

Now under their national security point: we said that the National Center for Policy Analysis on August 6, 1998, showed us that the House of Representatives passed the Defense Authorization bill 420 to zero, which said, “no provision of the Kyoto Protocol will restrict the procurement, training, operation, or maintenance of U.S. troops.” The Senate has said this and also it doesn’t make sense if the United Nations wants us to ratify a treaty that they’re selectively going to say the United States only has to restrict their military. That simply doesn’t make sense. We’re not restricting solely the United States military. We’re saying that all militaries are exempt from the Kyoto Protocol; it’s in the actual transactions.

As far as India and China goes, we’ve already seen in the transcripts that India and China made no motions to say that they would pull out of the climate treaty. That doesn’t make sense when they stand to gain so much from these climate treaties through these CDMs. Honestly, in the transcripts, China stood up and said they’ve a point of information and then they stayed silent, so I have no idea what my opponents are talking about.

As far as scientists go, they say that we can’t reduce CO₂ realistically. The Kyoto Protocol addresses over six greenhouse gases, and in fact, methane is found to be 23 times more potent than CO₂, and we’re having success reducing methane, which is specifically what the Conference of Mayors focuses on. Our opponents are offering you a narrow scope of this resolution. They’re saying that selectively the UN is going to put restrictions on certain countries that they want to join the Protocol. They’re saying that selectively, even though 800 projects have been implemented according to clean development mechanisms to get countries to profit, it’s somehow suddenly not going to work. They’re saying that okay, we already have these standards in the United States, but somehow they’re not going to work in the future. They’re not offering you a holistic view of this resolution. We’re offering you economic benefits. We’re offering our businesses a chance to flourish in a new greener technological era, which is a false market in which we can stand to gain from. We only offer you benefits on the affirmative side of the resolution. We’re admitting that it will take an initial transaction cost. Anyone who wouldn’t admit that is lying. What we’re telling you is that a net gain will result from this resolution, and that’s what you want to affirm. You want to give our businesses a chance to compete; you want our deficit with India and China to decrease; and you want to give our country a chance to see the benefits on a 100 percent global scale that we’ve seen in select cities. Overall emissions have reduced worldwide according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Control, the IPCC, the official measurer of this. That is why you want to affirm today’s resolution.

SECOND CROSSFIRE