

get a free pass for 5 years while our jobs are just being drained away.

Now the Congress is reviewing the TPP, the largest free trade agreement of its kind in history. It does include countries like Vietnam and Malaysia, where labor and human rights abuses are rampant.

My colleagues have talked about Malaysia and trafficking and forced labor. Where are the values of this Nation when we can take Malaysia that traffics in young girls and say that they have gotten better and they go from a tier 3 country to a tier 2 country just so that they can be part of this agreement?

Where are the values of the United States of America? They are not present here. We can't afford more free trade agreements without adequate enforcement.

Worst of all, this bill weakens protection in so many areas. We are dealing, as I said, in trafficking. It is modern slavery. That is what that is all about.

Democrats have been clamoring for years and years for our government to include enforceable labor standards and enforceable environmental provisions, and it has fallen on deaf ears.

This motion to instruct—and I say to my colleague thank you for doing this—should pass. It will pass tonight or tomorrow, but it really should not go to conference. There are so many flaws in the underlying bill and in the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement as well, and this should not go to conference.

In fact, put a gloss on a piece of legislation that is one of the worst pieces of legislation that has hit this floor of the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I am prepared to close if the gentlewoman from New Hampshire is prepared to do so as well.

The value of a country's currency is a complex issue. It is determined by a number of factors: how much a country saves, how much it invests, the strength of its economy, its trade flows in and out. It is a complex issue.

Where Republicans and Democrats and the White House find common ground is the desire that countries don't manipulate their currency in order to give themselves an unfair trade advantage.

The difference is how best to go about it. And because it is a complex issue, there are some very good ideas on all parties' sides on how best to do that.

This motion essentially says to forget those discussions and don't have Republicans and Democrats from the House and Senate work together through this complex issue and find a common solution. This motion simply says to forget all that. There is only one solution, and we insist upon it. End the discussion.

I don't think that is the right way to go about it. I think, frankly, there are

real serious concerns not just from Republicans, but from the White House on insisting on this one solution.

I think our country is better served and those who want to stop currency manipulation are better served by bringing our best ideas together in this conference committee.

That is what I am determined to do. That is what the American public wants us to do, an open, transparent, regular process that brings about the very best solution for America.

That is why I urge a "no" vote on this motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to say to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, I think that we do agree to part of this about the danger of currency manipulation and the millions of jobs that are lost here in our country.

That is why I rise this evening to offer this motion to instruct the conferees to include in the conference report language to combat currency manipulation from the Senate-passed version of this bill.

I also want to associate myself with the comments of my colleagues because these are bipartisan issues. I have worked with my colleagues across the aisle on human trafficking, and I know that my colleagues share my values and are appalled at the egregious efforts that have gone down in Malaysia to traffic in young girls.

These are not American values that are being expressed at this historic moment, as countries across the world gather in Paris to protect our society, our whole humankind, from the ravages of climate change.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to support my motion. I will be asking for a recorded vote.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1915

CLIMATE CHANGE DEBATE NOT SETTLED

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, recently, President Obama declared climate change to be the number one adversary of the United States.

He has proposed wide-ranging regulations to fight this supposed enemy, regulations that not only drastically increase the scope of government but could only irreparably damage our economy. Today, we voted to reject those policies.

While he concentrates on crony capitalism disguised as feel-good policies, our true enemy has grown in strength and struck one of our oldest allies. We know this enemy: a radical form of Islam that has sworn to destroy Western civilization, that abuses and enslaves women, that seeks victory through suicide attacks and terrorizing civilians.

From manufacturing fake data to fit computer temperature models, to manipulated actual temperatures being rounded up to fit the narrative, and the resistance by government entities to reveal their methodology and internal biases show that, indeed, the debate on climate change is far from settled.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to wake up, recognize that no nation should willingly choose to damage its own economy, as he proposes. It is time he recognized the United States' responsibility to the free world and end the self-destructive cycle that his policies would initiate.

RADICAL ISLAMIC TERROR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, just to follow up on the eloquent 1-minute speech by my friend, DOUG LAMALFA, that it is extraordinary to think that the President of the United States—some say he is the leader of the free world—would actually say publicly and, even worse, at a conference of world leaders that, in effect, the worst blow we could hit ISIS with is for the leaders to come together on climate change?

