

Their research shows that if you remove the climate effects of two volcanic eruptions and the El Nino and La Nina systems that occurred over the last 38 years, there has been no change since the early 1990s to the rate of warming and that model predictions from the IPCC are overstated by about double.

Keep in mind that the IPCC is the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change of the United Nations. They started this about 40 years ago, and their scientists have been completely discredited.

I remember when that took place in Copenhagen. They had one of the big annual United Nations parties. At that time, Lisa Jackson was Obama's Administrator of the EPA. She knew I was going to go there and tell the truth to all these people.

I asked her this question on the public record. In the event that I leave town and you are going to start regulating global warming, you have to first declare that there is an urgency to this and you have to use a scientific declaration. What science will you use?

She said: We are going to use the IPCC, or the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

As luck would have it, just a matter of days after, the IPCC was totally rejected. Everyone remembers how they had been caught rigging the information in terms of weather, and it was really quite a mess.

Going back to Christy's explanation, which just came out the other day, the volcanic eruptions cooled the Earth when ash, soot, and debris entered the atmosphere and sunlight was reflected away. "Those eruptions happened relatively early in our study period, which pushed down temperatures in the first part of the dataset, which caused the overall record to show an exaggerated warming trend."

So we have two respected climate scientists using sound science to discredit the so-called consensus scientists. By the way, there are hundreds of other scientists out there. One of the best known is a guy from MIT named Richard Lindzen. He has been very outspoken on this.

So every time we hear people talking that "there is a consensus of science," I think we know better. Remember that the media does not share the studies. So quite often they do not say anything about some of the failed practices being used to draw us to these conclusions. I am thankful we have a President and an administration that refuses to handcuff our economy with policies based on overblown headlines.

So while we continue to have tornadoes in May, hurricanes in the fall, and bitterly cold temperatures in the winter, we must remember that the climate has been stable over the last few decades, and we shouldn't give in to the fearmongers out there. Rather, we should focus on actual threats to American families, like the regime which calls for "death to America" and "death to Israel."

IRAN

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, one week ago today, the men and women of Iran began protesting in the streets. It began with people speaking out against a sluggish economy, and economic growth does not exist in Iran. People finally got fed up with it. Keep in mind that the country of Iran is still recognized as the financial backbone of terrorism throughout the world.

The State media in Iran has reported that over 20 individuals have died in these protests for their own freedom and over 450 have been arrested since the regime's violent crackdown against the protesters. Let's keep in mind what they are protesting for. They just want some of the freedoms they know other countries have, and right now they don't see any other way to make this happen.

In an act that defies transparency and democratic principles, the regime has shut down social media and messaging sites, limiting the flow of information about the protests. In other words, they are not letting the outside world know what is going on there. Iran clearly thinks they can get away with this flagrant disregard of human rights, and why shouldn't they? Under the Obama administration, Iran was able to violently crack down on democratic protesters in 2009, to continue ballistic missile tests in violation of U.N. resolutions, and to finance terrorist organizations in the region without international condemnation or repercussions. Remember, Iran is the financial backbone of terrorism in that part of the world.

Just last month we learned how the Obama administration undermined law enforcement efforts against Hezbollah's drug trafficking operations. Hezbollah is well-known to be a proxy of Iran. Everybody knows it is a terrorist organization. But rather than going after the financial backing of a known terrorist organization, Obama swept it under the rug. His focus was on creating and then protecting the flawed Iran nuclear deal—a deal Obama promised would end Iran's aggressive behavior in the region and promote reforms in Iran through economic opportunity.

The actual results of the deal have never been clearer. The ruling elite of Tehran continues their aggressive behavior by putting their nation's resources toward supporting Assad's regime in Syria, testing ballistic missiles, and committing human rights abuses against women and religious minorities. It is no wonder that freedom-loving men and women in Iran seek meaningful change.

Fortunately, President Trump has already been clear that the United States stands behind the rights of Iranian citizens for peaceful protests.

Maybe the Ayatollah doesn't recall or didn't get the message from President Trump when he was sworn in last year: Under President Trump, America is the leader of the free world again—

standing up for common, human dignity and democratic values. He has backed up his support with action, weighing additional sanctions against the regime and having U.N. Ambassador Nikki Haley—who is doing a great job, by the way—call for emergency U.N. meetings to address the human rights concerns.

I support his efforts and look forward to working with the President and his administration to enact any needed sanctions against Iran in order to advance freedom and democracy.

TAX REFORM BILL AND GOVERNMENT REGULATION

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I mentioned that there were three things I wanted to address for this new year. The third is tax reform.

We are approaching 1 year under President Trump's administration, and we are already seeing the benefits of tax reform and cutting harmful regulations.

The comprehensive tax reform legislation passed by Congress last month will allow American families to keep more of their hard-earned money—which we had been talking about for a long time—and it will make it easier for businesses to grow and hire more hardworking people.

