

**Floor Speech on Global Warming, given on 18 Mar 2009**

Congressman Dana Rohrabacher (R - CA)

**INTRODUCTION**

Last week, President Barack Obama pledged that during his Administration, he'd see "that scientific data is never distorted or concealed to serve a political agenda - and that we make scientific decisions based on facts, not ideology."

Viewing this commitment through the lens of the global warming issue gives us hope that President Obama will break ranks from the lockstep conformity demanded of politicized scientists concerning the issue of global warming. Perhaps now we can get on with discovering the truth through science, and leave political pressure out of it.

Unfortunately, up to today, politicians like former Vice President Al Gore have done their best to silence the rational voices of scientists who have been skeptical of Mr. Gore's agenda. Let no one forget, Al Gore's first act as Vice President was to insist that Dr. William Happer be fired as the Chief Scientist for the Department of Energy. Dr. Happer, apparently, had uttered words indicating that he was open minded to the issue of global warming. So off with his head. Open minded... out the door. They wanted someone who was going to provide grants only to scientists who would verify this man-made global warming theory. Dr. Happer was relieved in 1993, the first year of the Clinton-Gore administration. So for over a decade, all we heard was a one-sided drumbeat.

Dr. William Gray, now an emeritus professor of atmospheric science at Colorado State University and a Fellow at the American Meteorological Society, verified this. "I had NOAA money for 30 years," Gray recounted, "and then when the Clinton administration came in and

Gore started directing some of the environmental stuff, I was cut off. I couldn't get any money from NOAA. They turned down 13 straight proposals from me." This man is one of the most prominent hurricane experts in the world.

This gross intimidation was done to lay the foundation for a radical agenda to change our way of life, but first hand-picked scientists had to create a fear that the planet is in jeopardy, then lie about every expert agreeing.

Unfortunately – for all those scientists who went along with the scheme – now, over a decade later, there is a big problem. The claim that the science is clear and there is a consensus that humans are directly responsible for global warming is now as clearly wrong as it is dishonest. Why is that clear? Because it has not been getting warmer for 8 years now, and it is harder for everybody to ignore that fact, especially as more and more scientists are pointing this out.

In January, a U.S. Senate Minority Report stated - "Over 650 dissenting scientists from around the globe challenged man-made global warming claims made by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and former Vice President Al Gore." The esteemed scientists being referred to come from a wide range of disciplines. Several are Nobel Prize winners, and many work at the most respected scientific institutions in the world.

Finally, just last year, the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine, the OISM, released the names of some 31,478 scientists who signed a petition rejecting the claims of human-caused global warming. Of those 31,478, 9,029 have Ph.D.s; many currently work in climatology, meteorology, atmospheric, environmental, and geophysical studies, astronomical studies, as well as the biological fields that directly relate to the climate change controversy.

### **CASE CLOSED**

So there is no consensus. Yet we are bombarded by radical environmentalists, and the media hype, with the common refrain “Case closed: Global warming is real.” It is repeated as if it is the mantra of religious zealots. It was pounded into the public consciousness over the airwaves, in print, and even at congressional hearings, “Case closed.” Well, this was obviously a brazen attempt to end open discussion and to silence differing views, dismissing the need to explore legitimate, contrary arguments, on both sides of the issue.

And again, there are hundreds of prominent scientists and meteorologists, the heads of science departments at major universities, Nobel Prize winners, and others, who are highly skeptical – and highly critical – of the man-made global warming theory. There is Dr. Richard Lindzen of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He has been adamant in his opposition, as has Dr. William Gray, who I mentioned a moment ago, a world-renowned hurricane expert and Fellow at the American Meteorological Society. He recently pointed out that the 15-year prediction by global warming activists that the Earth would, by now, be suffering many more, and more severe, hurricanes were dead wrong. It is not only NOT getting warmer, hurricanes are at a 30-year low.

But the views of these, and so many more prominent scholars and scientists, don't matter. The debate is over. Al Gore has his Nobel Prize, and the film, “An Inconvenient Truth,” has its Academy Award. So shut up and get your mind in lockstep with the politically correct prevailing wisdom, or at least what the media tells us is the prevailing wisdom. And no questions, please, the case is closed. We have heard this dozens and dozens of times.

Okay. The science has been skewed by a heavy-handed intervention in the awarding of research grants, evidenced by a propaganda barrage that would make George Orwell blush.