It is hard to believe the leader of the free world would make such a statement. Maybe it was just something that was given to him to read and he read, maybe it was in a teleprompter, or maybe he didn't have time to think about what he was saying. Because I have talked to too many people in all parts of the world who have dealt directly with radical Islamist terrorists, and they make clear that radical Islamist terrorists know nothing and respect nothing but power. Incredible. Just incredible.

Growing up, it would have been akin to bullies beating up and taking from smaller students on the playground and the teacher gathering all the students and other teachers together and saying, "I am going to teach the bullies a lesson by just ignoring them and

reading you a lovely story from our library.” Who wouldn’t understand that the next day the bullies would be beating people up again and robbing again? It is incredible.

Such insanity followed a terrible event, a shooting in Colorado Springs. As a judge, a former judge, a former prosecutor, the man that did this needs to be punished. It is wrong, and no one should use any excuse to go in and shoot other people, whether it is an Islamic terrorist or whether it is a deranged, mentally unstable person thinking they have some kind of score to even with people they don’t even know, shooting people about whom they know nothing.

This story from November 30, Fox News, about the three people killed in Colorado, FoxNews.com:

“The two civilians killed in Friday’s shooting at a Colorado Planned Parenthood clinic were identified by authorities and family members on Sunday.

“Jennifer Markovsky, 35, was accompanying a friend to the Colorado Springs Planned Parenthood clinic when she was killed in the shooting rampage, her father told The Denver Post.

“John Ah-King said she grew up in Hawaii and met her husband, Paul, before the couple moved to Colorado when he was stationed here for the military.

“Ah-King told the Post from his home in Hawaii that Markovsky was a kind-hearted, lovable person with two children.

“The second civilian killed was identified as Ke’Arre Stewart, 29, Amburh Butler, a lifelong friend and family spokeswoman told the Associated Press.

“Butler said that Stewart was accompanying someone to the clinic, and leaves behind two girls, 11 and 5, who live in Texas.

“Stewart served in the Army’s Fourth Infantry Division and was deployed to Iraq, where Butler said he would often send her letters describing the horrors he saw on the front lines.

“‘He would tell me how terrible it was, how many guys he watched die. It was terrible for him,’ Butler told the Associated Press. The Army stationed Stewart at Fort Carson in Colorado Springs in 2013 before he was discharged from the military the following year. ‘He went someplace where people expect to die, only to come back . . . and be killed.’”

She also said, “He was just a standup guy, he would take a bullet for you. He was the most sincere person I’d ever met.”

“Markovsky and Stewart’s identities were confirmed by officials, who said a full identification would be provided once autopsies were completed Monday.

“The third victim was Garrett Swasey, who worked as a police officer at the University of Colorado, Colorado Springs, and was called to assist with an active shooter at the nearby clinic.

“Swasey was married with two children and a co-pastor at Hope Chapel, where he was remembered Sunday by parishioners who watched a video of him ice skating.

“‘We are learning that eyewitnesses confirm that the man who will be charged with the tragic and senseless shooting that resulted in the deaths of three people and injuries to nine others at Planned Parenthood’s health center in Colorado Springs was motivated by opposition to safe and legal abortion,’ Planned Parenthood Rocky Mountain CEO Vicki Cowart said.”

Well, that is from Vicki Cowart. That does not appear to be official. And it always seems if it works better—for example, I would hope that the President has learned by now that he shouldn’t give opinions about shootings until he knows more about them. Don’t condemn a policeman when it turns out the policeman was entirely justified because, by doing so, you help stir up and divide this Nation that needs to come together.

So there are so many questions. When I was a prosecutor, when I was a judge, I wanted to know motive. I wanted to know what caused people to do what they did.

We know why Islamic terrorists do what they do. They think that that is contributing to the caliphate. If they happen to die, just as Thomas Jefferson was told—it was reported that Jefferson asked why the Barbary pirates kept attacking American ships when they weren’t a threat to that Muslim area. He was reportedly told, “We believe we go to paradise if we are killed while we are fighting infidels like you.”

So we know what motivates most Islamic terrorists. Either they think they are going to go to paradise—what a surprise they are going to get—or they think they are contributing to bringing the world under a totalitarian domination by one theocrat, like the Ayatollah Khamenei or al-Baghdadi, who is head of ISIS.

So, with that tragedy just in our rearview mirror, unfortunately, once again, the President, in front of a massive group, spoke without thinking about what he was saying.

