taxes for the richest people, you’re putting more money in the hands of these folks. I don’t think that’s wise public policy.

So my point, Mr. Speaker, is just this: you know, you want to talk tax breaks for the one of your first million, we’re not asking for no more taxes on your first million. But on your second million, can we have 3 percent? You know. What do you think?

They’re, like, nope, nothing doing. I said, even if it’s going to help working-class people, you know? Will you help then?

Nope. No. Can’t do it. Cannot possibly do it. It might sap their incentive to work. If we were to help the working-class people of America, it might sap their incentive to work, so we can’t help them.
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Tax breaks for billionaires or tax breaks for teachers, police, firefighters, job training, small business, investment, better schools, clean energy, health care, infrastructure investment, college affordability.

Now, my question is, Mr. Speaker, what are America’s priorities? I’ve got a feeling that they’re with these folks down here. I think America would rather help these folks than these folks. Just a wild guess.

So that’s all we’re asking for. This payroll tax deduction, you know, $1,000, $1,500 in the pockets of people who really need it. We asked billionnaires and millionaires to pony up just a little more. They wouldn’t even notice it, they wouldn’t have to cancel any of your country club memberships. But they said no.

There is a loss of civic virtue among some of our most privileged Americans, but I’m proud to tell you about a group of guys and women called the Patriotic Millionaires. They came to a forum that the Progressive Caucus organized last week, Mr. Speaker, and the Patriotic Millionaires said, you know what, you’ve invested in research which we used to make our products that made us rich. You invested in roads and bridges and education that we used to help make us rich. And we love America more than we love all that money, and we’re here to pay taxes.

And then some smarty-pants Republican said, Well, if you want to pay extra and you’re rich, you can. I’m sure the Treasury will accept your checks. And then one of the Patriotic Americans said something really wise. He said, You know, America is not a charity. It’s part of our responsibility, and that’s what taxes are.

I’m here today, Mr. Speaker, to argue that taxes are the dues we pay to live in a civilized society. Taxes are not a punishment. When they talk about tax relief, really, from what, from good schools and clean water? When they say “tax burden,” I mean, let me tell you.

If you want to live in a society where there’s no taxes and therefore no public services, you could move to Somalia. That’s what it is. No government. I don’t see any of our friends who love—I call them the free market fundamentalists—I don’t see anyone moving to Somalia, moving to Mogadishu.

So, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say quite frankly that on this Thursday night in this great country, in my view the greatest country in the history of the world, Americans have a question before themselves. Are we going to choose community, choose each other, or is it going to be a selfish pursuit where everybody is only on their own? I view America as people who would look out for each other, even the least-to-be.

Americans don’t think that helping seniors who are on Social Security is a bad thing to do. Americans don’t think that helping the poor and the sick is somehow a bad thing to do.

In fact, one of the things that illustrated this national debate we’re having, Mr. Speaker, is something that happened in the United States Senate today, the other body.

Today, I can’t blame my friends in the House, my Republican friends in the House. They didn’t do this one. But today, Republicans in the Senate voted to block President Obama’s appointment of Richard Cordray to head the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

Now, look, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau came about because of the massive failure of decency on Wall Street that resulted in all of the foreclosures and America having to bail out the likes of Bear Stearns, and Bank of America and a whole bunch of others. And they said, look, you know, this mortgage crisis is very complicated, and we just want to have a bureau that will try to make these things simpler so people know what they’re signing up for; a bureau that will say you’ve got to say what the interest rates are going to be, you’ve got to say what the terms are going to be so that we can have transparency.

Actually, the real free marketeers around here would never be against wanting more information and better and more effective information going to the consumer. I mean, Adam Smith, the one who wrote—oh, my goodness, I can’t believe I can’t remember the name of that great book—but the one in which he describes the invisible hand and how the markets move and people operate and their individual interest yields the economy. He said in that book that consumer information is key to a good market operating. So I don’t know why people wouldn’t want a good market to operate.

But anyway, Republicans in the Senate—can’t blame the House members this time—like to claim that the new Consumer Financial Protection Agency would be reformed before it gets a new director. They say they won’t even allow it to exist. They won’t allow it to have a director until they change it. Well, we had a vote and it came into being. So now we want to wreck it before it even gets up and running.

