

will not be shackled into fighting wars over the last drops of water or oil or remaining acres of arable cropland. They will not have to spend their last treasure building higher flood walls, bigger levees, and fortified cities to escape rising seas and angrier hurricanes.

Their cars will run on clean renewable fuels that do not pollute the air they breathe. The United States will lead in exporting clean technologies and products that are the engine of a new green economy. We will lead the world in showing the way to live well, in a way that respects the Earth.

To make this vision a reality, we must face our challenge in a way that overcomes our differences, and that defies our party affiliations.

Madam President, I yield the floor to my friend, Senator INHOFE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Thank you, Madam President. It is my understanding—I would ask for clarification—I am entitled to 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republicans control the remaining 30 minutes of morning business.

Mr. INHOFE. Thank you very much.

GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, let me, first of all, say it would be very difficult to, in only 30 minutes, refute everything that was just said. Interestingly enough, I was honored to have about 2 hours 10 minutes on the floor last Friday to tell the truth about this subject of global warming. I have had a chance to do that. I have very carefully written down all the points that were made by my good friend from California, and I am going to try to get through these as quickly as I can within that 30-minute period of time.

First of all, on the wildfires in California—this is interesting because everything that is out there that is distasteful is blamed on global warming. People say: Oh, it must be true; that is what I read in the newspapers.

I believed, 4½ years ago, it was true. We all know that the Northern Hemisphere has been going through a period—up until about 7 years ago—where it was warming. That has stopped. But it was true at that time. So I assumed it had something to do with manmade gases until we started looking at it and realizing the science just isn't there.

On wildfires out in California, just real quickly, it is interesting, the Los Angeles Times headline was "Global warming not a factor in wildfires." An excerpt from the article reads: Are the massive fires burning across southern California a product of global warming? They say no. Scientists—almost unanimously—say that has nothing to do with it.

In fact, it is kind of interesting; it is reported: The Santa Ana winds, which typically have gusts of up to 45 miles per hour, were recorded at more than

80 miles per hour several times this week—strong but inside the range of normal variability.

Meteorologist Joseph D'Aleo said this past Friday:

The unfortunate fires can be explained very nicely by natural factors.

Environmentalists would not allow brush clearing. He goes on to talk about the prohibition against clearing up accumulated brush from the areas surrounding housing developments that was instituted at the insistence of the Sierra Club and other environmental organizations.

Climatologist Patrick Michaels debunks the wildfire-global warming link. Do not blame this on global warming. There is no trend whatsoever in the frequency of heavy-rainfall years and so forth. He goes on and on. So that just flat is not true.

Now, the Senator from California has claimed, on several occasions, it would be cheaper in the long run to immediately enact regulatory policies aimed at controlling the Earth's global temperatures. The claim is clearly wrong. Of the half dozen major bills introduced in the Senate, all will harm the economy, yet none will put a dent in global warming, even if the worst fears were well founded.

Earlier this month, the Environmental Protection Agency concluded that over the long run each bill before Congress, including those that would reduce U.S. emissions by 70 percent—70 percent—would only reduce global concentration of greenhouse gases by 4 percent—just 4 percent.

Here is something that is interesting. When former Vice President Al Gore was in office, he went to Tom Wigley, who at that time was a very renowned scientist and one of his top advisers. He said: What would happen if all developed nations—not the developing nations such as China and other countries where they do not have any control over what can be done there, but if developed nations all signed on to the Kyoto treaty and lived by their emissions, how much would it reduce the Earth's temperature in 50 years? The result was 0.07 degrees Celsius. Now, that is if everybody did this and inflicted all the damage.

In June of this year, China—this is something which is kind of interesting; they try to blame America and our emissions on greenhouse gases—they were projecting we would be the No. 1 greenhouse gas emitter by 2040. We were shocked to find out that just recently China already passed us. So they are increasing their emissions of greenhouse gases at a real rapid rate. As a matter of fact, we went through the 15 years prior to 2005 by having no new coal-fired generating plants. China is now cranking out one every 3 days. This is kind of interesting because as we lose jobs to China, because we do not have the energy here, they are going to be using technologies that are not nearly as ecologically refined as ours. So it is going to end up having

the effect of even more and more greenhouse gases.