I don’t know whether it was on a teleprompter again and he just hadn’t thought about what he was reading to the public, maybe somebody put something in front of him, or maybe he was talking off the cuff and hadn’t really thought about what he was saying.

But this article from Alex Griswold, dated today, says, “While giving a press conference in Paris, President Barack Obama told reporters that the mass shootings that plague the United States just never happen in other countries. ‘With respect to Planned Parenthood, obviously, my heart goes out to the families of those impacted,’ Obama said in response to a reporter’s question. ‘I mean, I say this every time we’ve got one of these mass shootings; this just doesn’t happen in other countries.’”

He is in Paris, France, where they have just buried one of the 130 people, mostly from mass shootings. I mean, they probably just finished the funeral services for the victims of the Islamic terrorists, and the President says in front of the world so insensitively that these shootings, like the three people in Colorado Springs, never happens in any other countries, as he is standing in a country where it just had 130 people killed, mainly in mass shootings.

In fact, the article says that “the majority of the 130 deaths were in mass shooting attacks, where the ISIS-affiliated terrorists attacked public places with automatic rifles. Nearly one hundred people alone were killed in just one mass shooting at the Bataclan Theater.”

“Earlier this year, Paris was also the victim of a terrorist attack targeting the satirical magazine Charlie Hebdo. The Al Qaeda-affiliated terrorists wielded assault rifles, killing 11 innocent people.” That was in Paris.

□ 1930

Now, I do realize this article says the 11 people with Charlie Hebdo, the publisher of the magazine, that those 11 people, it says here, were innocent. But, obviously, again, a leader of the United States, our Secretary of State, John Kerry, addressed on video for the world to see this issue and basically was saying we can understand why the Charlie Hebdo people were killed.

I mean, for goodness’ sake, those people used the idea that they had the freedom to speak any way they wanted to; and, apparently, radical Islamic terrorists were insulted, even though the President has said repeatedly and John Kerry has said repeatedly and Hillary Clinton has said repeatedly, and continues to say, that these terrorist attacks by radical Islamic terrorists have nothing to do with Islam.

Well, that is a head-scratcher, because if the terrorist attacks on Charlie Hebdo had nothing to do with Islam, then why did John Kerry think there may have been some justification for Islamic terrorists to kill these satirists, these magazine employees, because they said something offensive about Islam? If it wasn’t about Islam, then why were the terrorists killing these magazine employees because they said something about Islam? That is a head-scratcher.

And then when we look at what the media is saying about the Colorado Springs shooting and we look at what people in the mainstream media, whether it is “The View” or other places, talk about, yeah, Hitler was a Christian. No, he wasn’t. And, yeah, McVeigh, was a Christian. Well, I am sure that would be a surprise to him. He seemed to brag late in life about being agnostic. Hitler certainly wasn’t a Christian.

So if the President, Hillary Clinton, and John Kerry are right that, gee, we need to worry as much about Christians—actually, our State Department

seems to think, in their reports, that we need to worry more about Christians than we do about Islamic terrorists, even though there is no indication that the Colorado Springs shooter was a Christian.

I can absolutely assure you, Mr. Speaker, no matter what he says his religious affiliation is, he certainly was not a Christian, because he certainly was not following the teachings of Christ. The Bible makes clear that we are known by our fruits, and if he has gone in and killed other people in this way, illegally, then he is certainly not following the teachings of Christ. He is not part of the government. There is no justification. There has been no trial.

But it does also raise issues about the effects of the lawlessness of this administration, having had whistleblowers come to me, law-abiding, moral, ethical people you want to know. We have seen that the Justice Department will go after and destroy any honest, moral, ethical whistleblower that may reflect poorly on the administration. We have seen reports of the acting inspector general at Homeland Security changing IG reports. We get word that in the intelligence community reports have been changed from truth to something that would not make the administration look bad, reports now coming out about, and apparently former intelligence leader Flynn talking about this, how the truth that was coming from intelligence in 2012 did not match up with this administration's reelection campaign so they just changed the reports.

I mean, what effect does an administration lying and being lawless have on what traditionally has been a majority law-abiding country? Can it create helplessness, a feeling, or a need that perhaps we need to take the law into our own hands? I would tell anyone that is never justified. You do it through lawful means, through the government. Of course, Thomas Jefferson might say otherwise.

