

meaning that Russia can actually increase their current emissions levels by 30 percent under the Protocol. With these flaws in the Protocol, all emissions goals the United States achieves now will be undone by Russia, China, and other developing countries. So now that we know what the Protocol won't do, it's time to address what it will do.

The certain economic repercussions as a result of the Protocol are enough to put anyone in a bad mood. We don't expect you to catch all of these numbers; just notice that they're all bad. The overall abatement costs stand at 2.2 trillion dollars according to the *Journal of Science*. These costs will be felt by the American family. By 2010 the Wharton Economic Forecasting Association estimates that 2.7 million jobs will be lost. Food prices will increase by 11 percent, medical expenses by 14 percent, electric bills by 55 percent, and home heating costs by 70 percent. If you're complaining about the gas prices now, just wait until Kyoto ups them 66 cents a gallon. The Heritage Foundation estimated that the average family would be forced to make do with \$30,000 less between now and 2020. Kyoto comes at the price of unemployment, poverty, and struggle for the American people. State tax revenues will decrease by 100 billion in 2010, negatively affecting state programs such as education initiatives. To put this in perspective, UN statistics state that half the U.S.'s yearly cost of Kyoto could buy clean water, sanitation, health care, and education for every single person in the world. Moving on, national security takes a hit as well. The U.S.'s largest consumer of energy is the Defense Department. Only one-third of the necessary cuts to the department would reduce tank training by 328,000 miles per year; flight training by 210,000 flying hours; and naval training by 2,000 days at sea, according to the Pentagon. It reduces military readiness by adding up to six weeks of time needed to deploy in a crisis. Allowing the UN control over U.S. military is unacceptable.

There are already viable alternatives the United States government has enacted to address global warming. For example, the Carbon Sequestration Leadership Forum is a multilateral agreement in which the U.S. has invested \$20 billion to support the advancement of environmentally friendly technology.

The Energy Policy Act implemented in 2006 provides market-based tax incentives to encourage the private sector to choose wind and solar power, clean vehicles, clean coal technology, and renewable biofuels. Market-based incentives have fueled the capitalistic nature of the American economy for years and should continue to do so.

Kyoto did the extent of what it is capable of; it put global warming on the international agenda. But even the scientific community is not backing it. Over 15,000 scientists signed a petition urging the U.S. government to reject the Kyoto Protocol and any other similar proposal. According to Bruce Swami, a law professor, a 30 percent decrease in carbon-dioxide emissions in the next four years is simply laughable. We refuse to advise you as a judge to vote to ratify a Protocol that compromises the economic stability as well as the national security of the United States.