Now, when Time magazine named the Model T Ford the 20th century's worst environmental product because it brought mobility and prosperity, it was clear that common sense has been turned on its head in this country. Almost a century ago, when the first Model T was rolling off the assembly line, the average American could expect a lifespan of 53 years and an inflation-adjusted income of only \$5,300 a year. Now that the automobile is here and we can take people long distances—to hospitals and that type of thing—we are now looking at an average lifespan at 78 years as opposed to 53 years and an annual income, adjusted for inflation, of \$32,000. Yet, despite this, some are still making the claim it will not be all that harmful to the economy to take drastic action in trying to do something about this. They keep insisting that China and other countries will mimic us. I think it is pretty reasonable that when China's Deputy Director General for Environmental Affairs makes such uncompromising, clear statements of China's policies to pursue an economic growth agenda first and foremost, we would be wise to take him at his word.

Adopting these policies will only cost the country trillions of dollars over time on the naive belief that if China sees how serious our country is, it will decide, in the goodness of its heart, to do this. This is just not right. They made it very clear they do not have any interest in doing that at all.

Now, when we talk about the Kyoto protocol—which is the first one that came along—I think it is interesting that of all 15 Western European countries that joined the Kyoto protocol, only 2 out of 15 have lived within the emissions, have emitted the amounts that were acceptable by the protocol. One of those is Great Britain, and right now they are increasing their emissions of greenhouse gases.

The facts above may be what prompted the journal Nature to publish an article declaring that Kyoto is dead and that we need a new approach, one remarkably similar to the Bush approach, and that is the Asian Pacific Partnership Act, which I talked about for quite a while last Friday, which I will not repeat now.

The Senator from California relied on the 2006 Stern report from Britain to bolster her claim. Senator BOXER stated:

This is a very important moment in time. The cost of doing nothing, according to the leading economist on this topic in the world, Nicholas Stern, is five times what the cost will be to address this issue now.

Now, I do think this is worth spending a little bit of time on because my good friend, the junior Senator from California, spent quite a bit of time on this subject.

What did the experts say about the Stern report?

Economist Richard Tol of Hamburg University, one of the world's leading

environmental economists, tore apart the Stern report on January 26, saying:

If a student of mine were to hand in this report on a Master's thesis . . . [it is] likely I would give him an "F" for fail. There is a whole range of very basic economics mistakes that somebody who claims to be a Professor of Economics simply should not make.

Tol said, according to the BBC:

Stern consistently picks the most pessimistic for every choice that one can make. He overestimates through cherry-picking, he double counts particularly the risks and he underestimates what development and adaptation will do to impacts.

Danish statistician Bjorn Lomborg critiqued the Stern report in a November 2, 2006, Wall Street Journal op-ed piece. He said:

The report seems hastily put-together, with many sloppy errors. As an example, the cost of hurricanes in the U.S. is said to be both 0.13 percent of U.S. GDP and 10 times that figure.

Lomborg wrote:

It seems naive to believe that the world's 192 nations can flawlessly implement Mr. Stern's multi-trillion-dollar, century-long policy proposal. Will nobody try to avoid its obligations? Why would China and India even participate?

Particularly when they stated they would not do it.

Roger Pielke, Jr., the director of the University of Colorado's Center for Science and Technology Policy Research, also chided the Stern report for "cherry picking" data on October 30, 2006. Pielke wrote:

The Stern Report's selective fishing out of a convenient statement from one of the background papers prepared for our workshop is a classic example of cherry picking a result from a diversity of perspectives, rather than focusing on the consensus of the entire spectrum of experts that participated in our meeting.

Quoting further, he said:

To support its argument the Stern Report further relies on a significantly flawed report from the Association of British Insurers, which we critiqued here. Its presentation of the future costs of disasters and climate change is highly selective to put it mildly.

Australian Paleoclimate scientist Dr. Bob Carter ridiculed the Stern report in a November 3, 2006, article:

The Stern warning could join Paul Ehrlich's "The Population Bomb" and the "Club of Rome's Limits to Growth" in the pantheon of big banana scares that proved to be unfounded.