But what effect does it have when the law of the land, the Federal administration governing, ruling over the country, required by the Constitution to follow the laws that have been passed by Congress and signed by other Presidents, this President may not agree with and he just disregards the laws, say, on amnesty, disregards the laws about governing the EPA, so they just make up new regulations, and you just create 79,000 pages of new regulations as if you are a dictator in chief? I mean, if, hypothetically, that were happening, what effect would it have on people who believed in having a law-abiding country when the administration over the country becomes so lawless? It seems surely it would create a feeling of desperation.

What do you do? I have talked to whistleblowers who had that feeling. What do you do? I can't go to the Justice Department with the truth about what is going on because they will

prosecute me. They will destroy my family. I will never be able to make a living again. I have seen what they do to whistleblowers who just want the administration to be honest and follow the law. What do you do? Where do you go?

I would submit that the place you go is not to Russia to give away our utmost secrets because that is treason, but it is bound to be mitigating when an administration makes it so tough to just come forward and state the truth.

We found out that this administration had known about General Petraeus' affair for most of a year, but they waited until General Petraeus was in a position to destroy the election possibilities, reelection possibilities for President Obama, and they flowed out about the affair they have known about for most of the year, and he is destroyed. They prosecute him because apparently, as I understand it, he provided a calendar to his biographer and searched as they might for anything that they could hang around his neck of being a lawless activity. As I understand it, they found something in his calendar that could have been said to be classified, so he agreed to plead to that.

And we find out yesterday there apparently have been 1,000, around 1,000 Hillary Clinton emails so far that contain classified information. If Chuck Colson gets a year and a half for having information he is not supposed to, Petraeus' life, his livelihood, is ruined because they are finally able to find something that might have been classified that he pleads guilty to having turned over to his biographer. How long do you get for doing that a thousand times? I am just asking, Mr. Speaker.

But if, let's say, hypothetically, it were true what President Obama, John Kerry, and Hillary Clinton keep saying, that you should not say anything negative about the terrorists who claim to be Islamic and who say, Praise be to Allah, "Allahu Akbar," and then they kill innocent people, you can't say anything that that is related to radical Islam because that only makes matters worse. Well, if they really believe those things they have been saying, and if it were even true, and if Homeland Security is right that we need to worry about evangelical Christians or people that belong in the authority of the United States Constitution, then shouldn't the President, Hillary Clinton, and John Kerry, be worried that they are going to stir up another crusade by besmirching and maligning Christianity and Christians as routinely as they do, saying these Christian terrorists are so bad or pointing out we have got bad Christians, we have got the Crusades?

Well, if Christianity is as big a threat to commit violence as people who say they are Islamic terrorists or jihadists, then I am just asking, Mr. Speaker, wouldn't that indicate that the President, Hillary Clinton, and John Kerry

are actually going to be responsible if a Christian goes and does something violent? I mean, using their own logic, if they are out there running down Christians as a threat to violence while saying you can't say anything negative about radical Islam and a Christian has done something wrong, well, if you are saying we stir up radical Islamic terrorists by talking about them, then wouldn't you be responsible if you—generic indefinite "you"—be responsible for saying bad things about a Christian if a Christian then does something violent? I am just asking, applying the President's own logic or lack thereof.

There is an article from 4 months ago by Kyle Becker that said, after the tragic Charleston shooting that left nine Americans dead, President Obama said the following: "But let's be clear: At some point, we as a country will have to reckon with the fact that this type of mass violence does not happen in other advanced countries. It doesn't happen in other places with this kind of frequency."

□ 1945

The President said that 4 months or so ago, and he says it again now, while he is in Paris, where 130 people were just killed in a mass attack.

But this article was written 4 months ago, and it actually charts it. And it reads, "Since most statistics on mass shootings in the world compare apples and oranges by not correcting for population, let's get a chart that makes sense, shall we?" Between 2009 and 2013, the author goes through and charts.

The loss of even one life should not be occurring. As someone who has looked a defendant in the eye and has ordered him to be taken and held by the Texas Department of Criminal Justice until he is put to death and has signed the order requiring a multiple-murderer or a kidnapping murderer-torturer be put to death, I know every life matters. Every life matters. Every little baby who is cut up and sold for parts matters.

How about the lawlessness of seeing the Planned Parenthood videos and not only not be offended or finding those grotesque and inhumane but actually having the Department of Justice stand ready to be the criminal defense firm for Planned Parenthood and stand by Planned Parenthood in these alleged horribly egregious violations of humanity? Would that invoke helplessness? It shouldn't invoke anybody to violence, but could it?

