

we spend on delivery of health care and making sure that all Americans have access to the quality of care that we want, not just because you can afford it but because you're American. And let me just say these things:

Number one, if you like your doctor, you will keep your doctor. If you don't like the plan that you're in, you can move to another. There is going to be freedom of choice, and there will be broad choices in the plan that has been unveiled in this Chamber.

Number two, we want to make sure that health care professionals and physicians and doctors and nurses are prescribing health care and administering health care and not necessarily the bean counters or bureaucrats that we find too often who are making health care decisions for too many Americans.

And the third issue that we need to emphasize is that there is enough money in the system already to pay for health care. The 46 million uninsured and underinsured folks who are out there, we know that there is enough money in the delivery of health care—\$2.5 trillion we spend every year, 16 percent of our gross national product. We spend more than any other industrialized nation in the world, but yet have a life expectancy on par with Cuba. There is enough money in the system that is out there that we can make sure that 46 million uninsured or underinsured people have access to health care.

□ 2230

How are we going to do that? With the five P's. Making sure that all people have access to health care. If they don't, it is going to end up costing all of us more because when they use the hospital room as their primary care physician, they will actually cost all of us more.

Making sure they have a portable plan that allows them to take it from job to job. End this notion of preexisting conditions, that if you're working at one place and you go to another job that somehow being pregnant or being a diabetic or having a chronic disease somehow eliminates you from seeking health care from this new provider. End preexisting conditions.

Making sure that we provide incentives for physicians to not only enter the field but also that physicians are making the health care decisions.

And, lastly, prevention, prevention, prevention. Four cents of every dollar that we spend on health care is for prevention.

We can do a better job. We have to do a better job. The President has called us to action. The Nation has suffered for too long under a system that has excluded a few and allowed others to seek access. And this delivery system that we have should be about health care and not a health sickness plan that we have that's a fee for service but that encompasses all the things that we talked about here tonight.

I thank the gentlewoman from Maine for allowing me to be a part of this.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I thank my colleagues from Ohio and Illinois for being willing to be here.

#### MAN-MADE GLOBAL WARMING THEORY

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. Mr. Speaker, as I stand here on the floor of the House tonight, I am reminded of the television series the "Twilight Zone." And these days I half expect Rod Serling to appear from behind a curtain and announce, "This is the Twilight Zone." Yes, there is an almost bizarre sense of unreality here in the Nation's Capital.

The transformation of private liability into public debt on a massive scale. The unprecedented level of deficit spending, debt piled upon debt, borrowing from China to give foreign aid to other countries. The willingness to pass draconian restrictions and controls on our national economy and on the lives of our people. And while seeking to save us from a recession, Congress shovels hundreds of billions of dollars into the financial industry, much of which has ended up in the pockets of fat cats and wheeler-dealers who have been giving themselves multi-million dollar bonuses even as they drove their own companies into bankruptcy. The giveaway and the lack of oversight has been mind-boggling. And we don't know where hundreds of billions of dollars have gone, and we don't know to whom. Yet we know that the taxpayers are now on the hook for this increase in our national debt.

We have watched as this has been happening, and, of course, there are so many things that are being done here today to our people. But we also note how much is not being done that needs to be done to protect our people, which is just as mind-boggling.

Our Nation's borders leak like a spaghetti strainer. Millions of people illegally continue to pour into our country to consume our limited health care. And, by the way, we just heard a lot about health care. Why are we not hearing that we should not be picking up the tab for the tens of millions of illegals that have come into this country? But that's not part of the discussion. But millions of people are flowing into our country, and they are consuming the limited health care, education, and other social service dollars that we have. We have limited money; and yet they are taking that money, and they're taking jobs from our people.

And sometimes they come here and they commit crimes against our people. And our government just sits and lets it happen even while we are passing all these hundreds of millions on to wheeler-dealers in the financial industry. We can't even come to grips with our illegal immigration problem. We can't even build a fence.

In California we can't even build a new water system in the middle of a drought. This we are told is because of a tiny fish, the delta smelt. So our people will have to suffer because of concern over a little tiny worthless fish that isn't even good enough to be used as bait.

So last week even amidst California's tremendous difficulties, with drought conditions and a shortage of water at near crisis, this House, the House of Representatives, voted not for the people of California but for a fish. No water for our people because if we would give it to the people, that little fish might be affected in a detrimental way.

Perhaps the most damaging of the weird policies that I have described is America's longtime commitment not to develop its own domestic energy resources. Even as high energy prices have brought suffering and economic hardship to our people, we have not been developing our own resources. Even as we see dollars being siphoned from the pockets of our people and deposited in coffers overseas, enriching foreigners, some of those foreigners who hate us, while our hard-earned dollars are being extracted from us, massive deposits of domestic oil and gas worth trillions of dollars are untouched, untapped, and unused.

Even as California sinks into an economic catastrophe, off the coast are huge caverns filled with massive deposits of oil and gas just sitting there. And even as California cuts and cancels public services to our own people, billions of dollars of tax revenue could be derived by utilizing that oil and gas that's just sitting there right off our shore. Yet the State of California lets it sit there while our people suffer and the State goes broke. Trillions of dollars have been sent overseas for energy, while at home no new oil refineries, no hydroelectric dams, no nuclear power plants.

As I say, all of this seems a bit bizarre. And it may be a bit bizarre, but it is not meaningless nonsense. Those who have insisted upon these antidomestic energy development policies know exactly what they're doing. They want to change our way of life whether we like it or not. So a few decades ago, they grabbed onto a theory, a theory that the world is heating up because humankind uses carbon-based fuels. Read that oil, gas, and coal. This theory gives them the ability to stampe politicians and even stampede scientists with a certain amount of prodding and promises of being excluded from grants or promises to receive grants, but that theory gives them the ability to get these people, whether they are scientists or politicians, to support draconian policies and mandates, changes in our economy and lifestyle that they otherwise would never dream of considering and supporting.

All of this is in the name of protecting us from a climate calamity: man-made global warming. Well, the

Good Book says: "The truth shall make you free." A caveat might be: "And a lie can destroy your freedom." Man-made global warming has given respectable cover to advocates of a tax and regulatory policy that no one would even consider except, of course, unless it's to take care of an emergency.

□ 2240

In reality, the effort behind the man-made global warming juggernaut is the biggest power grab in history. It gives politicians who always wanted to control the behavior of normal people a seemingly legitimate reason to do so, even over those normal people's objections. This power grab was set in motion in the very first days of the Clinton administration in 1993.