The truth is that these folks who are against consumer protection and the lobbyists that support them are trying to water down our new consumer watchdog’s power so they can hold Wall Street and predatory lenders accountable. And that’s too bad. They don’t want anybody to be the new cop on the beat protecting all Americans against these predatory lenders.

I’ve always said, look, if you’re offering a good financial product that helps people and is fair, why would you be afraid of a little transparency? Only if your business model is based on bilking and cheating customers would you want to fight against a Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

Without an enforcer and without real powers to crack down on predatory loans, we will keep on seeing mortgages that are designed to fail from the very beginning, tricking people with the fine print, cheating consumers to make a quick buck.

So, Mr. Speaker, I see that Republicans are ready to take the time. I’m happy to yield it. I’m going to yield back the balance of my time in just a moment.

But I just want to say that America was a good idea. America is a good idea. But it’s an idea that you have to fight for; and the idea of liberty and justice for all living in a fair, prosperous economy is something that Americans all over this country have to stand up for and assert because if we leave it to the big guys, to the 1 percent, to the people with all the money and all the dough, they’re going to steal this great American Dream away from us.

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

THE SPECTER OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before I go into my prepared remarks, I would like to point out that I personally have oversight of the bailouts and the hundreds of billions of dollars that the Obama administration has channeled to different financial Wheeler-dealers and cronies, like Goldman Sachs and the others that have received so much money as directed to them from this administration, just to put it on the record.

Many of these so-called corporations that my colleague just pointed out, if
we take a look, when we say if we're going to increase taxes on them, these corporations' biggest stockholders happen to be pension funds. What we're really talking about by trying to say we're going to just tax these big corporations what they're really looking at is taking the pension funds and are taxing the entities that provide the money for the pension funds for the rest of the citizens of this country. But that is an other issue that I will discuss some other day.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, as a strong advocate of human progress through advancing mankind's understanding of science and engineering, I rise to discuss the blatant abuse and misuse of science. A few nights ago, I watched a video of President Eisenhower's 1961 farewell address. Unfortunately, his much-heralded warnings about the military industrial complex, which were right on target, I might add, that warning has unfortunately obscured another warning that that farewell address that is just as significant.

Eisenhower pointed to the danger of domination of the Nation's scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present—and is gravely to be regarded. Yet, in holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must not, to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientifc-technological elite.

In my lifetime, there has been no greater example of this threat, which Eisenhower warned us about, than the insidious coalition of research science and political largesse—a coalition that has conducted an unrelenting crusade to convince the American people that their health and safety and—their very survival on this planet is at risk from manmade global warming. The purpose of this greatest-of-all-propaganda campaigns is to enlist public support for, if not just the acquiescence to, a dramatic mandated change in our society and a mandated change to our way of life. This campaign has such momentum and power that it is now a tangible threat to our freedom and to our prosperity as a people.

Ironically, as the crusade against manmade global warming grows in power, more evidence surfaces every day that the scientific theory on which the alarmists have based their crusade is totally bogus. The general public and decisionmakers for decades have been inundated with phony science, altered numbers, and outright fraud. This is the ultimate power grab in the name of saving the world; and like all fanatics, disagreement is not allowed in such endeavors.

Prominent scientists who have been skeptical of the claims of manmade global warming have themselves been cut from research grants and have been obstructed when trying to publish peer-reviewed dissenting opinions. How the mainstream media or publications like the National Journal, for example, have ignored the systematic oppression that I speak about is beyond me.

If you've heard the words "case closed," or "science is settled," to the extent that it is so, I ask you to examine the purpose of such a proclamation in order to make a firm determination to limit and repress debate. Well, the case isn't closed, let's start with some facts about manmade global warming and the theory of manmade global warming.

First and foremost, the Earth has experienced cooling and warming climate cycles for millions of years, which a significant number of prominent scientists believe is tied to solar activity—just like similar temperature trends have been identified on Mars and other bodies in the solar system—and that is the Sun.

So how about those icecaps on Mars that seem to expand and recede, mirroring our own polar icecaps? Doesn't that place more than a modicum of human activity? After all, there are very few, if any, human beings around on Mars, and certainly millions of years ago, when we had other cycles in the world, there weren't very many human beings either. Where do the climate cycles come from? What causes climate cycles?