According to this article by Kyle Becker, between 2009 through 2013—these are rampage shooting fatalities per 1 million people—Norway had 15.3, Finland had 1.85, Slovakia had 1.47, Israel had 1.38, Switzerland had .75, and the United States had .72.

Even one is too many, and the perpetrator should and must be punished. But if someone has committed crimes in Planned Parenthood, shouldn't we have an administration that believes in enforcing the laws and in at least doing

a proper investigation on whether what was said in the videos were true, which certainly indicated orally that there were apparent crimes committed?

Since every life matters, every Black life matters, not just the Black lives that are needlessly taken by a White person, but every Black life matters no matter who takes the life.

This article from the Chicago Tribune reports, "Holiday toll: 8 killed, 20 wounded over Thanksgiving weekend." It seems rather callous.

The article reads, "Eight people were killed, including a 16-year-old boy, and at least 20 others were wounded in shootings over the Thanksgiving weekend in Chicago, an increase over last year as the number of gunshot victims rose above 2,700 for the year."

There were 2,700 gunshot victims in Chicago, when Chicago has such strong gun control laws in place? How could that be? Is it possible that having the toughest gun control laws, like Washington, D.C., has had, doesn't stop violent murders?

In fact, is it possible that places that have the strictest gun control have become murder capitals? It certainly appears so in Chicago and in Washington, D.C.

This article from the Chicago Tribune reads:

"Mysean Dunnin, 16, was among the first victims of the long holiday weekend. He was shot in the head a few minutes before midnight just west of Kedzie Avenue on Van Buren Street in East Garfield Park, about a block from his home.

"Police said two people walked up and fired at Dunnin. He was pronounced dead at the scene.

"Four other people were wounded between 3 p.m. Wednesday and 2:30 a.m. Thursday.

"Two men were killed and four others were wounded from 1:20 p.m. on Thanksgiving Day to 3:15 a.m. Friday.

"A 36-year-old man was killed and two people, including a 14-year-old boy, were wounded between Friday afternoon and early Saturday morning.

"The most violent stretch occurred Saturday into Sunday, when three men were fatally shot and at least four other people were wounded.

"Father of three, home for the holidays, dies in Back of the Yards shooting.

"Between Sunday afternoon and early Monday, an eighth person was killed and six other people were wounded.

"The toll during last year's Thanksgiving weekend" in Chicago "was 5 killed and 14 wounded. That included a fatal shooting inside the Nordstrom's store on North Michigan Avenue."

With the President's precious ideas on gun control that certainly his former chief of staff, Rahm Emanuel, would have in place in Chicago since he has such power to effectuate the passage through the city leaders of ordinances for tough gun control, how could this be?

The number of homicides is 444. "So far this year, there have been at least 2,740 shootings in Chicago, up more than 400 from the same time last year. The number of homicides is 444, an increase of 42 from last year." That is tragic.

An article by Charles C.W. Cooke on November 23, 2015, reads, "Anyone who would use terror as an excuse to subvert the Second Amendment should be tarred and feathered." A rather interesting position.

An article from Charlie Spiering of 30 November 2015 reads, "In his inaugural speech at the COP21 climate change summit in Paris, President Obama acknowledged the terrorist attacks that occurred in the city earlier this month, but warned his fellow leaders not to be distracted from focusing on the looming threat of global warming."

The President was quoted as saying, "What greater rejection of those who would tear down our world than marshaling our best efforts to save it."

Ignoring the violent terrorism that the Islamic jihadists are infecting upon the world and talking about climate change—and, obviously, I mean, most thinking people know it is called "climate change" now because "global warming" hasn't really been supported for many years now, and, certainly, it is not provable that it was manmade.

I do believe in climate change. We have it four times a year in east Texas, where I live, so I know climate change is a fact. We know that the weather normally works in cycles.

We had a witness before our Natural Resources Committee who knows a great deal about the climate, and I asked him, is it true that planet Earth had to have been warmer during the days of Leif Eriksson's crossing the North Atlantic when the Norse came to Greenland? Is it true that planet Earth was warmer then? It turns out, according to his testimony, the planet was much warmer then.

Now, we don't know what kind of fuel, what kind of carbon emissions those Norse boats were putting into the atmosphere, but I guess you would have to figure those Norse must have really been putting out some pollution from those ships with the sails on them to have created a warmer planet back then than we have now.