When the Clinton administration took over, one of the first actions that the administration was to do was to fire Dr. William Happer, a man who dared challenge Vice President Gore. Yes, Dr. Happer believed in science, not in the junk science of radicals, and he was skeptical, although not an advocate of either side of the global warming debate.

He didn't fit in, so out he went. From there on, the pattern was very clear, and it's very clear. In order to receive even one penny of Federal research money, a scientist would have to tow the line on the man-made global warming theory. Any dissident would be quickly squashed or at least be cut off from any Federal research funding. That went on for 8 years.

So when approaching this concept of man-made global warming, we must examine the science behind it. So let's state right off, the unconscionable intimidation of the science community during the Clinton years has ensured that bad science permeates the entire argument of the alarmists who are perpetuating this man-made myth. This man-made myth global warming is based on bad science, and it's very easy to discern this by the Herculean efforts made by the man-made global warming advocates to cut off all debate on this issue.

So not only did we see people in the scientific communities being intimidated with the promise of having their research funds cut off, but now, after this, and after the presentation of the global warming alarmist alternative, let's say, alternative projects and alternative policies, that there has been an intense effort to cut off debate on the issue of man-made global warming itself. That is why in Congress they are now trying to quickly slip by a drastic life-altering legislation that is based on the science of man-made global warming. And they want to do this without confronting the basic science.

So, if we want to take a look at the science of global warming, the first thing to notice is why have those people who believe in global warming spent so much effort and so much time and been so abusive in trying to cut off

debate? Has anyone ever heard the slogan, case closed?

Come on, if you really are honest, admit that is an attempt, and it was a huge attempt, to cut off debate. The debate is over.

How many heard that? Again, an attempt, not to discuss the issues, not to have an honest discussion of the science, but never to discuss the science. That is what the language—and that is the language of the debate. And what we have here is a language of debate and discussion restriction, not the language being used by the advocates of global warming for let's have an honest discussion, the words they used are aimed at limiting and restricting and cutting off debate. Case closed.

Al Gore never takes any questions. Do you know that, when he goes out and speaks and goes to universities, not only does he not debate, which would be a good idea, he refuses to take questions.

I don't know how many times have we heard, every prominent scientist agrees, so you must be a kook if you disagree. Well, every prominent scientist doesn't disagree and the names of hundreds, of those people in the scientific community, people who are heads of universities like Richard Lindzen, one of the great scientist from MIT, from all over the world there are major scientists who have put themselves on the record and taken great risk in doing so, telling them that they are, no, very skeptical and have serious doubts about the man-made global warming theory.

The name calling and stifling in this debate by the man-made global warming advocates has been shameful and a disservice to democracy. If someone so much as tries to make a joke, it is reported as if it is being serious. The people who do that are themselves admitting that they cannot stand a major scientific and truthful scrutiny and exchange of ideas.

So what about the science? Let's take a look, and I would challenge any Member of Congress to come here and debate me on the science of this issue.

First, let's talk about the so-called global-warming cycle that's being caused by human activity. That's the bases of what this whole issue is. We know that there have been weather and climate cycles throughout the history of the world, going back to prehistoric times. The global warming alarmists now are using a low point of a 500-year cycle of cooling, and that was at the end of the Little Ice Age, as the baseline for determining if humankind is making the planet hotter at this time.

So, let's get back to it. There have been all of these cycles through the history of the planet, and this cycle, there is a cycle that is going on. But to analyze that cycle, those people are saying man-made global warming, as differentiated from all the other cycles, are using the 1850s as their baseline, and that is at the 500-year low in

the temperature of the Earth. It was the end of what they call the Little Ice Age.

Is that good science? Should we really be upset when there is a 1- or 2-degree rise from a 500-year low point in temperatures? So, come on, let's answer that scientific question. Let's not call me names, which is what's happened over and over again, as if I don't believe in science, and I am some sort of Neanderthal, or that I am any number of pejorative names. Let's look and be honest.

Those people using names do not understand the issues and are afraid to discuss the science and the issues at hand. They are doing a disservice to our country, and they are exposing themselves as being people who do not believe in the very issue they are advocating because they can't defend it.

So, science question number one: Are they not using an unreasonably cooler moment as the baseline for analysis? Is that not an unreasonable thing to do, to start your settings and use as a baseline a 500-year low in temperature when trying to tell us that we should be concerned about the warming trend that's going on?

Question number two: What about those other weather cycles that we have had long before humankind emerged on this planet? A thousand years ago, even after we had people, things were much warmer than now. Iceland and Greenland were farmed by Norsemen. Farms, there were farms there. It was a time period a thousand years ago when there were not only cattle, but there were plants going there.

Vineland, was actually—people thought Vineland was something that Leif Erickson made up. No, there was a place, a Vineland, back in Nova Scotia, and in those days grew grapes. Well, that's because the weather was warmer then, and there was a cycle, as I say. Was that cycle—as I say, was that cycle—was the decline in temperature by the Little Ice Age, was that caused by human beings?

What about all the other cycles taking place. Were those caused by human beings? If we see that there were cycles that even happened before prehistoric man even existed, well then there must be some other explanation. Well, what is that explanation?

So, if there were cycles before human beings were forced on the planet, what is the other explanation? Well, it seems to many scientists who believed this that the cycles of climate have followed solar activity.

That's why, and I get that, the sun is the biggest force of energy on the planet, and they believe that many scientists believe that it's solar activity and not human activity that's creating this cycle, just as it did the other cycles that we have gone through long before human beings even existed on the planet.

And that also explains why we have cycles, monitoring those on Earth,

that have been observed on other planets. That's right, on other planets.

□ 2250

In recent years, we have been treated to the outcries of agony about the melting that is taking place in the Arctic. This is being used to touch people's hearts to get them alarmed so they will accept the draconian controls that will come from those people who are advocating policies to deal with man-made global warming.

They're saying, Oh, it's our activity that's causing the ice caps to melt. Well, who hasn't seen these pictures of these polar bears? The poor polar bears on the ice floe, obviously a victim of man-made global warming.

Well, not so fast. Yes, the ice cap is retreating. There's no doubt about that. But what about the ice cap on Mars? Yes. Right now, at the same time we have our ice cap that is retreating, the ice cap on Mars is retreating at exactly the same time, and it seems to be mirroring, paralleling what's going on on the Earth. Doesn't that indicate that it might be the Sun and not somebody driving an SUV or using modern technology that is creating such a cycle; it's creating the situation that left the bear in a warmer climate?