So what is this theory that now is so accepted that grants were denied and debate deliberately stifled? The man-made global warming theory is presented as scientific truism.

So what is it? It is a disturbing theory that the Earth began a warming cycle 150 years ago, a warming cycle that differed greatly from all the other cycles of warming and cooling evident in our Earth's past. This warming cycle of 150 years, we keep being told, is tied directly to mankind's use of fossil fuels, basically coal and oil. These so-called fossil fuels, that have powered our industries and made modern civilization possible, are, we have been told, causing a global catastrophe; the weather is changing, getting hotter and hotter.

After all, former V.P. Al Gore now said it all "Humanity is sitting on a time bomb. If the vast majority of the world's scientists are right, we have just ten years to avert a major catastrophe that could send our entire planet's climate system into a tail-spin of epic destruction involving extreme weather, floods, droughts, epidemics and killer heat waves beyond anything we have ever experienced - a catastrophe of our own making." Al said that not acknowledging that when his statement was made, the world temperature had already ceased to climb in the previous five years. But he should be excused because he was sure, so sure, that global warming would come back and validate his warnings.

Why was he so sure? Fossil fuels, people like Al tell us, put an ever-increasing level of "so called" greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, and the most prevalent of which is carbon dioxide, "CO2." This increase in CO2, we are told, causes the warming that we are now

supposed to be experiencing. This man-made warming cycle, according to the theory, is rapidly approaching a tipping point, as we just heard from Al, when the world's temperatures will abruptly jump and accelerate with dire and perhaps apocalyptic consequences for the entire planet.

### **THE PROPOSED GOVERNMENT RESPONSE**

If one accepts this theory as fact, that man-made global warming is overwhelming our planet, then we would be expected to also accept controls, regulations, taxation, international planning and enforcement, mandated lifestyle changes, lowering expectations, limits to consumer choice, as well as personal and family sacrifices that are all going to be necessary for us to save the planet from--well, from us.

And what are the costs of these controls? According to a Wharton Economic Forecasting report, complying with the Kyoto Treaty alone, would reduce our country's national output by 300 billion dollars annually, and would result in the loss of 2.4 million jobs.

The cap-and-trade legislation now being considered in Washington would cost American industry 600 billion dollars. This of course will simply be passed onto consumers in the price of the goods we purchase. By the way, didn't President Obama promise no new taxes on anyone with less than \$250,000 in annual income? Wonder who is going to pay that \$600 billion. Promise or no, this economically oppressive medicine will be shoved down our throats at a time of hardship and economic chaos. We can't afford a loss of millions of jobs, to charge the American taxpayers billions more in the price of the goods they buy which is little more than a

thinly disguised cap-and trade tax. We can't afford to increase their electric costs as much as 129%, and significantly raise gasoline prices.

It really takes a lot to frighten people into accepting such economically destructive and personally restrictive mandates that would result from implementing a global warming-based agenda. That's why debate has been stifled with "Case is Closed" and phony claims of consensus. That's why proponents of the theory have been heavy-handed enough to interfere with the unbiased issuance of research grants. How else except such dishonest tactics can they frighten people to accept huge changes in their lives? And these are not changes for the better.

Inexpensive air travel, for example. The global warming alarmists believe that jet aircraft should be considered among the worst CO2 polluters. Jet travel, therefore, must be restricted. People are expected to give up the freedom to use cheap air tickets. So how many people are aware that, if the global warming fanatics have their way there will be no more discounted airline tickets, which, of course, means fewer visits to see our loved ones or to explore the world.

Better known is the global warming movement's commitment to severely restrict the use of private automobiles. The rich will still have limos and private jets, carbon offsets will let Al and others off the hook. The rest of us will not be able to travel by plane and will be stuck sitting next to gang members on public transportation, or just staying home.

Outlandish global warming predictions, then, are designed to strike fear into the heart of those malcontents who just won't willingly accept the government-mandated changes in their lifestyle. Those changes, we are told, are needed in order to save the planet. People, if

proponents have their way, are just going to have to accept things like higher food prices and, importantly, less meat in their diet.

A 2006 report titled "Livestock's Long Shadow" to the United Nations mentions livestock emissions and grazing, and it places part of the blame for global warming squarely on the hind parts of cows. Cows are to be added to the list of greenhouse-emitting machines.