It goes on and on in some detail criticizing the report.

Yale University's Sterling Professor of Economics William Nordhaus recently authored a study on the economic effects of climate change titled "The Challenge of Global Warming: Economic Models and Environmental Policy." The study revealed that so-called global warming solutions would cost two or even three times the benefits they would theoretically achieve. Nordhaus was specifically critical of Stern's use of novel methodology, in which he assumes a near zero discount rate which dramatically increases the benefits of addressing global warming.

The New York Times captured the views of mainstream economists in its

February 21, 2007, article by David Leonhardt, when he cited Nordhaus's concerns, adding:

This was fairly tame compared with the comments of another Yale economist, Robert O. Mendelsohn. "I was awestruck," he said, comparing Sir Nicholas to "The Wizard of Oz." But "my job is to be Toto."

It goes on and on and on.

Even Alan Greenspan talks about spending quite a bit of time on this. He said: There is no effective way to meaningfully reduce emissions without negatively impacting a larger part of the economy.

Now, if you look at the Wharton study—there it is, right there. If you look at this, I hope people understand there is no question that there are scientists who actually believe that man-made gases are a major contributor to climate change. I don't believe—and the scientists I outlined last Friday—one thing is sure and that is the cost to America, should we decide to take one of these steps. Keep in mind, all of this is pushed on us by the United Nations, similar to a lot of other things we have to live with. But if you look at the last four largest tax increases in the last three decades, the most recent one was a \$32 billion tax increase in 1993 called the Clinton-Gore tax increase, a \$32 billion tax increase. I can remember coming to the floor—it was an increase on all the rates, the rates of individuals, regardless of income range. There were all kinds of increases. Yet as bad as that was, and as we were talking about the huge tax increase—\$32 billion—the Wharton School of Economics estimates the Kyoto cost would have been over \$300 billion; in other words, ten times the largest tax increase in modern history.

I think people do have to understand that, because there have been all kinds of articles. The op-ed piece in the Financial Post by Wayne Weingarten said that the cost of reducing greenhouse gases through cap-and-trade regulations are not trivial. If implemented, cap-and-trade policies would add significant costs to production and would likely have a severe negative impact on long-term growth and an estimated \$10,800 per U.S. family—\$10,800.

Recently the MIT study which was referred to, I think, by Senator BOXER, the MIT study analyzed how energy producers would have to spend to buy allowances if they were auctioned, and the cost to energy producers to buy these allowances would be equal to \$4,500 per household family. Now, all of these seem to be unanimous in terms of what it would cost, and I think we all understand that.

For fear that I might lose—or run out of time, I am going to real quickly go over some of the things I did last Friday, talking about what has happened in 2007. In August of 2007, a peer-reviewed study published in the "Geophysical Research Letters" finds global warming over the last century linked to natural causes. The September peer-reviewed study counters the global

warming theory by finding carbon dioxide did not end during the last ice age. In October of 2007, the Danish National Space Study concluded the Sun still appears to be the main forcing agent.

By the way, all the way through this, we have approximately 11 other quotes that I will submit for the record talking about how the scientists have come out and talked about how expensive it was.

The geologist at the University of Pennsylvania, Dr. Giegengack, makes comments. He says:

If we reduced the rate at which we put carbon into the atmosphere, it won't reduce the concentration in the atmosphere; CO₂ is just going to come back out of these reservoirs.

He talked about natural reservoirs, which are oceans, soil, and permafrost.

Going back to Dr. Giegengack, he says:

In terms of global warming's capacity to cause the human species harm, I don't think it makes it into the top 10.

He said that in an interview at the University of Pennsylvania.

Now, again, if we have time, we will come back and expand a little bit on that.

What I have done is written down as quickly as I could the things the junior Senator came out with. She spent a lot of—let's put the polar bear back up there. People wonder why they always keep using polar bears. Everybody loves animals. This was a Time magazine top seller. They had this poor polar bear standing on this last cube of ice out there. It says: "Be worried. Be Very Worried." That is the same publication that in 1975 said another ice age is coming; we are all going to die.

