

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. We're actually talking about extending the payroll tax deduction so that \$1,500 bucks, you know, could stay in the hands of people who are really struggling.

We asked—in the U.S. Senate there was a bill that said, you know, millionaires, on your first million, we're not asking you 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 them?

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.

□ 1620

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 folk 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 billionaires and millionaires to pony up just a little more. They wouldn't even notice it, 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. America is all 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 them running 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, a mortgage document can be 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 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 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 they're trying 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't 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 snatch 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. ROHRBACHER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before I go into my prepared remarks, I would like to point out that I personally have opposed all 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 we're really doing is taxing 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 another issue that I will discuss some other day.

Today, 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 in that farewell address that is just as significant.

□ 1630

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 also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-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 their safety and—yes—their very survival on this planet is at risk due to 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," it doesn't take a genius to figure out that the purpose of such a proclamation is to limit and repress debate. Well, the case isn't closed, so 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 point to the Sun rather than to 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, if any, around. So where do the climate cycles come from? What causes climate cycles?

Right off the bat, let's acknowledge that manmade global warming advocates, who I suggest are alarmists, do not believe the Sun has no impact on climate cycles. They just believe that the Sun has a minimal impact as compared to the increasing level of CO₂ in the atmosphere. Basically, they believe that the Sun does have some impact but nothing compared to the increase in CO₂ in the atmosphere. Today, they believe this increase in CO₂ in the atmosphere has become very frightening because mankind is using fossil fuels, which they believe is causing this dramatic increase in CO₂.

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 that CO₂—carbon dioxide—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—less—than one half of one-tenth of 1 percent of the atmosphere, and humankind's contribution to that one half of one-tenth of 1 percent is a small fraction of that. So to

say that what we're talking about is minuscule, 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 air standards and 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 NO_x, which are damaging to human health, should be a much higher priority than CO₂. NO_x is harmful to people's health. It's global pollution, not global warming, that we should be concerned about.

Not making this distinction has cost us billions, maybe more. The temperature of this planet isn't manmade, and we can't do anything about it. Our energy challenges and the air quality that we have are man-influenced, if not manmade. We can do something about these maladies.

But the alarmists are not interested in solving those 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 submission. Make 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 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 Happer, a professional who, at the time, dared to be open-minded about the global warming theory. Al Gore decided Dr. Happer 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 certainly 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 science 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 around the Nation, with hundreds of 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.

□ 1640

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 ROHRBACHER from California.

So what is this 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 Americans, put 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 entraps a certain amount of heat in the atmosphere, thus dangerously warming the planet. We have been warned about huge changes in our environment, including a 10-degree jump in the overall temperature, and thus a serious rise in the level of the oceans of the world.

Vice President Gore, in his movie, "An Inconvenient Truth," showed what seemed to be a video of melting and breaking icecaps. Inconveniently, somebody squealed, the video was actually a special effect. It was Styrofoam made to look like melting and breaking icecaps. But that's no problem. People still listen to Al Gore.

Over and over again, the alarmists have said that the Earth is dramatically heating up. Look closely at the data that they're talking about. Look closely at the date that was picked by these people as a baseline for comparing temperatures. It is 1850. And what is 1850? It's the end of a 500-year decline in the Earth's temperature. The Little Ice Age was ending in the 1850s. Skeptics say that a 1- or 2-degree increase in the planet's temperature is irrelevant if the basis of comparison is a 500-year low in the Earth's temperature. To skeptics, currently we are just in another natural climate cycle. That's what we as skeptics believe. This is another natural climate cycle, and it's been going on, as was the 500-year decline in the Earth's temperatures. If it's going up a little bit now, that is a natural climate cycle.

To alarmists, however, the sky is falling. A couple of degrees warmer and the sky is heating, or it's falling, that is, or heating, and all of this is caused by mankind pumping CO₂ into the air.

This theory of manmade CO₂ causing global warming emerged when scientists mistakenly believed that the data they were studying from ice cores indicated that a warming of our planet was happening after a major increase in CO₂.

However, later, it was found that the ice cores were misread. Nicholas Caillon pointed out in *Science* magazine in 2003 that the CO₂ increase lagged Antarctic deglaciation warming by 800 to 200 years, give or take 200 years. So the heating came first, and then the CO₂ increased, not the other way around.

Yes, when Earth heats up, there is more CO₂. But we've been told the opposite over and over again, and we were told it was the CO₂ that was making the Earth heat up, and they were telling us that the Earth will keep heating up until it reaches a tipping point, and then there will be a huge jump in the temperature. The temperature will shoot up once it reaches this tipping point. And we could expect, this is what we were told over and over again by the scientists predicting over and over again that we could expect this warming to go on and on until we quit using CO₂ and quit using these CO₂-emitting fossil fuels as a major source of our energy.