So, not only are we then going to have to cut our personal air and ground transportation, which will keep us at home, but when we stay at home, we can't even have a BBQ. And heck, they won't even let us have a hamburger.

I'd point out that before the introduction of cattle to the United States, millions upon millions of buffalo dominated the great plains of America. They were so thick that you could not see where the herd began or where it ended. One can only assume that the anti-meat, man-made global warming crowd must believe that buffalo farts have some redeeming value that's better than the flatulence emitted by cattle.

Underscoring the dishonesty of the global warming fanatics, in my attempt to make light of the arguments that cattle production is an evil element in our world, I once suggested, in jest, that perhaps dinosaur flatulence changed the climate back in those ancient days.

Well, it was reported, widely reported as if I was serious. Anyone who could suggest that I was serious is either a fool, or intentionally portraying something that they knew not to be true.

What we have here, of course, is steely-eyed fanaticism by those on the other side of this debate. People clearly blinded by their fanaticism are thus unable to grasp a nuance, much less honestly examine an opposing argument.

But let's look at the proof these zealots give us to back a claim of man-made global warming threatening our planet.

First, let us note the baseline used to prove a global warming. 1850 marked the bottom of a 500 year decline in the earth's temperature. Yes, it was a cycle trending down, and then it started trending up. 1850 is the baseline for judging the warming of our planet. They are making comparisons against a temperature that was at the bottom end of a 500 year decline in temperature. I've pointed that out at numerous hearings and the issue continues to be ignored. So, if you're listening, give us an answer. Isn't the statistical base clearly flawed when you start at a low point? Then there are the predictions.

In testimony before Congress 20 years ago, NASA's James Hansen predicted CO2 would shoot up and global temperatures would shoot up by more than one-third of a degree Celsius during the 1990s, and the trend would accelerate.

A rise in temperature was predicted, and it would lead to what? Rising sea levels. Cities under water, droughts and famines, and of course an increase in tropical diseases. Yes, tropical diseases. Sometimes it's difficult for me when radical environmentalists use that as an example, considering the fact that tropical diseases, especially malaria, have killed millions of children in the Third World because radical environmentalists have been successful in banning DDT. But that's another issue.

### **THE DOOM-AND-GLOOM PREDICTIONS WERE WRONG**

It has been a while since the apocalyptic predictions were made. Were these predictions correct? Mr. Hansen said the temperature would rise by a third of a degree just a little over a



decade ago. And the answer is that the predictions have turned out to be dramatically wrong. Temperatures during that decade rose only one-third of what was predicted by Hansen. A modest increase to the point that it would alarm nobody and would be little different than any of the many other cyclical changes our planet has experienced for millions of years.

And again over the past eight years there hasn't been even a modest rise in temperature. We shouldn't be surprised – climate modeling, which is the basis of almost all the alarmist predictions, is not an exact science. No weather or climate model has ever been accurate as what the alarmists would have us believe. This was stunningly clear when Dr. Hansen called for an anti-global warming protest in Washington just two weeks ago. The day the demonstrators arrived coincided with the worst snowstorm of the year – and the coldest March 2<sup>nd</sup> in more than a decade.

Let's look at other predictions that were dead wrong. Numerous and powerful hurricanes that were forecast by the National Hurricane Center at NOAA and others. For the last eight years it hasn't been getting warmer and we haven't seen more hurricanes. Yes, as I stated earlier, the number of hurricanes is at a 30-year low. During the Clinton administration, scientists produced study after study predicting the horrific impact of the unstoppable onslaught of man-made global warming: drought, fires, polar ice caps melting, mass extinctions. We were led to believe this nightmare would be overwhelming us right now. Of course, if there was even a hint that the conclusion wouldn't back up this theory, these scientists wouldn't have seen one red cent from the Federal research pool.

And just recently, Tom Knutsen, research meteorologist for the National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration, that's NOAA, that's the ones who ended up not being able to give

Dr. Gray any research grants, this gentleman, Mr. Knutsen, now says he has reviewed the evidence, and totally changed his mind and now admits he was wrong about global warming and increased hurricane activity.

So here is a scientist with integrity. Unfortunately, such scientific integrity did not always rise to the occasion.

Contrary to what all those scientists living on their Federal research grants predicted, the world hasn't been getting warmer. In fact, for the last 8 years, there has been no warming at all. Global snowfall is at record levels and there are fewer, not more, hurricanes.

