

Goldstein: We're saying ...

Schmit: If it's working so well, and they're making so much money, can you explain why ...?

Goldstein: Do you want us to answer your question?

Schmit: Please.

Goldstein: Okay. All you're saying is that they haven't done anything since 2002 according to your standards—that you haven't seen results. But we've had actual, you know, meetings with the U.S. Conference of Mayors that has shown these results. Just because you don't consider them valid from 2002 doesn't mean they aren't valid at all.

Schmit: Do you have any evidence that says that, though? Or do you just assume that they've gone further, because the furthest report I can find is four years ago.

Goldstein: Okay, what does that report say?

Schmit: It simply says that there ... I can read it all to you, but it's kind of long. It's just the point that it comes from 2002 and there hasn't been a report published since. And usually, to me, if there hasn't been a report published since, it's because no progress has been made. And so probably, they began to feel the economic repercussions.

Hobbs: Can we ask you a question?

Nadle: Yes.

Hobbs: You state [timer beeped] ... or not.

MICHELLE SCHMIT, BISHOP HEELAN (FINAL FOCUS, CON)

Judges ready? What this round comes down to is the fact that the Kyoto Protocol doesn't solve for anything. If you don't see an environmental benefit, I'm not very impressed. One-twentieth of one degree Celsius from the Hoover Institute that scientists have deemed laughable. It really makes no difference. And the fact of the matter is that's optimistic. That's only if every single country in the world follows it, and that's clearly not happening. And China and India, which will not follow it post-2012, as we gave you information for, as well as Russia that can actually increase. Anything that gets done, they're just going to undo later because the Kyoto Protocol is simply a flawed treaty. You have to look to the economic repercussions. The reason that those happen is that the timetable is too drastic; you only have four years to make the cuts, and small businesses can't do that. We've quoted a lot of these from the *Journal of Science*, something that actually supports the Kyoto Protocol. It still admits that it will cost \$2.2 trillion out of the American people's pockets;

I have a real problem with that. National security has also not been answered; six weeks longer to deploy in a crisis. All they can tell you is that Congress thinks that's bad. I think that's bad, too. We cannot accept those kinds of standards that the Kyoto