Right off the bat, let's acknowledge that manmade global warming advocates, those I suggest are alarmists, do not believe the Sun has no impact on human activity? After all, there are very few, if any, human beings around on Mars, and certainly millions of years ago, when we had other cycles in the world, there weren't very many human beings either. Where do the climate cycles come from? What causes climate cycles?

Similarly, skeptics like me believe the solar activity of the Sun is the major factor in creating the Earth's climate cycles, including the one that we're currently in. We also believe that manmade CO2 buildup may have a minor impact. The debate isn't all Sun or all manmade CO2. It's over which of these factors is a major determinant or even the significant determinant.

At this point, one other fact needs to be understood. Many intelligent people believe in a little more CO2 in the atmosphere—represents 10, 20, even 30 percent of the atmosphere. If anyone is reading this or is listening to this, answer this question:

What do you think the percentage is after all we've heard, time and time again, of how CO2 is changing the climate of our planet?

As I say, most people think it's 10, 20, even 30 percent of the atmosphere. In reality, CO2 is less than one half of one percent of the atmosphere, and humankind's contribution to that one half of one-tenth of one percent is a small fraction of that. So to say that what we're talking about is miniscule, no, that's not smart enough. What it really is is microscopic.

Frankly, I believe that CO2 is so irrelevant that it should not be the focus of any regulations. After all, it is not harmful to human beings unless, of course, you stick it into your automobile in the garage and shut the door for hours and hours at a time. The CO2 that's in the atmosphere is not harmful. Other gases, like NOX, which is coming to human health should be a much higher priority than CO2. NOX is harmful to people's health. It's global pollution, not global warming, that we should be concerned about.

But the alarmists are not interested in solving these problems. They are part of a coalition that wants to change our way of life, which requires us to acquiesce—or, better yet, to frighten us into the no mistake: The manmade global warming theory is being pushed by people who believe in global government. They have been looking for an excuse for an incredible freedom-busting centralization of power for a very long time, and they've found it in the specter of manmade global warming.

For the past 30 years, the alarmists have been spouting "Chicken Little" climate science. This campaign was turbocharged in the 1990s when the Clinton administration made it part of its agenda, thanks to Vice President Al Gore. One of the first actions that the administration took was to fire the top scientist at the Department of Education, Dr. William Willingham, a professional who, at the time, dared to open-minded about the global warming theory. Al Gore decided Dr. Haper just didn't fit in, and out he went. From there, the pattern became all too clear. In order to receive even one iota of Federal research funds, a scientist had to toe the line on manmade global warming.

There is a biblical quote: "The truth shall set you free." Well, this is a battle for the truth, and we are up against a political machine that has been yelling, "Case closed," and restricting Federal research grants only to those who agree with them.

That we have politicians who believe in centralizing power and are willing to use their own power is a conflict that should surprise no one, but that a scientific-technological elite, the very group that President Eisenhower warned us against 50 years ago, has allied itself with such a political power play is totally contrary to what scientific and scientists are supposed to be all about.

Because of the retaliation of those alarmists in charge of bestowing the
Federal research grants, opposition to this power grab has taken time to coalesce; but the opposition to the man-made global warming theory is now evident and won’t be ignored.

There have been major conferences here in Washington and at other locations, attended by prominent members of the scientific community. Individuals, many of whom are renowned scientists, Ph.D.’s and heads of major university science departments, including a few Nobel Prize winners, have all stepped up and spoken out.
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Even with little news coverage, this group, who are accurately referred to as skeptics, are gaining ever more recognition and ever more influence. They face a daunting challenge, however, and they, as I say, have to fight for any attention, even though they have just as good credentials as those people who are advocating on the other side. For a list of some of these credentialed and very well-respected skeptics, one can visit my Web site. I’m Congressman DANA ROHRABACHER from California.

So the apocalyptic manmade global warming theory that the globalists and radical environmentalists would have us believe? It is that our planet is dramatically heating up because we human beings, especially America and other industrialized countries, are releasing large amounts of CO2 into the atmosphere as a result of using oil, gas, and coal as fuel.