And yes, there is some melting in the Arctic. We hear about it over and over again. In fact, NBC did a special on the melting of the Arctic and how bad it is, showing pictures of penguins sitting on a diminishing piece of ice in the Arctic. There was a problem. Penguins don't live in the Arctic; they live in the Antarctic. There are no penguins in the Arctic. So NBC had it wrong. Somebody must have told them that the penguins from the Arctic were being victimized by global warming. In fact, in the Antarctic, where the penguins are, there is a buildup of ice. It is getting cooler.

In the Arctic, of course, we do recognize there has been some rise in temperatures, likely due to ocean currents that have changed in the last few years and, emphatically, not due to CO2 that comes from somebody's SUV. The Arctic is, in fact, returning to temperature levels of the 1940s.

And what about the disappearing polar bears? Are the polar bears really disappearing? Dr. Mitchell Taylor, from the Department of the Environment under the Canadian territory of Nunavut, and other experts suggested that all but one or two types of polar bears are

flourishing. Yes, of the 13-odd populations of polar bears, there are perhaps one or two that are in decline, but all the rest of the polar bear populations are expanding. So let's be clear: there are more polar bears, yet we are treated to the spectacle of polar bears being put on the endangered species list, with a caveat that they really aren't endangered now, but with global warming they are expected to dwindle. Never mind that the warming trend stopped 8 years ago.

Unfortunately, the debate on this case is not closed. So the emerging, obvious, differences between the reality and the theory need to be addressed by the people who have been advocating the global warming theory.

### **WHY WERE THE PREDICTIONS WRONG?**

Even without going outside and checking the thermometer, it is easy to tell that the predictions of man-made global warming were wrong. How? The words "climate change" have now replaced the words "global warming." Get that? Every time you hear it the words "climate change," it is evidence of error or deceit on the part of the radical environmentalists. So no matter what happens now that "climate change" has replaced global warming, whether it's hotter or cooler, it can be presented as further verification of human-caused change.

We just need to ask ourselves, if a salesman gives a strong pitch and claims something that is later found to be wrong, totally wrong, when do you stop trusting that salesman? Then if he starts playing word games, changing the actual words that he's using about the same product rather than just admitting an error, isn't it reasonable to stop trusting him?

Yes, Al Gore and company, we have noticed that you are now saying “climate change” rather than “global warming.” They tried to slip it in, but we noticed. Why the alteration? Well, again, that's because the world has not been getting warmer in these last 8 years, as they predicted it would.

So now we see a beehive of activity going on. Those federally funded scientists are trying to save for themselves some modicum of credibility. This even as more and more scientists speak up and publicly disassociate themselves with the scientific claims that have been foisted on us.

### **CO2 IS NOT A CAUSE OF GLOBAL WARMING**

To understand all of this nonsense, you have to go back and look at the basic scientific assumptions that are being used by global warming alarmists. They claim that excessive amounts of man-made CO2 are being deposited into the air which causes a greenhouse effect that warms the atmosphere. They call this increase in CO2 mankind's “carbon footprint.”

The global warming analysts want us to judge everything by its carbon footprint. What that means is how much CO2 is being released as a result of that specific activity. They adamantly believe it is CO2 that causes our planet to warm. The more CO2, the hotter it will get. Increasing CO2 is the problem, and that's due to us.

And although mankind is responsible for significantly less than 10% of all CO2 in the Earth's atmosphere, we are told climate change is still our fault. Can one huge volcano spew more CO2 into the atmosphere than all the people? Yes, but it's still our fault. Can one huge fire, like in Australia, throw just as much CO2 into the air? Yes, and still it's our fault. Rotting

trees in the Amazon, and the byproduct of rot and termites may cause more? Yes but, again, still it's our fault CO2 is rising.

This concept, just like the extrapolations from their computers, is wrong. It is dead wrong. Andrei Kapitsa, a Russian geographer and Antarctic ice core researcher, slammed the UN IPCC as "the biggest ever scientific fraud" in 2008. "The Kyoto theorists have put the cart before the horse. It is global warming that triggers higher levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, not the other way round." Furthermore, he went on to point out "A large number of critical documents submitted at the 1995 U.N. conference in Madrid vanished without a trace... As a result, the discussion was one-sided and heavily biased, and the U.N. declared global warming to be a scientific fact... We found that the level of CO2 had fluctuated greatly over the period but at any given time increases in air temperature preceded higher concentrations of CO2."