Already, businesses across the country—such as American Airlines, Southwest Air, Boeing, Comcast, Wells Fargo, AT&T, and Express Employment Professionals, headquartered in Oklahoma City, in my State of Oklahoma—have announced investments in their employees and businesses as a result of the tax bill.

Clearly, the tax reform will compound the economic growth we have already seen as a result of President Trump's consistent efforts to cut regulations his first year.

Following the severe economic recession of 2008 and uncertainty in the future, many companies had chosen not to invest in their business or their employees. During the Obama administration, Federal bureaucrats unleashed hundreds of regulations that increased the cost of doing business, stifling job creation, and the result was obvious.

According to a report by the Heritage Foundation, by 2015 Obama's regulations were costing taxpayers over \$100 billion a year. With these limitations on job creators, it is no surprise that the average GDP growth under President Obama was just a little over 1.5 percent—no matter that previously, throughout history, in the United States it has consistently been about 3 percent.

In less than 1 year, by directing Federal agencies to delay, withdraw, or invalidate 1,600 planned regulatory actions, President Trump has done what President Obama was unable to do in 8 years; that is, to restore the confidence of the American business community. He did this by reversing the Obama regulations. I have one—in fact, I have

taken the time to list these regulations that were putting people out of business.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a document entitled "Congressional Review Act Resolutions Passed" at the conclusion of my remarks.

There are two ways you can get rid of regulations. One way is to do it through Executive actions. I think everyone knows what that is. The more difficult way is to do it through the Congressional Review Act Resolutions; that is, the CRAs. I was very proud of the first CRA that we were able to get passed. It was one that I introduced, and it was one that is very popular. It was a rule that was put in during the Obama administration that said that we were in competition with the domestic oil and gas companies with China or some other company, and we had to give to them how we put together our playbook, which would put the U.S. companies at a disadvantage.

We did a CRA on that, and I was very proud to do that. I think people should look at these and realize the great results we had as a result of doing away with the overregulations. I have them listed here, and this is something people are not really aware of.

On January 1, the New York Times even recognized the positive effect of the President's deregulatory agenda. This doesn't happen very often with the New York Times, but they reported on a new "wave of optimism" in American business.

Listen to this. The "Trump effect"—this is what the New York Times is calling it, very appropriately, I might add—"is beginning to translate to investment in new plants, equipment, and facility upgrades that bolster economic growth."

This is from the New York Times. They continued by saying that with the lowest unemployment rate in 17 years, we are also seeing the "Trump effect"—again, that is their term—on wages as businesses invest in their workforce by raising wages to keep attracting skilled employees.

This week the Wall Street Journal reported that cities like Minneapolis have seen a 4-percent wage growth in the last year—the highest growth in 6 years.

I am confident we are going to hear more success stories around the country. The proof is in the numbers. For the first two full quarters of the Trump administration, starting with the second quarter of 2017—the ones he would have control over—we have increased the GDP growth to over 3 percent. That is pretty amazing—over 3 percent. This is from the average of 1½ percent.

What is important about this is, for each 1 percent increase in economic activity, or the GDP, that translates into additional revenue coming into the government of about \$3 trillion over a 10-year period. That is why, in the 1981 tax cut under Reagan, they started the year with the total revenue coming in

to be \$469 billion. But then, as a result of the tax reduction, the increased economic activity increased it to \$750 billion. We actually increased our revenue by decreasing the individual rate.

Finally, the made-in-America economy is running at full speed again. We have three huge success stories of the Trump administration: No. 1, eliminating the Obama overregulations to free up businesses and, No. 2, reestablishing America as a leader in the free world by reversing the Obama policy of appeasement. Hiram Mann said: "No man survives when freedom fails, the best men rot in filthy jails, and those who cry 'appease, appease' are hanging by those they tried to please." And No. 3 is tax reform—the first tax reform in three decades.

With that, I want to say happy new year; 2018 is going to be great.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT RESOLUTIONS PASSED

1. SEC Rule requiring oil and gas companies to disclose their "playbooks" on how to win deals. Inhofe CRA—first signed since 2001.
 2. Stream Buffer Zone rule that blocks coal mining.
 3. Education rule mandating federal standards for evaluating teacher performance.
 4. Education rule establishing national school board.
 5. Interior rule that blocked Alaska-control of hunting & fishing.
 6. Social Security rule that put seniors with "representative payees" on gun-ban list.
 7. OSHA rule that changed paperwork violation statute of limitations from 6-months to 5-years.
 8. Defense rule that blocked contractors from getting deals if suspected (not convicted) of employment-law violations.
 9. Labor rule blocking drug-testing of unemployed beneficiaries.
 10. BLM rule blocking oil and gas development on federal lands.
 11. Federal Communications Commission rule that would have established 2nd regime of privacy rules in addition to Federal Trade Commission.
 12. HHS rule that would make it easier for states to fund Planned Parenthood.
 13. Department of Labor (DOL) rule forcing private sector employees onto government run retirement plans.
 14. DOL rule allowing states to bypass protections on retirement plans.
 15. CFPB Arbitration Rule.
- Note: the 15 CRAs are estimated to save the American taxpayers \$3.7 billion. Inhofe's revoking SEC rule for oil and gas companies will save almost \$1.3 billion.