The CO2 has an impact in that it traps a certain amount of heat in the atmosphere, thus dangerously warming the planet. We have been warned about this for years, even though in 1998, the much-touted melting of the icecaps has now reversed itself in the last few years. According to the most recent data from the National Snow and Ice Data Center in Boulder, Colorado, not all the icecaps are melting now. There’s melting, and there is also re-freezing going on.

So the polar icecaps aren’t going away, and yes, the polar bears are not becoming extinct. They were put on the extinct list even though they weren’t extinct. In fact, there are some number of polar bear families that are growing dramatically in the last few years, even as we were warned that polar bears were becoming extinct.

Warming has ended, but the power grab continues. What we are now finding out is exactly how ruthless and, yes, deceitful that power grab has been.

One example of blackballing is of prominent scientists like Dr. William Gray, Emeritus Professor of Atmospheric Science at Colorado State University and the head of the Tropical Meteorology Project at CSU’s Department of Atmospheric Science. Gray had the courage and honesty to point out that there have not, in recent years, been more or stronger hurricanes and other such storms than in the past. No more research grants for him, no attention in the media, either. Professional figures in white coats with authoritative tones of voices and lots of credentials repeatedly dismiss criticism by claiming that their so-called scientific findings had been peer reviewed, verified by other scientists. It sounds so much beyond reproach. They gave each other prizes as they selectively handed out research grants.

To those who disagreed, like Dr. Gray, no matter how prominent, they were treated like nonentities, like they didn’t exist, or were personally disparaged with labels like “denier.” Well, you know, Holocaust denier, that’s what you do. Now, how much uglier does it get? How much against the standard of professional science can you be than to try to paint someone like that because he disagrees with you?
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Well, these unprofessional tactics won’t work forever, and it’s becoming ever clearer that the man-made global warming steamroller is beginning to fall apart. We now know that the scientists clamoring for subservient acceptance to their theory of man-made global warming were themselves making a sham out of the scientific methodology they were using. Zealots can usually find high-sounding excuses for their transgressions against other professionals like Dr. Gray. Professional figures in white coats with authoritative tones of voices and lots of credentials repeatedly dismiss criticism by claiming that their so-called scientific findings had been peer reviewed, verified by other scientists. It sounds so much beyond reproach. They gave each other prizes as they selectively handed out research grants.

To those who disagreed, like Dr. Gray, no matter how prominent, they were treated like nonentities, like they didn’t exist, or were personally disparaged with labels like “denier.” Well, you know, Holocaust denier, that’s what you do. Now, how much uglier does it get? How much against the standard of professional science can you be than to try to paint someone like that because he disagrees with you?
obtained documents from one of the world’s foremost global warming research institutes, the Climate Research Unit of East Anglia University in the United Kingdom. And we have all heard of those quotes. Here’s a few of them: “We can’t account for the lack of warming at the moment, and it’s a travesty that we can’t.”

How about another quote: “I’ve just completed Mike’s nature trick . . . to hide the decline.”

Here’s another quote: “We’ll keep them”—meaning the skeptics of their science. “We’ll keep them out somehow—even if we have to redefine what peer-review literature is.”

How about this for another quote: “If they ever hear there is a Freedom of Information Act now in the U.K., I think I’ll delete the file rather than send it to anyone.”

Deleting files? Trying to prevent peer review? What kind of scientists were these? Well, arrogant and politically motivated scientists, that’s who.

The unauthorized release of those internal memos exposed the shenanigans of the man-made global warming alarmists and the crime being committed against science and the public. Even the wikileaks published their peers held a a kangaroo court—yeah, their own peers judged them, that’s right—and that kangaroo court loudly proclaimed there had no wrong doing by these people, well, public confidence and public confidence in the global warming science advocates.

Now, just as that scandal was about to be forgotten, we have an even larger database being exposed showing even more clearly how this elite operates, and it ain’t pretty.

Here are some of the quotes from the newly released database: Unfortunately, there is no way to fix the IPCC, and there never was. The reason is that its information over 20 years ago was to support political and energy policy goals, not to search for scientific truth.

Here’s another quote: If you disagree with their interpretation of climate change, you were left out of the IPCC process. They ignore or fight against any evidence which does not support their policy-driven mission, even to the point of pressuring scientific journals not to publish papers which might hurt the IPCC’s effort.