Well, if so, let us note this. If it is indeed caused by the Sun, and yet we have had all this propaganda to touch our hearts and get us to think, not to feel about the poor polar bear, let us note that if it is the Sun and it's not us, then that polar bear is the victim and has nothing to do with man-made global warming, but is being challenged, just like animals have been challenged throughout the history of our planet by planet cycles.

By the way, let me just note this. How many have not heard the polar bear is 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 on the world than there were in the 1960s. But you would believe from what you have seen and the movies and the ice caps melting and Al Gore showing, by the way, a false—a piece of Styrofoam that was breaking off in a movie, presenting to us as if that's the ice caps breaking off the Arctic. You'd think that it was that the polar bears were doomed and that we were to blame for it.

Well, here's another scientific challenge. Okay. If we have cycles already, if the ice is melting on Mars, just as it is here, what is the science behind this claim that mankind is causing the climate cycle, if there is a climate cycle, and what climate cycle it is?

So, let's have an answer to that. Let's not call me names. Let's not just say, Oh, the polar bear—I remember reading this on the Internet—the polar bear is near extinction, when it is clear from many other sources, which I will be happy to provide, that the polar

bear population is actually going up. Besides that, that's not the point.

The point is that the polar bear is, whatever condition it's in, is not due to the fact that human beings can drive in automobiles or that we have to change our lifestyle and be controlled by the government in order to protect the polar bear from climate changes that our activities bring about. Man-made global warming theory?

And my colleague from Texas, if he would like to step in for a few words, I'd be very happy to have him.

Mr. GOHMERT. I certainly appreciate my friend from California yielding. With regard to the polar bears, in the Natural Resources Committee we have been hearing that by 20 years ago we were up to under 12,000 polar bears in the whole world, and now we know there are over 25,000 polar bears in the world. They're doing pretty well.

But as we know—and there's some friends here from Texas—in Texas we have a problem with overpopulation of deer because they don't know when to stop overpopulating, and so we have seasons to help keep them from starving themselves to death.

So it is a little misleading to see the ice cap breaking off and the starving mother bear and the cub. That's heartbreaking. And, apparently, it's heartbreaking enough that millions of people—or at least millions of dollars come flowing in.

You kind of hate if you've got millions of dollars coming in from people that feel bad about the polar bears—by the way, the Bush administration was asked to say that the polar bears should be on the endangered species list. But the Bush administration knew they were increasing, just like you were saying, and so what they did was compromised and allowed polar bears to be listed as threatened, even though they're increasing in population.

I'm pleased the polar bears are doing well. Hopefully, we won't have to open up additional seasons, that they will moderate their behavior.

But we also saw with the caribou and people talking about how terrible it is to produce oil in Alaska. And we heard that if they ever put that pipeline up to Prudhoe Bay, it would kill off the last 2,900 caribou that were in the area, that we just couldn't do that. It would destroy their mating habits.

Turns out, caribou now, when they want to go on dates, invite each other to go to the pipeline on cold winter nights because that oil is warm going through the pipeline and it makes them amorous. And now we're up to 30,000 caribou in that herd. So it turns out man and caribou and polar bears can do just fine.

But it does remind one a little bit of the scare that went across the Nation about chlorofluorocarbons just as the Freon patent was coming up, and lo and behold we had to outlaw CFCs that were destroying the ozone layer. It turned out we found out that one eruption of Mount St. Helens put a thou-

sand years' worth of CFCs in the atmosphere—one eruption.

So sometimes I think that we think much too highly of ourselves as human beings and the effect that we have on the world and on the globe, when actually we do need to be good stewards of this wonderful planet, but we also should not be fearmongers that scare people out of doing things to help themselves and their families.

I appreciate so much my friend from California and his yielding.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Thank you. I appreciate my friend from Texas reminding us of a past scare that proved not to be based on science. I remember about cranberries. Couldn't eat cranberries for 2 years because that caused cancer. I remember when they took cyclamates off the market to the cost of a billion dollars for the industry, then, 20 years later, found out that that was not legitimate.

I remember during the Reagan years, the same sort of intensity now being used on global warming was used to advocate we have to have massive controls on our economy based on controlling acid rain. And what happened to that? Ronald Reagan held firm. There was a scientific research project that went through for a \$500 million research program that showed that, yeah, there's a little bit of a problem with acid rain, but not very much. In fact, it was not the threatening force that we were told at that time, which would have cost tens of billions of dollars if we tried to use their agenda, what was being put forward in order to "stop acid rain."

Well, the man-made global warming theory, again, is like that. It is based on another scientific factor, and that is CO<sub>2</sub>. So let's talk about CO<sub>2</sub>.

CO<sub>2</sub> is a part of what is in the atmosphere. CO<sub>2</sub>, carbon dioxide, is a miniscule part of our atmosphere. So, CO<sub>2</sub> is, yes, part of the atmosphere, but it was always considered a very small part of the atmosphere.

Let me just make sure we get this right. That CO<sub>2</sub>, most people believe that it is a large part of the atmosphere, because I have asked them, but in reality it is less than .04 percent. So what we're saying is much less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the atmosphere is CO<sub>2</sub>.

□ 2300

So at that rate, basically when we take a look at that, one-tenth of 1 percent and 80 percent of the CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere is not traced to human activity. There has been, over the years, times when CO<sub>2</sub> was going up. Now we are being told that the rise of CO<sub>2</sub> is causing the atmosphere to warm. But we have times when CO<sub>2</sub> was going up, but it didn't seem to affect the climate and the planet. For example, if man-made CO<sub>2</sub> causes warming, then why is it that when mankind was using much more CO<sub>2</sub> in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s, as the CO<sub>2</sub> was rising, there was an actual cooling going on in the climate?

Okay, so let's hear the science about CO<sub>2</sub>. Why is everyone afraid to try to look at the specific science? If CO<sub>2</sub> causes warming, why is it, when there were dramatic times of CO<sub>2</sub> increase that the Earth got cooler? I had one person suggest that the pollution in the atmosphere completely overwhelmed the greenhouse effect during that particular time period. Well, if that is true, then what we have to say is the Clean Air Act of 1970 is directly responsible for man-made global warming. And does anyone believe that? No, of course not. By the way, anyone telling a joke or trying to make humor is always reported as if that person is being serious.

