work, yet at the same time, the government can initiate moves to help the businesses in the long run. In regards to international relations, they say that our 60 percent foreign investment in renewal technology in the United States is not due to the fact that we haven't signed the Kyoto Protocol, but rather because of the global war on terrorism. However, that simply makes no point. We talk about international relations, and they say well, that's because of the global war on terrorism. That doesn't make any sense. We specifically talked about the fact that foreign investment is down in the renewal technology sector. That's not due to the war on terrorism; my opponents have drawn no link to that.
Next, we need to look to the successes of the Kyoto Protocol in the United States, and they said that there are no timetables. However, I brought up information from the ICLI organization that showed studies that they have reduced their emissions below the Kyoto Protocol already. So, regardless of the fact of whether there are timetables or not, the facts show they have already met it before the timetables would be up. So even if the timetables were initiated form the 2008 to 2012 commitment period, they still would have met them. The timetables in this instance don't make any sense.
Finally in regard to India and China, my partner brought up information about the fact that China is actually implementing cleaner coal technologies inside of their country. And furthermore, so the fact that they bring up that 562 new coal plants are being put in doesn't make any sense because they are actually cleaner coal plants that are actually being used. Furthermore, the fact about the developing countries is another reason to affirm, because if the United States can affirm the resolution, then we can help reduce emissions from developing countries such as India and China. Whereas if you negate the resolution, they continue to pollute and nothing is solved for. If you affirm the resolution, you get developing countries to reduce their emissions and that is what my partner and I would like to go for today.

GRAND CROSSFIRE

Schmit: About foreign investments: you talked about how foreign investments have decreased. But as we told you, in 2003, it's from Thomas Anderson, actually it's 2004, foreign investments have actually increased by 11 percent. Let's even just say that they did decrease, would you not expect that in a capitalistic economy, the profit-driven motive would make companies do better to be more competitive on a global front even without regulations?
Nadle: Well, first of all, your rebuttal was to foreign investment in total, whereas I bring up specific foreign investment in the renewal technology sector, more specifically related to the environment.