so dangerous, that what we have done instead of using nuclear power, we began relying on overseas oil and gas and burning coal. Then remember the acid rain? That was as near a high pitch as what we hear about global warming. Ronald Reagan stood up, put his hand up and said, no, we are going to have scientific research on this acid rain issue before we commit to all sorts of regulations and taxes that will destroy our economy. Luckily, Reagan did that, and when a \$500 million study was complete, it verified the fact that acid rain was a minimal problem, not a major problem, a minimal problem that didn't justify any of the draconian raises in taxes and controls that were

being suggested by those environmental alarmists.

Then of course the granddaddy of them all was, many of the same people who now talk about global warming were then talking about global cooling back in the early 1970s, some of the very same people. Yes. And what happened to global cooling? The cycle started going in another direction. Then it became, Oh, my God, it's global warming. Well, now it's back to global cooling. So is this all caused by us driving SUVs? No. Maybe it's caused by the sun. Maybe there are natural reasons for the cycles of climate on this planet.

The so-called "experts" were wrong when they told us about all of these things. All of these were exaggerated problems, exaggerated threats to our well-being. And the American people were deceived in many of these cases, whether it was about nuclear energy or whether it was about cranberries. And we had fanatics who were fast and loose with the truth and fast and loose with facts. Well, that's exactly what's going on today.

And what's the problem with that? Well, the problem is there are serious side effects when one gets you focused on something that's not true, like cranberries causing cancer or nuclear energy being such a threat. You end up doing things that are actually harmful to you that you wouldn't do otherwise. When you have CO₂ being called the primary pollutant for concern, you are doing a horrendous disservice to the people of this country. By focusing on CO₂, which is not harmful to human beings at all and in fact is a plant food—CO₂ makes plants grow better, it does not harm human beings. And if our job is just to try to reduce the amount of CO₂ in the world, we will actually be doing a grave disservice because we won't be concentrating on the pollution, like NO₂ and other things that are very harmful, the particulates out of diesel trucks that are particularly—again, no pun intended—but particular particulates that are very harmful to people. I have three children. I have my baby Anika and Tristan and Christian. I love those babies, and I do not want them to breathe in dirty air. And if we focus on CO₂, we are doing a disservice to them and their generation and we are doing a disservice to the older people of this country who will also breathe in the dirty air. And focusing on CO₂ to save the planet. That's because what's happening here is these people are out to save the planet, but they are not out to save the people of the planet.

I remember one solution to a non-existent threat, which also caused a huge destruction of people, was, of course, the eliminating of DDT. Now, DDT, we were told, was destructive to the environment, especially to bird egg shells. Well, then, DDT is banned. And what is the result of DDT being banned? Malaria out of control in Third World countries where before it

had been nearly eliminated. DDT was eliminated and malaria made a comeback, and millions of children in the Third World have died because of this nonsense.

I can't tell you if pelican egg shells are less fragile because of DDT, but I can tell you the tradeoff with millions of young children dying in Third World countries isn't worth that tradeoff about how fragile and building up the shell of a pelican.

Unfortunately, the people driving policy here are out to save our planet; they're not out to save our children or our seniors or any other people on the planet. That is the same mindset that would dramatically damage our economy in order to save the planet, with no consideration of the hardship and deprivation to ordinary people that would result from the draconian controls and taxation that is being proposed here in Washington right now as an answer to the global warming threat, the manmade global warming threat.

Now that manmade global warming has been driven into the public consciousness, the alarmists have the leverage right here in Washington. What should we expect unless the public changes its perception? There is a price to pay, just like those millions of little kids dying in Africa of malaria, and there is a price to pay for listening to irrational alarmists.

Excessive taxation regulation mandates are now being proposed in Washington, and they will reduce our gross domestic product by over \$7 trillion, destroying nearly 2 million jobs by 2012, at a time when we really need jobs. It will raise electricity rates by 90 percent above inflation, incur \$33,000 worth of additional Federal debt for every man, woman and child in America. And it will help the Chinese and other people steal our businesses from us. And this is only step one.

And even with this monstrous cost, little progress is expected. Here's back to the central point most Republicans want to make: That that cost isn't worth what we're going to get out of it. Well, no, there won't be any change in the temperature, and little change in the amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere. And CO₂ isn't harmful to people or this world.

The real calamity brought on by global warming will be the economy-killing taxes and regulations that are put in place to solve a nonexistent problem. That economic decline that we're talking about is just Round one, however. Round two is easy to predict.

□ 2350

Global and international bodies and our own government and our own Congress will be given the right and power to intervene in our lives to prevent manmade global warming. That's what it's all about, globalism. If man makes it, man must then be controlled. That's why it was so important for them to

steamroll over anybody who is in opposition and wanted to ask some questions. They want nobody to ask questions about their theory about man-made global warming because they believe men and women, people, need to be controlled. That is part of their theory of government. It will make it a whole new, more benevolent world. Unfortunately, a lot of the government they are talking about is not the American Government. We are talking about international mandates from unelected bodies that we will then pass on power and authority to, which is supported by many of the people right here in this Congress.