So here is another scientific challenge. The recent studies show that over 80 percent of America's temperature and weather stations, the monitors who have been collecting the information that is being passed on to us by the global warming, man-made global warming advocates, that 80 percent of these stations have been compromised and are faulty in the information they are providing. The numbers have been skewed. They are suspect because the monitors have been placed in locations that do not meet the National Weather Service basic standards. In other words, the equipment is being compromised. The figures coming out of the equipment cannot be relied upon. And our system, with its 80 percent of the monitors that do not meet the standards, has been heralded as the best in the world.

So think about that, what is going on in the rest of the world. What we are talking about here is we are talking about a 1-degree, of course, rise in temperature, from the depths of the mini-ice age, and yet now we have these monitors that even by today's standards are substandard. And that is by today's standards, not back in the 1860s and not in other parts of the world.

So how is that for a scientific challenge?

If the data is being based on monitors that don't meet scientific standards either today or in the past, how could we pass laws with taxes and controls on our people if the so-called problem is based on bogus or absolutely unscientifically obtained numbers? And even with the current methods of collecting data, we have been warned time and again of dire predictions.

So the numbers themselves are suspect. But those people who have been warning us about those numbers over the last 20 years have been spreading incredible alarm, as exemplified by Vice President Gore and others. The temperatures, we were told over and over again, were going to climb. And they were going to continue to climb, and then it would reach a tipping point, and then the temperatures would really jump up. Well, wake up. Let's talk reality here. Again, let's talk science. Let's quit saying "case closed." Let's not give speeches but never take any questions. Let's quit

saying that all the scientists agree when there are scientists all over the world disagreeing.

They were wrong. When they said that there was going to be a continued climb in the temperature, they were 180 degrees wrong, much less having reached a tipping point which then jumped the temperature of the world by even a larger amount.

It has not gotten warmer for over a decade. And it looks like it is still getting cooler. Now, that is totally contradictory to the predictions of the alarmists and those media people around the world who pushed that idea. It is totally contradictory to what was aggressively told to us, to what was foisted off on the American people and people throughout the world. They were totally, 180 degrees wrong.

Please let's talk about the science here. Come and talk to us about why, if your major prediction was that the Earth was going to continue getting warmer because of this CO<sub>2</sub> that comes out of the engines that we use and the coal and the oil and natural gas, if that was what you were saying and that you were very aggressive in your advocacy of this, now that it hasn't happened, come and talk to us. Don't dismiss us. Don't try to pass a piece of legislation here based on the alarms that went off 15 years ago that have been proven not to be true.

So that is another scientifically based challenge, again, not just ignored; but I would say that this is the arrogance behind never answering these types of science charges remains evident. Please don't ignore it anymore. Please let's respect each other, and let's get away from this basic idea that you can just shut off debate. But let's pay attention to what the debate was like before, if there was any debate. There was just a one-sided debate, because people weren't able to get any government grants, so we had a one-sided drumbeat going on. But those people were aggressive in that man-made global warming was being caused by CO<sub>2</sub>, and we have got to control human beings for this.

Well, by the way, they don't even use the words "global warming" any more. Think about that. We have a situation that people who were just aggressively talking and putting down anybody who disagreed with them about man-made global warming, now they use the word "climate change." Now if I am proven wrong in a point, if I were to be proven wrong in any point of this speech, I will apologize, and I will 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 they say "climate change," remember that that is an admission that they didn't know what they were talking about before. Man-made global warming. Their dishonesty is underscored every time they use the phrase "climate change."

Now, no matter if it gets warmer or if it gets cooler, they can tell us that

that backs up their theories, and we should do what they say, because now whether it is warmer or cooler, they have been proven right because they were saying and they were predicting nothing. Well, they believe they should have the power to tax and control us, even though the preponderance of evidence shows that the cycles that we are talking about were not global warming cycles created by human activity or even a cooling cycle created by human activity, but instead something that is based on solar activity.

Let me note this, the gang that told us that human activity was causing the planet to warm and to dramatically heat up, now I say they are using the word "climate change," is an admission of something. But what is it an admission of? They were saying "global warming," and now they are saying "climate change." It is basically an admission that, yes, for 10 years the world has been getting cooler. So if human activity through CO<sub>2</sub> was making it warmer, then maybe it is a good thing that human beings will mitigate the cooling cycle.

Now they are sort of admitting we are in a cooling cycle because they are saying global "climate change" and not "warming." So if they said that our activities were going to make it warmer, and now they have admitted they were wrong because they are using a different word, and it is actually getting cooler, then will the human activity that they were complaining about before that was making it warmer, well, logically then shouldn't Al Gore and these other people be advocating more fossil fuel use? Anybody who advocated global warming before and now says "climate change" is admitting that it is cooler now, that maybe we are in a cooling trend.

Well, if they believed that human activity made things warmer, maybe they should be advocating that we use more fossil fuel to mitigate the problem of a declining temperature of the planet.

□ 2310

So all of Al Gore's scientific mumbo jumbo is deceptive, and the contention that all of the prominent scientists that agreed with him was not true, wasn't true then, and it is especially not true now, and I would like to add to the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, a long list of prominent scientists who opposed the man-made global warming theory.

Temperature predictions have been wrong. The CO<sub>2</sub> premise is wrong, and we now find out that the monitors that were used to collect the data that were placed next to the air-conditioning exhaust vents in parking lots and on top of buildings near to heat sources, which of course made all of their data unreliable, we now know that was done wrong. And we also know the methodology of using computer models has been questionable from the very beginning.

We know the saying garbage in and garbage out. But let's look at the computer models we have been told are the basis for all of these predictions, many which we now know are wrong. No one was permitted to hear the questions, and no one was permitted to ask follow-up questions. And what about the information that was fed into the computer?

We weren't actually able to find out exactly what the basis of and what was going into those computer models. That was kept from us as well. But we do know that the projections have been wrong. We know there has been an attempt to stifle and shut up debate. People have been called names. Grants have been denied and personal attacks have been evident. All of this has been wrong.

So let's review the scientific challenges of man-made global warming, of the man-made global warming theory, which they have even given up because they now note that it is getting cooler, which is contrary to all of their predictions, because now they use the word "climate change."

I have issued a challenge to any of my colleagues to debate me on this issue. No one has come forward. And yet these very same people who refuse to debate the science will vote for draconian legislation that will implement the recommendations of global warming alarmists, even though these people have not stepped forward to debate, they will vote for the program that these alarmists have been advocating.

I am afraid that we should have some confrontation of ideas here and an honest discussion, and this issue has not been honestly discussed in terms of the science.