The future they described was hot and bleak, but their frightening illusion began to disintegrate when, about 9 years ago, even as more CO₂ was being pumped into the air and has continued to be pumped into the air, the Earth quit warming and, in fact, it may be now in a cooling cycle. That's right. The NOAA National Climate Data Center shows that ground surface temperatures have flattened, and there hasn't been any net warming since 1998, and the RSS microwave sounding units—that's MSU—operating on NOAA satellites show a net cooling since 1998.

It's totally the opposite of every prediction of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, that's the IPCC, and their faulty computer models, as well as the army of global warming scientists who have been warning us about higher and higher temperatures of what we could expect.

Well, miraculously, the frantic claims and predictions of manmade global warming have now been replaced with an all-new encompassing warning. So if it gets colder, or it gets warmer, the alarmists will have their way because that's being caused by too much CO₂.

Well, what is being caused? Well, whatever it is, it's being caused by it. And so they changed the words from global warming to climate change and have replaced, as I say, global warming with their climate change.

Well, I guess they think that we would just forget about the predictions and their predictions over and over again being 100 percent wrong. Even 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.

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?

□ 1650

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. We now know what they were doing. I'm speaking, of course, of Climategate, the publication of over 1,000 emails and 3,000 other unofficially

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 though handpicked panels of their peers held the kangaroo court—yeah, their own peers judged them, that's right—and that kangaroo court loudly proclaimed there had no wrongdoing by these people, well, public confidence was justifiably shaken 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 reconstructions, 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 5,000 emails 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: (1) prominent 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 science is the open sharing of scientific data, theories and procedures so that independent parties, and especially skeptics of a particular theory or hypothesis, can replicate and validate asserted experiments or observations. Emails between Climategate scientists, however, show a concerted effort to hide rather than disseminate underlying evidence 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 AR5 would be 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 email.

"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 email. "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 the public would naturally assume would be available according to freedom of information principles. "Mike, can you delete any emails you may have had with Keith [Briffa] re AR4 [UN 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 1945 problem in the Nature paper!!"

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

"The trick may be 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 thinks she's doing, but its not helping the cause," wrote Mann in another newly released email. "I have been talking 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 frank admissions of the scientific shortcomings of global warming assertions.

"Observations do not show rising temperatures throughout the tropical troposphere unless you accept one single study and approach and discount a wealth of others. This is just downright dangerous. We need to communicate the uncertainty and be honest. 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 pour through the 5,000 emails. What is 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 from the sun that determine global cloud cover, and the clouds have dramatically more to do with temperature than the minuscule amounts of CO₂ 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 Jolis for the RECORD.

THE OTHER CLIMATE THEORY

Al Gore won't hear it, but heavenly bodies might be driving long-term weather trends.

(By Anne Jolis)

In April 1990, Al Gore published an open letter in the *New York Times* "To Skeptics on Global Warming" in which he compared them to medieval flat-Earthers. He soon became vice president and his conviction that

climate change was dominated by man-made emissions went mainstream. Western governments embarked on a new era of anti-emission regulation and poured billions into research that might justify it. As far as the average Western politician was concerned, the debate was over.

But a few physicists weren't worrying about Al Gore in the 1990s. They were theorizing about another possible factor in climate change: charged subatomic particles from outer space, or "cosmic rays," whose atmospheric levels appear to rise and fall with the weakness or strength of solar winds that deflect them from the earth. These shifts might significantly impact the type and quantity of clouds covering the earth, providing a clue to one of the least-understood but most important questions about climate. Heavenly bodies might be driving long-term weather trends.

The theory has now moved from the corners of climate skepticism to the center of the physical-science universe: the European Organization for Nuclear Research, also known as CERN. At the Franco-Swiss home of the world's most powerful particle accelerator, scientists have been shooting simulated cosmic rays into a cloud chamber to isolate and measure their contribution to cloud formation. CERN's researchers reported last month 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 climate models do not consider any impact of cosmic rays on clouds.

Scientists have been speculating on the relationship among cosmic rays, solar activity and clouds since at least the 1970s. 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 relationship between solar variations and changes in the earth's surface temperature since 1860.

"I had this idea that the real link could be between cloud cover and cosmic rays, and I wanted to try to figure out if it was a good idea or a bad idea," Mr. Svensmark told me from Copenhagen, where he leads sun-climate research at the Danish National Space Institute.

He wasn't the first scientist to have the idea, but he was the first to try to demonstrate it. He got in touch with Mr. Friis-Christensen, and they used satellite data to show a close correlation among solar activity, cloud cover and cosmic-ray levels since 1979.