For example, in the future, we are going to face all kinds of mandates and controls from the Federal Government and the internationalcy. Some of these would be, for example, mandated increases in parking fees. Do they tell you that now? All your local communities are going to have to raise your parking fees. And there will be major impediments to the private use of automobiles. And then, of course, they've got to end frequent flyer miles and they've got to end discount air travel because, believe it or not, and nobody has ever been telling you this, they believe that airplanes are the biggest CO₂ footprint of all. That's right. Your frequent flyer miles and your discount tickets have got to go. Of course, the elite will be able to fly around in their private planes giving a donation by supposedly planting trees somewhere and thus they can fly in their private planes. But the rest of us cannot go to see our sick relatives on a discounted ticket. No one has heard about this. Nobody has heard about these types of controls that are going to be mandated on our own people by the United Nations perhaps. What has been the purview of local government will be transferred to much higher authorities. Local government will be required to follow international guidelines, climate guidelines, when it comes to building, zoning, even local planning.

This is part of our liberty. Where we live, what we eat, how we run our lives, this is what is at stake. It's called liberty. This is a fight between the globalists, who found a vehicle to try to gain power and grab power, and those people who do believe in liberty and justice. We call them patriots. We call them people around the world who do believe in these Western values of dignity for the individual and freedom and justice.

Yes, even our diet has been targeted by those claiming that animal flatulence and deforestation make meat the enemy of climate. We aren't even going to be able to have barbecues in our backyard, much less have hamburgers. Now, these are one of those things that people will laugh that no one could ever go that far. What is going on here is laying the foundation for extensive controls that now are up to the individual or up to the local government being given to a central government.

If you aren't frightened by this, you should be. We have a fanatical movement of steely-eyed zealots who cannot admit they made a mistake, who always attack the other person rather than trying to have honest discussions of issues. Couple that with self-serving interests, and there are many self-serving interests who are involved in this. They now have joined in a political coalition that believes they have the right to run the economy, run business, run local schools, and run our lives. They have been looking for an excuse to assume power.

Now, the left has always wanted to have power. Leftists have always wanted it. They believe that they can do better and make humankind over and make it a better world by having absolute power over the choices of the people who live in this world. Well, they have found a calamity. They can threaten the people of the world with a calamity in order to stampede them into a monstrously horrific policy, and that's what we are on the edge of here in Washington.

In this last 8 months here in Washington, hundreds of billions, even trillions of dollars have been shoveled into the coffers, and no one knows where the heck this money has gone to. There have been looters from all over the world in our financial system and everyone who has benefited from that. The American people know that this Congress was stampeded into giving away trillions of dollars because we were told there was going to be an economic calamity. I'm very proud I never succumbed to that hysteria that was perhaps the greatest rip-off in history. Well, the global warming stampede is designed to cover up the biggest power grab in history, and it too will be costly.

Wake up, America. Wake up, America. We should not be giving our power and our liberty, not to the central government in Washington, D.C., certainly not to the United Nations, which is composed of countries who are governed by crooks and kooks. And the United Nations having power to set regulations over our lives in the name of saving this world from a climate catastrophe would itself be a catastrophe to the freedom of liberty and justice in this country and to the freedom-loving people of the world.

Well, even Al Gore must be a bit embarrassed now that he has to use the words "climate change" rather than "global warming." It's an inconvenient truth for him. The fact is it's no longer warming. He must think that we are stupid if he thinks that we have not noticed that it's now "climate change" instead of "global warming" and that we haven't noticed that there are large numbers of scientists that are opposing what is being proposed. And he must think we are stupid if he thinks that these taxes and regulations and draconian laws that are being proposed are things that we will just accept because we have been frightened into submission.

Wake up, America. We need to save our country and future generations and we need to save the world from this incredible power grab, the greatest power grab and worst power grab in history.

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 Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. RICHARDSON, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, June 16.
Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, June 16.
Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, June 16.
Mr. OLSON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for 5 minutes, June 10.
Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, June 10.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 256. An act to enhance the ability to combat methamphetamine; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; in addition, to the Committee on the Judiciary for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on June 9, 2009 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 1595. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3245 Latta Road in Rochester, New York, as the "Brian K. Schramm Post Office Building".

H.R. 1284. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 West Main Street in McLain, Mississippi, as the "Major Ed W. Freeman Post Office".

H.R. 663. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 12877 Broad Street in Sparta, Georgia, as the "Yvonne Ingram-Ephraim Post Office Building".

H.R. 918. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 300 East 3rd Street in Jamestown, New York, as the "Stan Lundine Post Office Building".