The baseline comparison, I just noted, started in a 500-year decline. It was based at the bottom of a 500-year decline in temperature. Science measurements were partly or severely flawed by monitoring systems that do not meet minimum acceptable standards. And past climate cycles were frequent even before the emergence of mankind, cycles like the retreating of polar ice caps that we are shown all of the time to touch our hearts so we won't think but will feel. Those solar ice caps and the retreat of the solar ice caps are very similar to the cycles on other planets, especially the planet Mars, for example, suggesting that solar activity rather than human activity is the culprit.

Increasing levels of CO<sub>2</sub> did not cause warming back in the 1940s, 1950s, 1960s, and even the 1970s, when there were large increases of CO<sub>2</sub>, yet we are told now that the CO<sub>2</sub> was causing the world to get warmer. But yet more CO<sub>2</sub> has even been produced and for 10 years we haven't had a warming. Now that man-made global warming has been driven into the public consciousness, the alarmists have the leverage here in Washington.

I could talk all night long, but no one is going to confront the science on this,

as rotten as the science is. So right here there is a price to pay when the American people have been lied to in a big way. If the truth will set you free, lies will enslave you. There is a price to pay. Like, for example, the millions of children dying in Third World countries of malaria, all because we wanted to prevent the use of DDT. Why did we want to stop DDT? Because bird eggshells were thinning out, we believed, because of DDT. And thus, millions of children in the Third World have lost their lives to malaria because birds were more important to those who made policy than the millions of children in the Third World who were going to die as a result.

Remember, there is a serious price to pay for listening to irrational alarmists. And now all of this confronts us, and there is a bill to be voted on this week called the American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009. I call it the Destroy American Jobs and Use Candles Act.

It is a bill, of course, that is based on the theories of the man-made global warming alarmists that I have just demonstrated is totally flawed and wrong science, and a science that these people refuse to get up and defend.

This bill, of course, comes at exactly the wrong time, and its negative consequences will be ever more severe in economic hard times as we are suffering right now than they would be if we were in times of prosperity.

Even if it were true that man-made use of CO<sub>2</sub> was causing a warming, a global warming, this wouldn't be the time to try to implement it, at a time when we are going into such a recession and depression.

Maybe we are like the Third World children in the minds of the people who are going to vote for this horrible legislation. Maybe the birds are more important than the suffering of our own people. Maybe it is more important to posture yourself as a friend of the planet than it is to try to take care of the people of this country and try to alleviate their suffering.

So let's be clear. Our unemployment is currently at 9.4 percent, and that is expected to rise into double digits. There are unsubstantiated boasts coming about jobs saved through the Stimulus Act, but that doesn't help the 345,000 Americans who lost their jobs just last month. It doesn't put food on their table.

Our projected Federal deficit this year is going to reach \$1.8 trillion, almost \$2 trillion, which our children are going to have to pay for. We are going to have to service that debt. When the interest rate goes up, it will destroy all of our discretionary money. We will soon auction off an unprecedented \$104 billion of debt. That \$104 billion has \$11 billion in interest. That is \$11 billion that we are going to pay, and that is just thrown away. Wait until the interest rates go up. This \$11 billion will not save anybody's job or pave any roads or provide any health care. It will just be

used to continue our massive level of deficit spending.

And yet, excessive taxation and regulation mandates are now being proposed in Washington to deal with man-made global warming, which is a total fraud, as I have demonstrated, and which they admit because they are unwilling to debate the basic facts of global warming, the scientific facts that I have over and over again, myself and Senator INHOFE and others, have over and over presented, but instead we are called names and belittled by this arrogant group that just has in mind they want to tax and regulate and control us, and they always have.

So here and now we are asked to pass this economy-killing bill in the name of stopping man-made global warming.

What's in the bill? I don't have to go into total detail here, but let's just mention that Chairman WAXMAN was asked about a certain section of the bill. And he said, and this was in committee, Why are you asking me? I certainly don't know everything that is in my bill.

I would suggest if you are writing a bill that will have such profound repercussions for decades to come by killing our economy and subduing our people, that is an unacceptable answer.

□ 2320

We know that there are many dangers that are going to be unleashed by this legislation, and it's an economy-killing piece of legislation. Its aim supposedly is to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions—and let's again say this. CO<sub>2</sub>, 80 percent of it in the atmosphere is traced not to human activity, it's a minuscule part of the atmosphere. Yet the goal of this draconian legislation, this oppressive, anti-economy legislation is to reduce emissions to around 80 percent of the current level of the world level by 2020. From there, it would be gradually reduced further. In order to do this, the Federal Government would issue permits that companies would use in exchange for the right of emitting CO<sub>2</sub>.

Now, let's make this very clear; CO<sub>2</sub> does not harm human beings. CO<sub>2</sub>, we pump it into these greenhouses to make tomatoes grow better. I am all in favor of controlling pollution, pollution of the water, of the air, of the ground. CO<sub>2</sub> is not a pollutant that hurts human beings, but that's what we are being asked to focus on and that's what this legislation that will destroy the jobs of the American people focuses on.

Well, one wonders who will decide who will receive the vouchers that are going to be given out. Apparently, 85 percent of the vouchers for the next few years will just be given out by the government, and those vouchers will be used to give permits to people who want to do business that produces CO<sub>2</sub>. Who is going to get those? This is an invitation for corruption, an invitation for corruption. We don't even know where the money went from the TARP bill where we spent hundreds of billions of dollars.

So let's remember that this bill will have a dramatic impact on our economy and the American family. There will be over \$1,600 in new taxes per American family by this legislation. And all the jobs will then go to India and to China. That's what we're doing. We're taxing our people, regulating our business, and encouraging our businessmen then to go to China and to India. It will destroy millions of jobs by 2012.

Electricity rates will go up 90 percent above the inflation rate. We will incur \$33,000 worth of additional Federal debt for every man, woman, and child in America because of this legislation. And gas prices will rise over 50 percent, natural gas prices well over 50 percent.

And who will be helped by this? The Chinese and the Indians. That's what we're going to get out of this legislation. What did you expect from legislation that was designed to meet a phony problem, man-made global warming, which I have just demonstrated doesn't exist.

So, why is this happening? Why are we on the verge of passing legislation? Why have people even advocated man-made global warming? Well, this has all come about because there are people in our country and throughout the world who want to control the American people. They have wanted to do this forever. They have wanted to change our lifestyles whether we like it or not. But this is a democracy, and they had to scare us and they had to skew the argument. They had to beat down anybody who wanted to offer alternative arguments in order to get us to this point of passing legislation that will dramatically control our people and control industry and put us under a burden of taxation and regulation that will destroy the meaning of opportunity in America in the years to come.