They announced their findings, and the possible climatic implications, at a 1996 space conference in Birmingham, England. Then, as Mr. Svensmark recalls, "everything went completely crazy. . . . It turned out it was very, very sensitive to say these things already at that time." He returned to Copenhagen to find his local daily leading with a quote from the then-chair of the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC): "I find the move from this pair scientifically extremely naive and irresponsible."

Mr. Svensmark had been, at the very least, politically naive. "Before 1995 I was doing things related to quantum fluctuations. Nobody was interested, it was just me sitting in my office. It was really an eye-opener, that baptism into climate science." He says his work was "very much ignored" by the climate-science establishment—but not by CERN physicist Jasper Kirkby, who is leading today's ongoing cloud-chamber experiment.

On the phone from Geneva, Mr. Kirkby says that Mr. Svensmark's hypothesis "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 correlate with changes in solar activity, solar wind. You see correlations in the atmosphere between cosmic rays and clouds—that's what Svensmark reported. But these correlations don't prove cause and effect, and it's very difficult to isolate what's due to cosmic rays and what's due to other things."

In 1997 he decided that "the best way to settle it would be to use the CERN particle beam as an artificial source of cosmic rays and reconstruct an artificial atmosphere in the lab." He predicted to reporters at the time that, based on Mr. Svensmark's paper, the theory would "probably be able to account for somewhere between a half and the whole" of 20th-century warming. He gathered a team of scientists, including Mr. Svensmark, and proposed the groundbreaking experiment to his bosses at CERN.

Then he waited. It took six years for CERN to greenlight and fund the experiment. Mr. Kirkby cites financial pressures for the delay and says that "it wasn't political."

Mr. Svensmark declines entirely to guess why CERN took so long, noting only that "more generally in the climate community that is so sensitive, sometimes science goes into the background."

By 2002, a handful of other scientists had started to explore the correlation, and Mr. Svensmark decided that "if I was going to be proved wrong, it would be nice if I did it myself." He decided to go ahead in Denmark and construct his own cloud chamber. "In 2006 we had our first results: We had demonstrated the mechanism" of cosmic rays enhancing cloud formation. The IPCC's 2007 report all but dismissed the theory.

Mr. Kirkby's CERN experiment was finally approved in 2006 and has been under way 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. Kirkby, quick to tamp down any interpretation that would make for a good headline.

This seems wise: In July, CERN Director General Rolf-Dieter Heuer told *Die Welt* that he was asking his researchers to make the forthcoming cloud-chamber results "clear, however, not to interpret them. This would go immediately into the highly political arena of the climate-change debate."

But while the cosmic-ray theory has been ridiculed from the start by those who subscribe to the anthropogenic-warming theory, both Mr. Kirkby and Mr. Svensmark hold that human activity is contributing to climate change. All they question is its importance relative to other, natural factors.

Through several more years of "careful, quantitative measurement" at CERN, Mr. Kirkby predicts he and his team will "definitively answer the question of whether or not cosmic rays have a climatically significant effect on clouds." His old ally Mr. Svensmark feels he's already answered that question, and he guesses that CERN's initial results "could have been achieved eight to 10 years ago, if the project had been approved and financed."

The biggest milestone in last month's publication may be the content but the source, which will be a lot harder to ignore than Mr. Svensmark and his small Danish institute.

Any regrets, now that CERN's particle accelerator is spinning without him? "No. It's been both a blessing and the opposite," says Mr. Svensmark. "I had this field more or less to myself for years—that would never have happened in other areas of science, such as particle physics. But this has been something that most climate scientists would not

be associated with. I remember another researcher saying to me years ago that the only thing he could say about cosmic rays and climate was that it was a really bad career move."

On that point, Mr. Kirkby—whose organization is controlled by not one but 20 governments—really does not want to discuss politics at all: "I'm an experimental particle physicist, okay? That somehow nature may have decided to connect the high-energy physics of the cosmos with the earth's atmosphere—that's what nature may have done, not what I've done."

Last month's findings don't herald the end of a debate, but the resumption of one. That is, if the politicians purporting to legislate based on science will allow it.

In this piece, she says: charged subatomic particles from outer space, or cosmic rays, might significantly impact the type and quality of clouds covering the Earth, providing a clue to one of the least understood but most important questions about climate. Heavenly bodies might be driving long-term weather trends.

And while scientists have discovered the sun's relationship to cloud cover, even more recently there's been a study directly undermining the theory that CO₂ levels are a major determinant of the Earth's temperature.

A recent editorial from *Investor's Business Daily* on the topic of this new study about temperature sensitivity to carbon dioxide undermines the case-closed arguments of the scientific elite.

From the editorial: The left's proposed solutions to 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 foolishness.