TRUMP EXECUTIVE ACTIONS

1. Regulatory reform: requires 2 regulations be repealed for each new regulation.
2. WOTUS: directs EPA to rescind Waters of the United States Act.
3. Energy: repeals clean power plan, other harmful regulations . . . ending War on Fossil Fuels.
4. Mexico City: reinstates ban of fed funds going to NGOs that do abortions.
5. Hiring Freeze: freezes federal hiring (excepted military).
6. Military: rebuilds military.
7. Approves Keystone XL pipeline.
8. Approves Dakota Access pipeline.
9. Permit Streamlining: expedites infrastructure and manufacturing project permits.

10. Immigration: 90 day suspension on visas for visitors from Syria, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Yemen. 20 day suspension of U.S. Refugee Admission Program.

11. Sanctuary Cities: blocks federal Department of Justice grants to sanctuary cities.

12. Dodd-Frank: demands review of Dodd-Frank banking regulations and demanding roll-back.

13. Shrink government: directs federal agencies to reorganize to reduce waste and duplication.

14. Trade: evaluates policies to reduce trade deficit.

15. Opioids: fed task force to address opioid drug crisis.

16. Fiduciary rule: delays implementation of bad DOL rule.

17. Religious Liberty: Eases enforcement of Johnson Amendment and grants other protections for religious freedom.

18. Offshore drilling: revises Obama-era offshore drilling restrictions and orders a review of limits on drilling locations.

19. National Monuments: Directs a review of national monument designations.

20. Improves accountability and whistleblower protections for VA employees.

21. Affirms local control of school policies and examines Department of Ed regulations.

22. Reviews agricultural regulations.

23. Reviews use of H-1B visas.

24. Top-to-bottom audit of Executive Branch.

25. Moves Historically Black Colleges and Universities offices from Department of Ed to White House.

26. Obamacare: directs federal agencies to ease burdens of ACA.

27. Establishes American Technology Council.

28. Establishes office of Trade and Manufacturing Policy.

29. Identifies and reduces tax regulatory burdens.

30. "Hire America, Buy America."

31. Establishes a collection and enforcement of antidumping and countervailing duties and violations of Trade and Customs laws.

32. Creates an order of succession within DOJ.

33. Revokes federal contracting executive orders.

34. Establishes Presidential Advisory Commission on Election Integrity.

35. Reforms education and workforce programs and expands apprenticeship opportunities.

36. Updates visa and foreign visitor implementation plans through DHS and State Department.

37. Strengthens cybersecurity for federal networks and critical information technology infrastructure.

38. Revives National Space Council.

39. Extends actions against Sudan to October.

40. Establishes presidential advisory council on infrastructure at Department of Commerce.

41. Strengthens domestic manufacturing and defense industrial base.

42. Issues additional streamlining and accountability in the environmental review and permitting process for all infrastructure projects—also revokes Obama flood risk management standard order.

43. Imposes new sanctions on Venezuela.

44. Revokes Obama order that prohibited state, local, and tribal law enforcement entities from accessing federal response equipment.

45. Prohibits acquisitions by China entities of a semiconductor company for national security reasons.

46. Trade: widens trade sanctions on North Korea.

47. Committees: continuing certain Federal Advisory Committees.

48. Revokes Obama order that created labor-management forums.

49. Promotes healthcare choice and competition across the United States.

50. Provides the Secretary of Defense additional authority to manage personnel requirements.

51. Resumes the United States Refugee Admissions Program with Enhanced Vetting Capabilities.

Mr. INHOFE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

NOMINATION OF JOHN ROOD

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the nomination of John Rood for the position of Under Secretary of Defense for Policy.

I am concerned about the influence of different industries on key positions in government. Today, the specific problem under discussion is the influence of the defense industry over the Pentagon. The defense industry in America is powerful and profitable. The big five defense contractors together represented more than \$100 billion in government contracts in 2016 alone. Think about that—5 corporations, \$100 billion in taxpayer money in 1 year.

The defense industry in America is powerful. President Trump has stocked the Pentagon with an unprecedented number of nominees from defense industry. These nominees will oversee all those government contracts. They will influence which companies get billions in taxpayer dollars and what exactly those companies have to do to collect their checks. Without strict ethics rules and oversight, these nominees have the power to significantly influence the profitability of their former employers—the same companies that may, once again, be the nominees' future employers after they have finished their government service.