Now, why do they want to do this? Because they want to build a whole new world based on benevolent control of people like themselves. And that's where the real threat comes in. The real threat comes in that this is not just the idea of centralizing power in the Federal Government—which in and of itself is contrary to what America is supposed to be all about. We're supposed to let local government and State governments control many things, but this is a centralization of power into the hands of global government.

Yes, you hear global answers, We're global this and global that. What that means is international organizations like the United Nations—which is filled with corrupt governments and representatives from corrupt governments, filled with representatives from governments that are despotic gangsters who murder their own people. We should not be transferring power globally. That is the worst possible scenario. But this, too, like the man-made global warming theory, is their dream, the dream of a planet being planned

out by benevolent people, as if people on the international scale and Washington, D.C., are naturally more competent and more benevolent than the people themselves or the people in local government.

What can we expect? Yes, as this moves along, this is the first major step. This bill that will be coming up this week, the cap-and-trade bill based on fraudulent science, this will be the first step towards what? Towards centralizing money and power in the Federal Government.

The next step is centralizing that power globally, all in the name of benevolent ends, all in the name of stopping this horrible threat that's hanging over our heads, man-made global warming. Of course, they don't use that anymore. Again, remember, every time the word "climate change" is used is an admission that the people who advocated man-made global warming were wrong all along.

So I would suggest that this is the time for the patriots to stand up to the globalists. This is the time for us to say, We don't want this legislation. It will be harmful to our families. It will centralize power and money and resources in the Federal Government. It will destroy our economy at a time when people need jobs and a stronger economy. It will actually help the Chinese and the Indians more than us, all in the same benevolent-motivated activity, which is very similar to the ending of the use of DDT, which caused millions of children in the third world to die.

I don't care if people are benevolent. I don't care what their motives are, if their motives are benevolent. What is important is whether they're rational and whether they're right. I have pointed out in this speech numerous examples where the science is wrong, and I would suggest that the theory that big government controlling our lives as the way to solve our problems is also wrong. It will lead us not to more prosperity and not to more liberty, but a diminishing of the liberty and prosperity of our people.

Again, wake up America. It's time for the patriots to act. We still have time to turn this around. We have seen \$4 trillion being given out, \$4 trillion of private liability put on our shoulders as public debt in this last year. This is a tremendous centralization of power.

We will not give up our freedom and let this happen. We are not powerless. This is still a democracy. People need to call their Member of Congress. They need to call their Senator and say man-made global warming was a hoax. It was not something that we should be basing a centralization of wealth and power in the Federal Government, and certainly not something that we should be getting involved in in order to enrich the power of the United Nations and other international bodies.

I would invite my fellow Americans to get involved in the system. If one does not get involved in the system, we

will not go the right way. And I will say that in our country's history, it has always been the intervention of the American people at the right moment that has kept us on the right track. It wasn't just sitting back and allowing special interests—like are so evident in this cap-and-trade legislation that will be voted on later on this week—to write the legislation, to control what sounds like a benevolent-sounding initiative which will wreak havoc on the life of the American people. They want to control us and change our lifestyle. Let them convince us. Don't let them control us and take away our democratic rights.

Mr. Speaker, as I stand here on the floor of the House tonight, I am reminded of the television series, *The Twilight Zone*. These days I half expect Rod Serling to appear from behind a curtain and announce that "This is the *Twilight Zone*." Yes, there is an almost bizarre sense of unreality here in the Nation's Capitol: The transformation of private liability into public debt on a massive scale, the unprecedented level of deficit spending, debt piled on debt, borrowing from China to give foreign aid to other countries, the willingness to pass draconian restrictions and controls on our national economy and on the lives of our people.

While seeking to save us from recession, Congress shovels hundreds of billions into the financial industry, much of which has ended up in the pockets of fat cats and wheeler-dealers who've been giving themselves multi-million dollar bonuses even as they've driven their own companies into the ground. The give-aways and lack of oversight have been mind boggling. We don't know where hundreds of billions of dollars went and to whom, yet now the taxpayers are on the hook for this increase in our debt.

We've watched as nothing has been done to protect the well being of our people.

Our nation's borders leak like a spaghetti strainer, millions of people illegally continue pouring into our county to consume our limited healthcare, education, and other social service dollars, and yes, to take jobs from our people, and in some cases commit crimes against our people. Our government lets it happen. We can't even build a fence.

In California we can't even build new water systems in the middle of a drought, this we are told because of a tiny fish—the delta smelt—so our people will suffer because of concern over a little, tiny, worthless fish that's not even good enough to use as bait. So last week, even amidst California's tremendous difficulties, with drought conditions and a shortage of water at near-crisis, this House voted not for the people, but for fish. No water for our people if that little fish might be affected.

Perhaps the most damaging of the weird policies I've described is America's long time commitment not to develop our domestic energy resources. Even as high energy prices have brought suffering and economic hardship to our people. Even as dollars have been siphoned from our pockets and deposited in coffers overseas, enriching foreigners, some of whom hate us. While our hard-earned dollars are being extracted from us, massive domestic deposits of oil and gas worth trillions of dollars are untouched, untapped, unused. Even as California sinks into an economic catastrophe—off the coast, are huge caverns filled

with massive deposits of oil and gas sitting there? Even as California cuts or cancels public services, billions of dollars of tax revenue from that oil and gas sits right off shore, yet the state of California lets it sit while our people suffer and the state goes broke. Trillions of dollars have been sent overseas for energy while at home, no new oil refineries, no hydro electric dams, no nuclear power plants.

As I say all of it's a bit bizarre. But it is not meaningless nonsense. Those who've insisted upon these anti-domestic energy policies know what they are doing. They want to change our way of life whether we like it or not. So a few decades ago they grabbed onto a theory that the world is heating up because humankind uses carbon based fuel—oil, gas, coal, etc. This theory would give them the ability to stampede politicians, even scientists, into supporting draconian policies and mandates, changes in our economy and our lifestyle. All in the name of protecting us from a climate calamity: Man-made Global Warming.

The good book says "the truth shall make you free"; a caveat might be "and a lie can destroy your freedom." Man-made Global Warming has given respectable cover to advocates of tax and regulatory policies that no one would even consider, except, of course, unless it is an emergency. In reality, the effort behind the Man-made Global Warming juggernaut is the biggest power grab in history. It gives politicians, who've always wanted to control the behavior of normal people, a seemingly legitimate reason to do so . . . even over their objections. This power grab was set in motion back in the very first days of the Clinton administration in 1993.