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

[From the *Investor's Business Daily* Editorial, Nov. 25, 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 cost. Yet another study shows this is 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 Revolution, the 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. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's 2007 report, which predicted an increase of 3.6 degrees to 8.6 degrees.

Coupled with the fact the average global temperature hasn't increased at all over the past decade—even though under all of the global warming models now in use, this is

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, global green conspiracy to silence scientific opposition to the idea—even to the point of falsifying data and ruining others' careers.

Subscribe to the IBD Editorials Podcast—The left's entire prescription for solving the world's ills—ranging from population control to strict regulation of businesses to shrinking CO₂ output—are premised on the notion that carbon-dioxide is a poison.

Happily, the left's pernicious, economy-destroying and false global warming ideology is collapsing under a growing body of evidence that the CO₂ scare is a fraud.

Who says we have nothing to be thankful for?

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 record any CO₂ emissions. They estimated that based on energy use. They didn't take into account new technologies that make gas and oil and coal cleaner and greener. The scientists didn't care about how cleanly coal and oil might be being burned; they just estimated—or guesstimated—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 wasted \$25 billion or more on this 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 the money for that. How about space-based solar power, which could collect solar energy from the sun out in outer space and transmit it to the Earth?

Developing these new technologies will take hundreds of millions of dollars for these new reactors, billions of dollars for a space-based solar. Instead, we've squandered our billions of dollars and our limited science money and technology dollars on trying to prove that man-made global warming is something that we have to worry about and spread the fear.

We have not pursued these or other technologies which could have fun-

damentally 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.

□ 1700

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 isn'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.

I yield back the balance of my time.

YEAR IN REVIEW: FIRST SESSION OF 112TH CONGRESS

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.

Mr. WEST. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's very important that, as we draw to the close of this first session of the 112th Congress, we come back and we do what I believe is a yearly review or an assessment.

Mr. Speaker, today, the 8th of December, was the target adjournment day that the leadership of the new majority of the United States House of Representatives hoped would mark the end of the first session of the 112th Congress. Yet today we are short of completing some of the most important work that we must accomplish.

As we enter the final days of 2011 and approach the end of this first session of the 112th Congress, I must take the time to offer an apology to the citizens of the 22nd Congressional District of Florida and to all my fellow citizens across this great Nation. It is not because we have not changed the conversation here in Washington, D.C., but because I would have hoped our exertions would have been as a collective body a bit greater. Failure to pass a balanced budget amendment was a great disappointment and an example of a lack of exertion.

When I was elected to the House of Representatives in November 2010, I was one of over 80 new Members that you, the American people, sent to the House of Representatives, entrusting each one of us to come to Capitol Hill

and work diligently—and differently than our predecessors—on the critical issues our country was facing during these challenging times. Record high unemployment; a quickly growing debt; out-of-control spending that leads to budget deficits year after year; a spiraling foreclosure rate around the country, and specifically back in our district in south Florida; businesses shutting their doors, due in part to increasing uncertainty provided by the government from crushing regulations issued by Federal agencies in Washington, D.C., and the list goes on.

Friends, neighbors, colleagues, and our fellow citizens all believed our Nation was on the wrong track, and we were concerned for our future. Many of them felt our country's best days were in the past and that our future looked bleak. Each of them wanted our Federal Government to take a different course of action.

Mr. Speaker, I spent the majority of my adult life—22 years—serving in the United States Army, never having been elected to public office. I have dedicated my career to serving our great Nation. But unlike many of those whom I serve with here in Congress, I am not a career politician. I have led soldiers in combat on foreign battlefields, and was ready to go to our Nation's Capitol and lead from the front on this new battlefield. I understood that where my political experience would fall short, my military training would enable me to serve my constituents well in the Halls of Congress, because in the military we were taught a simple principle, Mr. Speaker, and I think you know it well: We work until the mission is complete. And on election night of 2010, I knew that I was embarking, along with my new colleagues, on one of the most challenging missions that I would ever face.

The leadership of the new majority in the House of Representatives created a calendar for the first session of this Congress, and as a newly elected Member of this body, I provided my assessment, stating that I believed the schedule did not provide the necessary days on Capitol Hill to address the pressing issues our Nation faced. Now, 1 year later, unfortunately, it seems I was correct. On the eve of the holiday season, the United States Congress is dealing with some of its most important issues, all while pressed against the desire to be home and with our families and loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I, along with you, spent many holidays away from my family and friends while serving our country in the Armed Forces. Every time I was away from home during the holiday season, as well as I'm sure you did, I proudly put on my uniform and did my duty on behalf of the American people. And while I may not wear the uniform of the United States Army any longer, I am proud to put on my new uniform of a suit and tie and spend this holiday away from home, once again putting our country first so that we may finish