Mr. Rood may be a decent man, but he is the latest example of this trend. He will come to the Defense Department directly from Lockheed Martin International, where he was most recently a senior vice president. Lockheed is the biggest of the big five defense contractors. In 2016, the U.S. Government awarded the company over \$40 billion in contracts. That was in 1 year.

According to his official bio submitted to the Senate Armed Services Committee, Mr. Rood's responsibilities included "developing and executing strategies to grow Lockheed Martin's international business" and "managing marketing and government relations activities" overseas. In other words, he was responsible for selling Lockheed's products to other countries, and it seems as though he was pretty good at it. Lockheed made over \$12 billion—or more than one-quarter of its net sales—from its international customers in 2016.

Here is why that matters. According to Lockheed's most recent annual statement, the international division

that Mr. Rood managed made about 66 percent of its sales to foreign customers through the Pentagon's Foreign Military Sales Program. This is a program that allows for the sale of U.S. defense products overseas.

In that same report, Lockheed acknowledges that its foreign sales are "highly sensitive" to changes in regulations and "affected" by U.S. foreign policy. In other words, government officials influence whether Lockheed's foreign military sales barely break even or whether sales shoot through the roof and bring in billions of dollars for Lockheed.

If confirmed as Under Secretary of Policy, Mr. Rood will play a significant role in setting U.S. defense policy and overseeing the regulation of foreign military sales of those very same products to those very same countries. If he is given this job with no constraints, Mr. Rood could implement policies that increase Lockheed's profitability, whether that is in the interest of the American people or not.

Chairman MCCAIN and I questioned Mr. Rood about this conflict of interest during his confirmation hearing. I asked him a simple yes-or-no question: Would he commit not to seek a waiver from his obligation to recuse himself from Lockheed Martin business, as required by his ethics agreement? That is all I asked.

He hemmed, he hawed, and finally made it clear that, well, no, he would not make that commitment.

So I asked him another simple question: Would he at least recuse himself from policy discussions about the sale of Lockheed Martin products through the Foreign Military Sales Program?

The answer was again clear. No, he would not make that commitment either.

I followed up with additional written questions. I asked: "Mr. Rood, will you commit not to seek or accept a waiver from your recusal obligations under your ethics agreement?"

Here is his response. "I am concerned that a commitment never to seek or accept a waiver could unnecessarily restrict my ability, if confirmed, to take an action that is important to U.S. national security and defense interests should a circumstance arise that is currently unforeseen."

In other words, no, he would not commit to abide by his own ethics agreement. Just think for a minute about what that means. President Trump has nominated an industry executive to one of our most senior national security positions, and that individual is unwilling to steer clear of the conflicts of interest involved in doing that job.

I think the standard here should be pretty simple. If a nominee cannot do the job to which he has been nominated without seeking a waiver from his ethical obligations, then he should not have that job.

Mr. Rood is not the only Trump nominee with this problem. The President has nominated many other execu-

tives from industry to the most senior positions at the Department of Defense. The Deputy Secretary of Defense was previously a senior vice president at Boeing. He now runs the Pentagon's budget process, including making the final call on which defense programs get funding and which do not.

The Secretary of the Army was a senior lobbyist for Raytheon and even ran Raytheon's political action committee. The Under Secretary of the Army, the No. 2 position, was also a vice president at Lockheed. The Deputy Chief Management Officer previously ran XCOR Aerospace, now a bankrupt developer of rocket engines and space launch systems. The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics spent her career at Textron, an aerospace and defense contractor.

I could go on with this list. I don't doubt that many of these individuals are service-minded, and I know that many have also served honorably in government, both in and out of uniform. I also believe that a strong partnership between government and industry is important to our national defense.

Industry experience, in and of itself, does not disqualify someone from public service, but there must be balance. When too many top government jobs are filled by industry insiders, we risk corporate capture of the whole policy making process.

The overrepresentation of defense industry officials at the highest levels of the Department of Defense has real consequences. It suggests to the American people that only one viewpoint or one experience will dominate our policy making decisions. No outsiders, no one with a competing point of view need apply, and the revolving door between industry and government raises questions about who our government serves.

No taxpayer should have to wonder whether the top policy makers at the Pentagon are pushing defense products and foreign military sales for any reason other than the protection of the United States of America. No American should have to wonder whether the Defense Department is acting to protect the national interests of our Nation or the financial interests of the five giant defense contractors. No man or woman in uniform should have to wonder whether their civilian leaders are putting the private financial interests of themselves and their friends ahead of the safety and the interests of our military servicemembers.

The American people have a right to know who their government works for and that the senior leadership of the Department of Defense is putting our national security first. Everyone has a right to know that. The readiness and safety of our men and women in uniform is too important for any of us to have to ask those questions.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I will not vote to confirm any nominee from industry