So this is the challenge, many prominent scientists, including the head of the Russian Academy of Science, who I recently met, are now confirming that a rise in CO2 comes after global temperature increases, not before. This has been observed in ice cores, yet this has been ignored by those screaming their warnings at us. Give us the answer to this challenge, to the most significant and fundamental element of the whole global warming argument. If the increase in CO2 is not the cause of any warming cycle the world may experience, not now or the many times in the past, how can there be any validity at all to any of the demands made upon us?

In fact, Dr. Claude Allegre, the scientist who first postulated the theory that CO2 increase was spiking the world's temperature, has now changed his mind. Officially, he says he was wrong. He told Al Gore that he was wrong. Al won't listen.

So what causes the Earth's warming and cooling cycles? How about Sun spots? Yes – solar activity. That explains why one sees similar temperature cycles on Mars and Jupiter to the cycles here on our planet. That's why ice caps on those planets, like ours, expand and contract. It's the Sun stupid.

So take note that the very argument upon which global warming is built has been proven to be false and that man-made global warming advocates will not address that or any of these issues. This the most supreme arrogance I've witnessed in my 30 years in Washington.

After all, the case is closed. We don't need to discuss any of those details. Yet expert after expert is pointing to flaws in their central argument.

And Mr. Gore's mumbo jumbo notwithstanding, the predictions have been wrong. And the CO2 premise is wrong. The methodology that has been used has been wrong. The observations have been wrong. And the attempt to shut up those people who disagree has been wrong.

Now, I remember when I chaired the Subcommittee on Research and Science in the House, I insisted that both sides be presented and that expert witnesses be expected to address each other's points and contentions. This methodology led Al Gore to refer to me as a "Stalinist". I would suggest that the propaganda campaign of the man-made global warming alarmists has much more in common with Stalinism than does insisting that both sides of the issue be heard at a congressional hearing. One has to really believe that he or she has a corner

on the truth to make such a complaint that Stalinism is having both sides presented and addressing each other's points.

Of course, Al Gore's documentary, ``An Inconvenient Truth," as suggested by its own title is to be taken as the truth. Well, I won't go into the numerous debatable points and outright errors of that film, but there's something far worse in that film. This pseudoscientific documentary presented numerous film segments of climate and environmental incidents, similar to National Geographic footage. This to add credibility to the points being made.

Specifically, the film portrays a dramatic cracking and breaking away of a huge portion of the polar icecap. The scene is awesome and somewhat overwhelming and leaves the audience with the feeling that they've witnessed a massive historic occurrence.

Unfortunately, it's all fake. This is not grand, firsthand photographic evidence. It is not National Geographic footage of a huge breaking away of a portion of the icecap. Instead, what the audience is looking at is a deceptive use of special effects. It's not the icecap. It's Styrofoam that you're seeing. That's right, Styrofoam, Styrofoam special effects trying to fool us into thinking we're observing an occurrence in nature. By the way, isn't Styrofoam an oil-based product? Isn't there some sort of a carbon footprint there?

Well, Mr. Gore has not commented on this depiction. Maybe it is inconvenient for him to comment because it may hurt his credibility. After all, it is not getting warmer, as he predicted, so maybe he has based his theories on a Styrofoam model that doesn't work.

The first time I met Al Gore was in my first term back in 1989-1990. Al Gore, then a United States Senator, marched into the Science Committee room, followed by a platoon of cameras and reporters. He sat in front of our committee demanding that President Bush--that's

George W's dad--declare an ozone emergency. And he waved a report in his hand as evidence that there was an ozone hole opening up over the northeast of the United States.

A few days later, the report touted by Senator Gore was found to have been based on faulty data, data collected by one so-called researcher, flying in a single-engine Piper cub with limited technology and no expertise. The emergency declaration the senator called for would have had severe negative economic consequences on the people who live in the northeast part of the United States.

Now, does anyone detect a pattern here? Such scare tactics, Chicken Little-ism, based on false information, of course, isn't new. We have many past examples of this nonsense being portrayed as science.