When the Clinton Administration took over, one of the first actions of that administration was to fire Dr. William Happer, a man who dared challenge Vice President Gore. He believed in science, not the junk science of the radicals. He didn't fit, so out he went. From there the pattern became all too clear. In order to receive even one penny of federal research funds, a scientist would expect to toe the line of Man-made Global Warming alarmism. Any dissent would be quickly quashed, or at least cut off from any federal research funding. So when approaching this concept of Man-made Global Warming we must examine the science behind it. So let's state right off, the unconscionable intimidation of the science community during the Clinton years has ensured that bad science permeates the entire argument of those alarmists perpetuating this man-made myth.

That it is based on bad science and lies is easy to discern by the herculean effort Man-made Global Warming advocates have made to cut off debate. That is why in Congress they are now trying to quickly slip by drastic life altering legislation based on the Man-made Global Warming theory without confronting the basic science. How many of us have heard "Case closed?" "This debate is over." That is the language of debate and discussion restriction.

Case closed. Al Gore takes no questions. Every prominent scientist agrees so you must be a kook to disagree. The name calling and stifling of debate by the Man-made Global Warming advocates has been shameful and a disservice to democracy.

So what about the science?

First, about the so-called warming cycle caused by human activity—we know that there

have been weather cycles and climate cycles throughout the history of the world. The Global Warming alarmists are now using a low point of a 500 year cooling cycle, the end of the Little Ice Age, as their baseline for determining if humankind is making the planet hotter. Should we really be upset when there is a 1 or 2 degree rise from a 500 year low point in temperatures?

So science question number one: are they not using an unreasonably cooler moment as a baseline for analysis? Question number two: what about the other weather cycles that have had nothing to do with human activity? A thousand years ago things were much warmer than now. Iceland and Greenland were farmed by Norsemen. What about the many other cycles, many of them to prehistoric times, even before man? So, all of a sudden it's man's fault?

So, if these cycles were happening before humans were a force on the planet, isn't it likely there is another explanation for the cycles? Well, it seems to many scientists that cycles of climate follow solar activity. That's why cycles mirroring those on earth have been observed on other planets.

In recent years we've been treated to outcries of agony about the melting taking place in the Arctic. Who has not seen the pictures of the poor polar bear on the ice flow, obviously a victim of Man-made Global Warming? Well not so fast. Yes, the ice cap is retreating. There's no doubt about that. But what about the ice cap on Mars? There is an ice cap on Mars and 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 driving SUVs or modern technology that's creating such cycles, including the one that we are already in?

So, if a polar bear is hurt it is not caused by human activity. And by the way, the polar bear population has dramatically expanded—there are 4 to 5 times the number of polar bears as there were in the 1960s.

So here's another scientific challenge: were there already cycles? And if polar ice on Mars is retreating as well, aren't cycles likely the result of solar activity? Let's have an answer to that.

The Man-made Global Warming theory has been focused on CO<sub>2</sub>. Let's talk about the science of this. CO<sub>2</sub> is 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 less than 0.04 percent. Much less than 1 tenth of 1 percent of the atmosphere is CO<sub>2</sub>. And of that, at least 80 percent of the CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere is not traced to human activity.

There have been, over the years, times when CO<sub>2</sub> was going up and down dramatically but did not affect the climate of the planet. For example, if Man-made CO<sub>2</sub> causes warming, why, as CO<sub>2</sub> levels were rising dramatically in the 1940s, fifties, sixties and seventies why, if the CO<sub>2</sub> 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. Why is everyone afraid to take on these scientific answers? I had one person suggest to me that the pollution in the atmosphere completely overwhelmed the "Greenhouse Effect" during this period. If that's true, then The Clean Air Act of 1970 is directly responsible for Man-made Global Warming. Does anyone believe that?

And here's another scientific challenge. A recent study shows that over 80 percent of America's temperature and weather stations have been compromised and are faulty in the information they're providing.

The numbers have been skewed. They are suspect because the monitors have been placed in locations that do not meet the National Weather Service basic standards. 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 that do not meet the standards, 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 a one-degree rise in temperature since the end of the little ice age?

So how about that as a scientific challenge? If the data is based on monitors that don't meet scientific standards, how can we pass laws with taxes and controls on our people, even if the so-called problem is based on a bogus number?

And even with the current methods of collecting data, we have been warned time and again with dire predictions. Over the last 20 years, spreading the alarm, told us, Vice President Gore and others.

The temperatures were going to continue to climb and then we would reach a tipping point and temperatures would jump dramatically. Well, wake up. Quit talking theory.

The Global Warming alarmists' predictions were wrong, 180 degrees wrong. It has not gotten any warmer for over a decade and it looks like we're even still getting cooler. That is totally contradictory to the predictions that alarmists like VP Gore and others aggressively made to us. OK, this is yet another science-based challenge.

Don't ignore it, please pay us more respect than just changing your basic mantra from "Man-made Global Warming" to "climate change."

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 they say "climate change" remember these were the same people who were talking about Man-made Global Warming. Their dishonesty is underscored every time they now use the phrase "climate change." Now, no matter if it gets warmer or colder, they want us to give them the power to tax and control us even though the preponderance of evidence now suggests that cycles come from solar activity.

Let me note this, this gang told us human activity was causing the planet to warm. Now they are using the words "climate change," which is an admission that the Earth is getting cooler. So if human activity was making it warmer, then maybe it is good that human beings will mitigate a cooling cycle with the human activity that, according to Al Gore and others, was making it warmer. Logically, they should now be advocating we use more fossil fuel.

So Al Gore's scientific mumbo-jumbo was deceptive, the contention that all of the prominent scientists agreed with him was not true then and especially not true now. I'd now like to add a long list of many prominent scientists who oppose the Man-made Global Warming theory. The temperature predictions have

been wrong, and the man-made CO<sub>2</sub> premise is wrong.

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

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; and to this day no one has been permitted to view the assumptions and calculations that went into the incorrect computer models used to justify the alarmist campaign that is now being used to justify punitive taxes and controls on our people.

The projections 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.

So, let's review the scientific challenges to the Man-made Global Warming theory. I have issued challenges to any of my colleagues to debate the science of this issue, not one of those who now seem willing to vote for draconian legislation to implement the recommendations of the Global Warming alarmists have ever stepped forward. What is it they don't want to confront?

Baseline comparison is at the bottom of a 500-year decline in temperature. The science measurements were partly or severely flawed by a monitoring system that does not meet minimum acceptable standards. 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 CO<sub>2</sub> levels did not cause warming, which can be shown in the 1940s, 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s where there was an increasing level of CO<sub>2</sub>, but yet it was getting cooler.