Apparently, they were growing crops in places on Greenland where you can't anymore.

My friend Ben Shapiro has an article in the Daily Wire entitled, "Five Reasons Obama's Climate Change Agenda is Dangerous—", and part of the words are blacked out after that.

One reason he has highlighted is because "we have no idea to what extent the Earth is warming." And he sets out some data and facts there, resources there or other.

Two, "We have no clue how much human activity causes climate change," and I would add "if any."

Of course, we call it "climate change" now because the data did not

support the "global warming" that was being used in a fear-mongering fashion to scare people. By changing from "global warming" to "climate change," that would allow them to say in the seventies, as they did, that we are at the beginning of a new ice age and then 30 years later say that we are heading toward cataclysmic global warming that will destroy all life on planet Earth.

Now, after the long pause in warming that seems to be inexplicable to scientists and after the release of private emails and information from the University of East Anglia some years back, it indicated data was being manipulated so that it reflected things that weren't true about so-called global warming or climate change.

Ben Shapiro's third point: "We have no idea how much climate change impacts human life." It has discussions and references there.

Then, the fourth: "We have no idea what level of de-development would be necessary to maintain our current climate."

The fifth: "The solution—destroying carbon-based fuels and capitalism—is the problem." He writes, "The left is in an all-out war with the two greatest forces for fighting poverty in history: cheap, carbon-based energy and capitalism."

□ 2000

"The same people celebrating the end of the Industrial Revolution economic model seem to forget that that economic model, boosted by carbon-based fuels, have led to a massive drop in global poverty; in 1990, 1.9 billion people lived under \$1.25 per day, as opposed to 836 million in 2015. That's because of the dominance of capitalism and the increased efficiency of technology. It's certainly not because of governmental environmental regulations.

"Some on the left seem eager to try out their theory that we can maintain our current standard of living while hopping in a time machine back to less usage of carbon, without reference to market efficiencies. This is foolishness. We have time machines; they're called airplanes. Folks on the left ought to fly to countries where people don't have coal or oil or natural gas or free markets, and watch them burn cow chips for heat to see how lovely and natural that lifestyle actually is.

"But President Obama has his goals. How many people will have to suffer or die globally because of them isn't really the issue. After all, to question him would make us 'cynical,' he assures us. If cynicism means saving lives, then perhaps we all ought to be cynical of his world-conquering, unscientific, redistributionist nonsense."

Going back to February 7, 2015, an article from Christopher Booker from The Telegraph titled "The fiddling with temperature data is the biggest science scandal ever," he said: "Two weeks ago, under the headline 'How we are being tricked by flawed data on

global warming,' I wrote about Paul Homewood, who, on his Notalotof peopleknowthat blog, had checked the published temperature graphs for three weather stations in Paraguay against the temperatures that had originally been recorded. In each instance, the actual trend of 60 years of data had been dramatically reversed, so that a cooling trend was changed to one that showed a marked warming.

"This was only the latest of many examples of a practice long recognised by expert observers around the world—one that raises an ever larger question mark over the entire official surface-temperature record.

"Following my last article, Homewood checked a swathe of other South American weather stations around the original three. In each case he found the same suspicious one-way 'adjustments.' First these were made by the U.S. government's Global Historical Climate Network (GHCN). They were then amplified by two of the main official service records, the Goddard Institute for Space Studies (Giss) and the National Climate Data Center (NCDC), which use the warming trends to estimate temperatures across the vast regions of the Earth where no measurements are taken. Yet these are the very records on which scientists and politicians rely for their belief in 'global warming.'

"Homewood has now turned his attention to the weather stations across much of the Arctic, between Canada (51 degrees W) and the heart of Siberia (87 degrees E). Again, in nearly every case, the same one-way adjustments have been made, to show warming up to 1 degree C or more higher than was indicated by the data that was actually recorded. This has surprised no one more than Traust Jonsson, who was long in charge of climate research for the Iceland met office (and with whom Homewood has been in touch). Jonsson was amazed to see how the new version completely 'disappears' Iceland's 'sea ice years' around 1970, when a period of extreme cooling almost devastated his country's economy.