In 1957, the FDA recalled 3 million pounds of cranberries. A few years later the FDA admitted it was a total mistake; sorry, it was a mistake. Of course, a tremendous price was paid by a large number of our farmers who went broke.

Then, of course, there was the scare over cyclamate used in everyday items like soda, jams, ice cream. It was very sweet and extremely low in calories. In the early 1970s, the FDA banned cyclamate as a cancer hazard. Well, come to find out, the rats in their study had been force fed the equivalent of 350 cans of soda a day, and only eight of the 240 rats that they crammed all this soda in got sick. It was a faulty test, and eventually, after years, the truth finally prevailed, and it was officially recognized that cyclamate does not cause cancer. Canada, by the way, never banned cyclamate. Our northern buddies, I guess, couldn't get themselves to force feed those rats.



Well, the FDA did take back its negative finding; however, great damage was done. This episode had serious consequences. It was the cyclamate ban that led to the introduction of high fructose corn syrup, with the obesity and the health problems that have come with high fructose corn syrup. So, yes, another scare tactic, another American industry decimated, another rotten theory with unintended consequences foisted upon us.

The next example of fear mongering with pseudo science came on February 26, 1989. On that evening, February 26, 1989, Americans tuned in to "60 Minutes" and heard Ed Bradley say, "The most potent cancer-causing agent in our food supply is a substance sprayed on apples to keep them on the trees..." And he went on to warn that children were being put at risk by eating Alar-dusted apples. The story snowballed out of control, climaxing with actress Meryl Streep's testimony before Congress. Frantic parents tossed apples out the window. Schools removed applesauce from the cafeteria, replaced with more safe and nutritious substances like ice cream and pudding.

There was only one small problem. Alar, which is what was on the apples, didn't cause cancer. The study that created the panic was based on bad science. Twenty-thousand apple growers in the United States suffered enormous financial harm.

Then there's the so-called nuclear disaster at Three Mile Island. This incident put an end to expanding the use of nuclear energy for the production of America's electricity. It is the prime example of how devastating pseudo-science scare tactics can be. In this case, our country ended up heavily dependent on foreign oil, while France has developed a thriving nuclear infrastructure. The French learned how to reprocess uranium. We learned how to buy

more energy from abroad. Three Mile Island also left us dependent on coal fired power plants and their pollution. Was this really better than the "risk" associated with nuclear power?

An operational mishap at the Three Mile Island nuclear power plant was portrayed as a deadly accident putting millions of people in jeopardy. Well, no one has yet to show me that one person's life was shortened by the Three Mile Island incident.

Because the media hype was coupled with Jane Fonda's movie called "The China Syndrome," which had just been released, the Three Mile Island incident "became" in the public's mind a major disaster. The only kind of disaster that really happened was a major public relations disaster. The American people were terrified into rejecting nuclear energy as a means of producing clean, reliable, domestically fueled electric energy.

Ironically, nuclear power is probably the most effective means of producing power with no carbon footprint, no CO<sub>2</sub>. Yet the radical environmentalists to this day still block attempts to expand the use of nuclear energy, even as we expand our dependency on foreign oil, and continue to use coal fired plants. Again, it was a total con job and has had a horrible impact on our lives.

And what about that ozone hole over the Antarctic? We were told it would continue to grow and grow and it would take decades to get it under control. Boyce Rensberger, director of the Knight Fellowship at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, now points to evidence that the ozone concentration is a cyclical event, expanding and contracting the ozone throughout the eons of time. It's just part of a natural cycle according to this scientist from MIT.

So here is a scientist from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology telling us the current ozone depletion is simply part of a recurring cycle, not the result of

chlorofluorocarbons, as we were told. In layman terms, he's telling us that the gigantic expense of shifting away from aerosol was a waste for America. We're talking about billions of dollars here. The ozone hole closed on its own. It was just part of a cycle. If it wasn't, it would be much different than it is today.

Then there is acid rain. Who can forget the frightening threats that acid rain posed to us just 20 years ago? Acid rain was supposed to decimate our forests, destroy fresh water bodies, and erode our buildings and sidewalks. Well, whatever happened to acid rain? Well, that theory, too, proved to be an extreme stretch.

President Reagan was pummeled without mercy for his unwillingness to take monstrously costly action aimed at thwarting acid rain. He insisted on waiting for an in-depth study to be completed, and he was vilified for his insistence on legitimate scientific verification.