Now that Man-made Global Warming has been driven into the public consciousness, the alarmists have the leverage right here in Washington. There is a price to pay, like the millions of children dying in Africa of malaria because we prevented the use of DDT. We did this so that bird egg shells would be thicker. The birds were more important to them than millions of third world children. So remember, there is a serious price to pay for listening to irrational alarmists.

And now all of this confronts us. There is a bill to be voted on this week—the “American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009” though I would call it the “Destroy American Jobs and Use Candles Act.” It is a bill that comes at exactly the wrong time, and its negative consequences will be ever more severe in economic hard times as we are now suffering. Maybe we are like the 3rd world children in their minds. The birds are more important than our own suffering people.

So let's be clear. Our unemployment is currently at 9.4%, and that is expected to soon rise over double digits. There are unsubstantiated boasts of jobs saved through the stimulus act, but that doesn't help the 345,000 Americans who lost their jobs last month put food on the table for their families. Our projected federal debt for this fiscal year reaches to one point eight trillion dollars!

We will soon auction an unprecedented \$104 billion in debt. \$104 billion with \$11 billion in interest. That's \$11 billion just thrown away. It will not save jobs; it will not repave roads; it will not provide healthcare. It will just be used to continue our massive level of spending.

And yet excessive taxation regulation mandates are now being proposed in Washington, and they will have severe consequences.

So here we are, and now we are asked to pass an economy killing bill, in the name of stopping Man-made Global Warming. What's in this bill? Well don't ask the bill's author. During markup of this bill, Chairman WAXMAN, when asked about a section of the bill claimed, “You're asking me? I certainly don't claim to know everything that's in this bill.” Well I would suggest, that if you are writing a bill that will have profound repercussions for decades to come, that is an unacceptable answer.

Of course, we know the aim of this bill is to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. As I have already said, this goal is foolhardy at best. It will reduce emissions of a harmless gas, while neglecting to address the dangerous pollutants that have had a demonstrated negative effect on human health.

The current proposal would reduce allowable CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to around 80 percent of the current level by 2020. From there it would gradually decrease further. In order to control this, the federal government would issue permits that companies would use in exchange for the right to emit CO<sub>2</sub>. These permits could be traded, bought and sold. Companies which emit more CO<sub>2</sub> than they have allowances for would face heavy fines. The sale of these revenues will supposedly cover the cost of the bill. It is surprising then, that 85% of these allowances will be given out for free during the next twenty years. What?!? One wonders who will decide who receives what will become yet another government subsidy, or a political giveaway. According to recently released numbers by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, this bill gives away \$821 billion worth of allocations to who the hell knows who, while consumers are going to pay \$846 billion more in carbon energy costs. We have no idea where those funds will go. The last time we passed legislation with no idea what we were voting on, AIG got big bonuses. Who will win big under this bill is still unclear, but what is clear is who will lose: The American worker.

But even if we believe all of the arguments made by those who would foist this bill on us, it will still not accomplish any meaningful CO<sub>2</sub> reduction. Remember, 80 percent or more of the CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere is not linked to human activity. We must ask ourselves if the cost of this bill, over \$1600 in new taxes per American family, is warranted given the fact that the U.S. share of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is falling as China and India's emissions are rising. So again, is it really worth it? Both of these countries have already stated publicly that they will not match these suicidal policies being proposed. All this bill will do is further encourage manufacturing to leave the United States for these countries. All of this will cost America. All of this, to decrease worldwide temperatures by less than one degree over the next 20 years, that might take us a little close to the 500-year low in global temperatures.

So it will not do what the bill's sponsors claim it will. But what this bill will also do is re-

duce our gross domestic product by over \$7 trillion and destroy nearly 2 million jobs by 2012. 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. Gas prices will rise over 50%. Natural Gas prices will rise by 50% as well. And it will help the Chinese and other people steal our businesses from us. This is the real climate change calamity.

So yes, this bill costs on average 1.1 million jobs a year. Between 2012 and 2035 the US GDP will lose \$9.4 trillion. All of this leads me to ask this simple question Mr. Speaker: What is worse: Living under Man-made Global Warming, or living under Man-made Global Warming legislation? I would suggest the latter.

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 Man-made 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 politics in this country who believe in centralizing power anyway.

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 Man-made 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.

Of course, the proposal before us will destroy the economy, and the irony of it is that it 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 and the attempt to push climate change legislation has never been more intense. 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 Man-made Global Warming theory over these 15 years, but especially over these last 4 years. The attempt to ramp up these scare tactics is at an all-time high.

But mark my words, the real calamity will not be an out-of-control climate caused by humans; the real calamity brought on by Man-made 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.

For example, in the future, we are going to face all kinds of mandates and controls from the Federal Government and the internationality. 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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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.

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.

We must stand up and defeat this power grab. Wake up America! Your freedom and prosperity are at stake.

I yield back the balance of my time.

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2647, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010**

Ms. PINGREE of Maine, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-182) on the resolution (H. Res. 572) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2647) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2010, 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. 2892, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010**

Ms. PINGREE of Maine, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-183) on the resolution (H. Res. 573) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2892) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**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. CONNOLLY of Virginia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. FLEMING, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today, June 24, 25 and 26.

**BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT**

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on June 19, 2009 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 2346. Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2344. To amend section 114 of title 17, United States Code, to provide for agreements for the reproduction and performance of sound recordings by webcasters.

H.R. 837. To designate the Federal building located at 799 United Nations Plaza in New York, New York, as the "Ronald H. Brown United States Mission to the United Nations Building".

H.R. 2675. To amend title II of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 to extend the operation of such title for a 1-year period ending June 22, 2010.

H.R. 813. To designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 306 East Main Street in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, as the "J. Herbert W. Small Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

**ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 24, 2009, at 10 a.m.

**EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL**

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the first quarter and second quarter of 2009 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

**REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO DENMARK, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 26 AND MAY 29, 2009**

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Steny Hoyer .....	5/26	5/29	Denmark .....	.....	1,529.64	.....	7,039.27	.....	.....	.....	8,568.91
Hon. Mariah Sixkiller .....	5/26	5/29	Denmark .....	.....	1,529.64	.....	7,039.27	.....	.....	.....	8,568.91
Austin Burnes .....	5/26	5/29	Denmark .....	.....	1,529.64	.....	7,039.27	.....	.....	.....	8,568.91