Here’s another one regarding the IPCC. I also think the science is being manipulated to put a political spin on it.

Here’s another one: It’s very likely that the mean temperature has shown much larger past variability than caught by previous reconstructions. We cannot, from these shakings in the climate, conclude that the previous 50-year period has been unique in the context of the last 500 to 1,000 years.

What’s that mean? That means the current cycle we’re in has nothing to do with the burning of fossil fuel by human beings.

I would like to insert an article from James Taylor of Forbes magazine who said Climategate 2: “These scientists view global warming as a political ‘cause’ rather than a balanced scientific inquiry.”

**CLIMATEGATE 2.0: NEW E-MAILS ROCK THE GLOBAL WARMING DEBATE**

*By James Taylor*

A new batch of e-mails among scientists central to the assertion that humans are causing a global warming crisis were anonymously released to the public yesterday, igniting a new firestorm of controversy. Nearly two years to the day after similar emails ignited the Climategate scandal.

Three themes are emerging from the newly released emails: Scientists central to the global warming debate are taking measures to conceal rather than disseminate underlying data and discussions; (2) these scientists view global warming as a political “cause” rather than a balanced scientific inquiry; and (3) many of these scientists frankly admit to each other that much of the science is weak and dependent on deliberate manipulation of facts and data.

Regarding scientific transparency, a defining characteristic of the open-sharing of scientific data, theories and procedures so that independent parties, and especially skeptics of a particular theory or hypothesis may conduct their own asserted experiments or observations. Emails between Climategate scientists, however, show a concerted effort to hide rather than disseminate underlying data and procedures.

“I’ve been told that IPCC is above national FOI [Freedom of Information] Acts. One way to cover yourself and all those working in similar fashion is to delete all emails at the end of the process,” writes Phil Jones, a scientist working with the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), in a newly released e-mail.

“Any work we have done in the past is done on the back of the research grants we get—and has to be well hidden,” Jones writes in another newly released e-mail. “I’ve discussed this with the main funder [U.S. Dept. of Energy] in the past and they are happy about not releasing the original station data.”

The original Climategate emails contained similar evidence of destroying information and data that would naturally assume would be available according to freedom of information principles. “Mike, can you delete any emails you may have had with Ken [[**IPCC** Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 4th Assessment]]?” Jones wrote to Penn State University scientist Michael Mann in an email released in Climategate 1.0. “Keith will do likewise. . . . We will be getting Caspar [Ammann] to do likewise. I see that CA [the Climate Audit Web site] claim they discovered the [**AR4** Nature paper]!”

The new emails also reveal the scientists’ attempts to politicize the debate and advance predetermined outcomes.

“The trick, as far as to decide on the main message and use that to guide[what’s included and what is left out]” of IPCC reports, writes Jonathan Overpeck, coordinating lead author for the IPCC’s most recent climate assessment.

“I gave up on [Georgia Institute of Technology climate professor] Judith Curry a while ago. I don’t know what she’s doing, but it’s not helping the cause,” wrote Mann in another newly released email. “I have to say, the w folks in the states about finding an investigative journalist to investigate and expose” skeptical scientist Steve McIntyre. Mann writes in another newly released email.

These new emails add weight to Climategate 1.0 emails revealing efforts to politicize the scientific debate. For example, Tom Wigley, a scientist at the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, authored a Climategate 1.0 email asserting that his fellow Climategate scientists must get rid of “the editor for a peer-reviewed science journal because he published some papers contradicting assertions of a global warming crisis.”

More than revealing misconduct and improper motives, the newly released emails additionally reveal fundamental flaws of the scientific shortcomings of global warming assertions.

“Observations do not show rising temperatures throughout the Earth’s atmosphere unless you accept one single study and approach and discount a wealth of others. This is just downright dangerous. We need to completely discredit the global warming elite, Phil, hopefully we can find time to discuss these further if necessary,” writes Peter Thorne of the UK Met Office.

“I also think the science is being manipulated to put a political spin on it which for all our sakes might not be too clever in the long run,” Thorne adds.

“Mike, The Figure you sent is very deceptive . . . there have been a number of dishonest presentations of model results by individual authors and by IPCC,” Wigley acknowledges.