Well, a 10-year study by the National Acid Precipitation Assessment Project was submitted to Congress in 1990. It minimized the human impact of acidity of water in the northwest and the northeast of the United States. The issue then died quickly and quietly, and no one ever apologized to Ronald Reagan. We haven't heard about acid rain. If they were right, we should have been hearing about it all this time.

Instead, of course we've been hearing about something else which is much easier to scare people with, global warming. And of course, the last one before global warming that I'd like to mention is the most pitiful of all. Yes, an alarmist scheme which made the cover of Time magazine 30 years ago.

Just 3 decades ago, scientists and politicians were frantic about global cooling. We were told the Earth was entering a new ice age. Unfortunately for the scare mongers, the

temperature did not plummet and the oceans did not freeze. In fact, it was getting a bit warmer during the 1980s and 1990s. It was part of the Earth's on-going up-and-down cycles, as has always been the case.

Well, some of those people, some of those scientists, and others who were talking about global cooling, changed their words, and, you guessed it, global cooling became global warming. Almost overnight global cooling was rejected, and then global warming was in vogue. And now, of course, global warming is changing to climate change.

So, scare tactics are nothing new; it's a tried and true method. Those pushing an agenda know people can be frightened and stampeded; and then policies can be foisted on a hysterical public. Unfortunately, this time around, the long-term consequences will be very, very damaging for the next generation.

I often ask students visiting from my southern California district whether they think that 45 years ago, when I went to high school in southern California, whether the air was cleaner or dirtier than it is now. A huge percentage believe that the air quality 45 years ago in southern California was dramatically better than it is today. When I tell them that what they believe is 100 percent wrong, that the air is dramatically cleaner today in southern California, you can see the frustration in their eyes; they have been lied to in a big way.

The big lie their generation has been fed is that the environment is going the wrong way and that they have to give up their freedom, and that they have to give up their expectations of certain things in their life because the future is bleak. They are told the lie that we have to give up our national sovereignty, because it's a global crisis --everything about the environment--the

air, the water, the land--is all getting worse. In fact, there's been tremendous progress in cleaning up the pollution that not that long ago was found in our air, water and soil.

And let me tip my hat to the environmentalists. This progress has been as a result of government regulations, often pushed by liberal Democrats. For anyone not to admit that would be disingenuous.

But the fact is that our children are now being told that this man-made global warming will devastate our whole planet.

Dr. John Christy, a professor of Atmospheric Science at the University of Alabama at Huntsville, has a different perspective, "I remember as a college student at the first Earth Day being told it was a certainty that by the year 2000 the world would be starving and out of energy." Dr. Christy goes on to say, "Similar pronouncements made today about catastrophes due to human-induced climate change sound all too familiar and are all too exaggerated for me, as someone who actually produces and analyzes climate information."

So, we are told that polar bears are dying, but they aren't. We are told that the polar ice caps are melting, but now we know that in the Antarctic, ice is actually growing.

Hurricane Katrina, we were told would only be the first of many horrendous hurricanes to hit the United States in the next few years but, of course, there has been no significant rise in the number or strength of hurricanes. Recently it was pointed out that a hurricane just as strong as Katrina hit the United States 100 years earlier, long before the effects of "global warming."

Katherine Richardson, one of the organizers of the Copenhagen Conference, an "emergency summit" established to forward the next Kyoto Protocol, advertised the event not

as “a regular scientific conference. This is a deliberate attempt to influence policy.” It was, she admitted, “Explicitly designed to stoke up the fear of global warming to an unprecedented pitch.”

### **THERE IS NO CONSENSUS**

What we have is calculated alarmism at its worst, and the consequences will be very, very severe if we let such fanatics determine policy that will shape the lives of our children. I would submit a list of 650 members of the scientific community, who I mentioned earlier; who do not agree that human activity is causing an unprecedented global warming trend.

People like me have been labeled with the epithet “skeptics.” Let me suggest something - science is skepticism. A scientist doesn’t “believe” something to be true. Nor does he negotiate a solution with his colleagues. He does not reach consensus. A scientist doubts, tests, verifies, and repeats. A scientist engages in a search for answers by forming a theory and trying to tear it apart. He invites his colleagues to prove him wrong and encourages other points of view. A scientist will do everything he can to prove a theory wrong. Only then, when he and his colleagues are unsuccessful at disproving a concept, will he accept it.