"One of the first examples of these 'adjustments' was exposed in 2007 by the statistician Steve McIntyre, when he discovered a paper published in 1987 by James Hansen, the scientist (later turned fanatical climate activist) who for many years ran Giss—or the Goddard Institute for Space Studies—"Hansen's original graph showed temperatures in the Arctic as having been much higher around 1940 than at any time since. But as Homewood reveals in his blog post, 'Temperature adjustments transform Arctic history.'

Wow, Mr. Speaker, I need to read that again. I had not seen that.

"Hansen's original graph showed temperatures in the Arctic as having been much higher around 1940 than at any time since."

"Homewood's interest in the Arctic is partly because the 'vanishing' of its polar ice (and the polar bears) has be-

come such a poster-child for those trying to persuade us that we are threatened by runaway warming. But he chose that particular stretch of the Arctic because it is where ice is affected by warmer water brought in by cyclical shifts in a major Atlantic current—this last peaked at just the time 75 years ago when Arctic ice retreated even further than it has done recently. The ice-melt is not caused by rising global temperatures at all.

"Of much more serious significance, however, is the way this wholesale manipulation of the official temperature record—for reasons GHCN and Giss have never plausibly explained—has become the real elephant in the room of the greatest and most costly scare the world has known. This really does begin to look like one of the greatest scientific scandals of all time."

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if it might be possible that there is a mainstream media reporter out there—with the New York Times, Washington Post, ABC, NBC, CBS, CNN, one of those that have lost so many of their viewers and readers—that might someday, against all of the criticism like Galileo got and others received, pick up that mantle and do a true investigation from a mainstream media outlet, facing the belittling and the criticism of all of the Chicken Littles that are in the mainstream media currently and actually gather accurate data, show the fraud, show the wasted money, show the lost lives, show the suffering by running up the price of energy so high, and show just what Christopher Booker talks about as he finished his article. This really does begin to look like one of the greatest scientific scandals of all time.

As the great philosopher Rush Limbaugh once said, "Follow the money." Many others have said it. If you hear someone saying, "Let's bring Syrian refugees in" when we know there is no adequate data to be assured of who they are, where they are really from, follow the money. See if they are part of those dividing up the 1 billion-plus dollars being paid to people to bring refugees into the United States.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when this administration goes about driving up the prices of energy as it has, despite its best efforts, gasoline prices came down. The last I saw, they had dropped their approval of production from Federal land to about 40 percent of grants that had been approved during the Bush administration's 8 years.

Less production is being authorized by this administration. They are sicing the EPA now with these new regulations on the oil and gas industry, which will ultimately—if they are successful and Congress isn't able to stop them as we should, the price of gasoline will skyrocket as the President said he wanted coal-produced power to skyrocket.

As one of my senior citizen constituents had told me—I think she said she was 80—she was born in a home that

only had a wood-burning stove. Because of the way the cost of energy has gone up, she is worried that she may leave this world in a home that only has a wood-burning stove. The trouble for her is, if this administration has its way, she can't have a wood-burning stove even.

You see the cost of home energy going up as dramatically as this administration has forced it and you realize that doesn't really hurt the rich in America to have higher prices for energy. It does hurt business. It absolutely does. It means they can't give raises because they are spending that money on higher bills. So people are not keeping up with what they should.

Then we found out during this administration the unthinkable occurred, and the President even admitted it on camera. For the first time in the history of this country ever, after this President's policies had been fully implemented for 5 years, 95 percent of the Nation's income went to the top 1 percent.

The President, who had talked so much about helping the middle class and helping the poor, has presided over policies that have made the rich—put them in a position where 95 percent of income is going to the top 1 percent. It had never happened before this President's policies, which have made life difficult for people in America.

I mean not for the people that have all the cronyism, crony capitalism, General Electric and all those friends of the President. I am talking about the distance between the rich and the poor has gotten farther with fewer people in between. That is tragic.

So countries swarm to the global warming conferences. Just watch. Follow the money. They hope to leave with an agreement by the United States that will punish American residents and cause them to have to pay more taxes that will be paid to countries around the world.

Of course, they flock to these global warming climate change conferences because they think the President is going to do what he is hoping to do and start sending checks from the American taxpayers to all of these other countries, places where their policies have stifled growth or they don't have the energy we do. How about sending them some energy? Send them some coal. They will be far better off.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me just remind that you don't have to pay people to hate you. They will do it for free. We don't have to be sending that money overseas.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2015

UKRAINE UNDER SIEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ABRAHAM). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.