More damaging emails will likely be uncovered during the next few days as observers poring through the emails are already clear, however, is the need for more objective research and ethical conduct by the scientists at the heart of the IPCC and the global warming discussion.

Perhaps the most perplexing aspect of all of this, amid all of the consternation about their malpractices to which we have now been exposed: The global warming elite just keeps a straight face. They keep up their PowerPoint presentations, distorted graphs and all, and continue projections of man-made global doom and gloom. They try to ignore the uproar and change the subject, but these recent revelations seriously call into question the basic science of man-made global warming fanatics.

In the meantime, a report was recently issued by world-respected scientists at CERN in Switzerland. The CERN study demonstrated it is cosmic rays, and not the sun or global warming, that are responsible for the increase in numbers of particles in the atmosphere.

The Cloud Project at a highly respected CERN laboratory published a paper in the journal *Nature* this past August based on this research which shows that the sun’s activity is influencing cloud formation and may account for most of the recorded temperature changes in the last century.

I would like to submit an editorial about this project from *The Wall Street Journal* by Anne Jolits for the **CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE December 8, 2011**.
climate change was dominated by man-made emissions went mainstream. Western govern-
ments embarked on a new era of anti-
emission regulation and poured billions into re-
search and development. As far as the
average Western politician was concerned, the
debate was over.

But a few physicists weren’t worrying about
1995. They were speculating about another possible factor in cli-
mate change: charged subatomic particles from outer space, or “cosmic rays,” whose
interaction with our atmosphere is thought to reflect the state of the Sun and our planet’s
cosmic-ray levels since 2009. So far, it has not proved Mr.
Svensmark wrong. “The result simply leaves
open the possibility that cosmic rays could influence the climate,” stresses Mr.
Svensmark, quick to tamp down any interpretation that would make for a good
headline.

This seems wise: In July, CERN Director Mr. Kelvin’s CE experiment was finally
approved, he had moved on from CERN. “It’s not that I’ve turned away from the
space particle physics. But this has been some-
how, not to interpret them. This would be
a climate-heating poison that must be
scrubbed from the global economy at all
costs. Yet another study shows this to
be foolishness.

And I submit that for the RECORD at
this point as well.

[From the Investor’s Business Daily
Editorial, Nov. 21, 2011]

GLOBAL WARMING MODELS CALLED INTO
QUESTION BY NEW STUDY

Climate: The left’s proposed solutions for the
world’s ills are based on the idea that carbon dioxide is a
climate-heating poison that must be
scrubbed from the global economy at all
costs. Yet another study shows this to
be foolish.

The study in the journal Science found that
global temperatures appear to be far
less sensitive to the amount of CO2 in the
atmosphere than originally estimated.

This sounds prosaic, but it’s a bombshell—
another in a long line of revelations showing the
scientific fraud at the heart of the anti-
global warming movement.

The study’s findings are simple and
devastating. “This implies that the effect of CO2 on climate is less than previously thought,”
said Oregon State University’s Andreas
Schmittner, the study’s main author.

Even with a doubling of CO2 from levels
that existed before the Industrial Revolu-
tion, this study found a likely increase in
Earth’s temperature only from about 3.1
degrees Fahrenheit to 4.7 degrees Fahrenheit.

That compares with the U.N. Intergov-
ernmental Panel on Climate Change’s 2007 re-
port, which predicted an increase of 3.6
degrees to 6.6 degrees.

Coupled with the fact the average global
temperature increase in the past decade—even though under all of the
global warming models now in use, this is
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be associated with. I remember another re-
searcher saying to me years ago that the
only thing he could say about cosmic rays
and climate was that it was a really bad
case—it was foolish.

On that point, Mr. Kirkby—who organi-
zation is controlled by not one but 20 govern-
ments—really does not want to discuss poli-

tical implications, at a 1996

1979.

Christensen, and they used satellite data to
isolate and measure their contribution to
cloud formation. CERN’s researchers re-
ported at that time that, in the conditions
they’ve observed so far, these rays appear to be
enhancing the formation rates of pre-
cloud seeds by up to a factor of 10. Current
climatic models do not consider any impact
of cosmic rays on clouds.