Dr. William M. Briggs, a climate statistician and professor at Cornell, explained that his colleagues described “absolute horror stories of what happened to them when they tried getting papers published that explored non-‘consensus’ views.”

Nobel Prize Winner for Physics in 1973, Ivar Giaever, a fellow of the American Physical Society, declared himself a dissenter in 2008. “I am a skeptic,” Giaever announced in June 2008. “Global warming has become a new religion,” Giaever added.

UN IPCC award-winning environmental physical chemist Dr. Kiminori Itoh of Yokohama National University, a contributor to the 2007 UN IPCC AR4 (fourth assessment report) as an expert reviewer, publicly rejected man-made climate fears in 2008, calling the promotion of such fears “the worst scientific scandal in the history.”

Environmental Scientist Professor Delgado Domingos of Portugal, the founder of the Numerical Weather Forecast group, who has more than 150 published articles said, “Creating an ideology pegged to carbon dioxide is a dangerous nonsense...The present alarm on climate change is an instrument of social control, a pretext for major businesses and political battle. It became an ideology, which is concerning.”

Dr. William Happer, award-winning Princeton physicist, said that “much of the current warming occurred before the levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere were significantly increased by the burning of fossil fuels.”

Dr. Takeda Kunihiro, vice-chancellor of the Institute of Science and Technology Research at Chubu University in Japan, said “CO2 emissions make absolutely no difference one way or another....Every scientist knows this, but it doesn’t pay to say so...Global warming, as a political vehicle, keeps Europeans in the driver’s seat and developing nations walking barefoot.”

Cleaning our air and water from real pollutants is very important to Americans. It’s important to us, to our children and our grandchildren. If we fail to leave a world clean of real pollutants because we were focused on CO2, then we will have done a major disservice to future generations. Let me emphasize that the issue should be global pollution, not global warming or climate change or any other phrases made up to scare people.

So with this said, we need to ask: what is the negative impact of all of this lack of truthful information? What could possibly happen? What is the big deal if someone is making a claim that global warming exists and it is caused by humankind and in reality it is just the pollution that we are both trying to get at? Well, it just doesn't work that way.

### **CONCLUSION**

The fact is if we accept this theory of man-made global warming, we will be focusing our activities on trying to eliminate CO<sub>2</sub> rather than on eliminating toxic substances from our air, land and water. I am concerned about my children, my three triplets, Christian, Anika and Tristan; I am concerned about their health, which is something that I think I share with every parent. Their health is not in any way threatened by CO<sub>2</sub>.

Carbon dioxide is, in fact, like the penguins and the Styrofoam ice caps. It's being falsely pictured. It is being portrayed as a pollutant; in fact, it makes things grow, and it is not toxic to humans. In the distant past the earth had much more CO<sub>2</sub> in the air, perhaps as a result of volcanoes, but at that time we had abundant animal life, dinosaurs and lots of plants for them to eat. CO<sub>2</sub> is today pumped into greenhouses to make tomatoes grow bigger and better. Nevertheless, we are now presented with ideas like sequestration or carbon credits that that serve only to enrich the alarmists and impoverish our people. This is only possible with a public that has been frightened into accepting totally false information about CO<sub>2</sub>. Let me state that I do support efforts that reduce pollution, particulates that do have a negative impact on the environment and human health. I support technologies that reduce these materials. If we are to save the environment for the people of the planet, that is what we should be focusing on.



Mr. Speaker, this old world has had many cycles of warming and cooling, influenced by solar activity, volcanoes, even forest fires and many other natural factors. The ice caps on Mars and Jupiter go back and forth, just as glaciers have gone back and forth. But such a powerful and mysterious force as the weather can be frightening. We need not fear the thunder, and we need not fear climate cycles.

We need not be frightened, hoodwinked into giving away our own freedom. Not to our own government, much less the U.N. or a global power--the power to control our lives in the name of man-made global warming, or climate change, or whatever they want to call it. We cannot allow the alarmists take this country down the wrong path. Let us pass on to the children of this country and the planet, let us give them the freedom and prosperity we enjoyed. We must not allow our future to be stolen by hucksters who would frighten us into giving up our birthright in the name of saving the planet. It sounds good and noble, as most scams do, but it is just a trick, a hoax. Let's not get taken in by the greatest hoax of all.

*END*