Scientists have been speculating on the
relationship among cosmic rays, solar activity
and climate since at least the 1930s. But the
notion didn’t get a workout until 1995, when
Danish physicist Henrik Svensmark came
across a 1991 paper by Eigil Friis-Christensen
and Knud Lassen, who had charted a close re-

cosmic rays, might significantly im-
portant questions about climate. Heavenly
bodies might be driving long-term weather
trends.

And while scientists have discovered their
relationships to cloud cover, even more recently there’s been a
"started me thinking: There’s good evidence
that pre-industrial climate has frequently
varied on 100-year timescales, and what’s
been found is that often these variations cor-

rate with changes in solar activity, solar
winds and cloud cover on Earth. The reason:
the Sun’s output, measured in units of one type of
cosmic rays and clouds—that’s what
Svensmark reported. But these correlations do not prove cause and effect, and it’s very
difficult to link the Sun’s output with the weather. At least, that’s what Mr.
Svensmark says.

In 1997 he decided that “the best way to
settle it would be to use the CERN particle accelerator to mass-produce cosmic rays and
reconstruct an artificial atmosphere in the
lab.” He predicted to reporters at the time
that, based on Mr. Svensmark’s paper, “it’s
possible to account for somewhere between a half and the whole” of 20th-century warming.
He gathered a team of scientists, including Mr.
Svensmark, to see if they could reproduce the
results. “If I was going to be wrong, I didn’t
want to be wrong all by myself,” he said.

By 2002, a handful of other scientists had
started to explore the correlation, and Mr.
Svensmark decided that “if I was going to
be wrong, I didn’t want to be wrong all by
myself.” His old ally Mr. Kirkby predicts he and his team will “defini-
tively answer the question of whether or not
cosmic rays have a climatically significant
effect on clouds.” But the cosmic-ray theory has been
on the list of unsolved questions among scien-
tists, cloud cover and cosmic-ray levels since
1979.

They announced their findings at the
possible climatic implications, at a 1996
space conference in Birmingham, England.
Then, as Mr. Svensmark recalls, “everything
got completely crazy . . . it turned out it
was a 5-day conference and there were
already at that time.” He returned to Copen-
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impossible—warmist ideology is crumbling. There is no climate armageddon on the horizon.

But don’t expect global warm-mongers to admit this. As we’ve discovered from a new trove of emails sent by leading European climate-change scientists, there has been a vast, coordinated, global effort to spread the fear.

We have not pursued these or other technologies which could have fundamentally benefited everyone on the Earth because we have been wasting our time and our resources. We have been trying to figure out how to bury carbon in the ground and other such things.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I’m here to explain that this is utter nonsense and to warn of the danger that lurks behind this high-sounding cause.

Don’t miss the significance, by the way, of the Durban conference in South Africa that is gathering now to determine how best to control our lives.

And despite the weaknesses of the linkage between CO₂ and temperature, the alarmists continue with their tactics. We just heard a report published in Nature Climate Change in the last few days that CO₂ emissions in 2010 went up by 5.9 percent, which scientists claimed was the highest total annual growth ever recorded—except they didn’t estimate CO₂ emissions based on the total amount of coal and oil used. And the media, like their lapdogs, faithfully reported that this sounds like a calamity when you have so much more CO₂ coming in, even though they never measured any CO₂ emissions. None of it was actually recorded.

The truth is CO₂ is not a pollutant. Anybody perpetuating that myth that CO₂ is dangerous, a dangerous pollutant, is contributing to the health-destructive impact of real pollution by diverting resources and attention away from these very real challenges. We have more than 60,000 people or more of us foolishness. That is money that could have been used to develop new energy technologies, for example, that could have moved us off of our dependence on foreign oil.

Some examples of these technologies are the small modular nuclear reactors which could offer us safety and no pollution, no leftover waste, but we didn’t have to worry about a calamity when you have so much more CO₂ coming in, even though they never measured any CO₂ emissions. None of it was actually recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEST) is recognized for 30 minutes.

As happened in Kyoto and Copenhagen in the past, they now are meeting in Durban to try to find ways of issuing mandates to the people of the world in the name of stopping global warming.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the people of the United States they pay close attention to this. Eisenhower wasn’t here to protect us anymore. The fact is our freedom is at stake. The globalists would like to control the people of the United States. It’s up to us to defend our freedom. The patriots will win if we stand together.
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