Let's talk about the polar bear. I think this is kind of a classic case of reality versus unproven computer model predictions. The Fish and Wildlife Service estimates that the polar bear population is currently 20,000 to 25,000 bears; whereas, in the 1950s and 1960s, the estimates were 5,000 to 10,000 polar bears. We currently have an estimated four to five times more polar bears than we did 50 years ago.

A 2002 U.S. Geological Survey of wildlife in the Arctic Refuge Coastal Plain noted that polar bear populations may now be near historic highs.

Top biologists such as Canadian biologist Dr. Mitchell Taylor, the director of wildlife research, dismissed these fears about polar bears with evidence-based data on Canada's polar bear populations. He says: Of the 13 populations of polar bears in Canada, 11 are stable or increasing in number.

There is only one that is dropping down, and that is in the western—what was it, the Hudson Bay area. This is the one the junior Senator from California talked about, and that is going down in population, mostly because of the hunting rules that have been established in that area.

The next thing she talked about was computer models. This is interesting because everyone now has debunked

the whole idea that computer models were accurate. Even the New York Times has been forced to acknowledge the overwhelming evidence that the Earth is currently well within natural climate variation. This inconvenient reality means that all the warming doomsayers have to back up their climate fears are unproven computer models predicting future doom. Of course, you can't prove a prediction of the climate in 2100 wrong today, which reduces the models to speculating on what could or might or may happen 50 years from now or 100 years from now.

But prominent U.N. scientists have publicly questioned the reliability of climate models. This is kind of interesting because it is the U.N. that started this whole thing. The IPCC, the scientists, Dr. Jim Renwick, a lead author of the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report—this is the United Nations—publicly admitted that climate models may not be so reliable after all.

He stated in June:

Half of the variability in the climate system is not predictable, so we don't expect to do terrifically well.

Let me repeat, a U.N. scientist admitted half of the variability in the climate system is not predictable.

Also in June, another high-profile U.N. lead author, Dr. Kevin Trenberth, echoed Renwick's sentiments about climate models by referring to them as nothing more than story lines.

Keep in mind, what we are talking about are the things that all this is based on and the distinguished junior Senator from California spent about 15 minutes of her 1 hour talking about—computer models. They have all been debunked.

Now, as far as Greenland is concerned, this is kind of interesting because, in fact, current temperatures in Greenland—and Greenland has been the poster boy for climate alarmists—the current temperatures are cooler than the temperatures there in the mid 1930s and 1940s, according to multiple peer-reviewed studies. You heard me right. Greenland has cooled since the 1940s, a fact the media and global warming activists conceal. Greenland reached its highest temperatures in 1941, according to a peer-reviewed study published in the June of 2006 issue of the "Journal of Geophysical Research." Keep in mind the 80 percent of manmade CO₂ after these high temperatures.

According to a July 2007 report from the Environment and Public Works Committee on Greenland:

Research in 2006 found that Greenland has been warming since the 1880s, but since 1955, temperature averages at Greenland stations have been colder than the period between 1881 and 1995. Another 2006 peer-reviewed study concluded the rate of warming in Greenland from 1920 to 1930 was about 50 percent higher than the warming from 1995 to 2005. One 2005 study found Greenland gaining ice in the interior higher elevations and thinning ice at the lower elevations.

So it has gone over and over again, the fact that it is factual, that it has actually been getting cooler in Greenland.

By the way, I think it is also interesting when you talk about global warming, consistently through the last several decades, the Southern Hemisphere has actually been getting cooler. The last time I checked, the Southern Hemisphere was part of the globe.

So I think if we want to talk about some of the changes in terms of the scientists that have been coming along, we could do that. I think one of the well-known—the scientist staff writer, Juliet Eilperin, from the Washington Post conceded that climate skeptics appear to be expanding rather than shrinking.

Geologist Peter Sciaky echoes this growing backlash of leftwing activists about global warming. He describes himself as a "liberal and a leftist" and wrote on June 9:

I do not know a single geologist who believes that global warming is a man-made phenomena.

I think that former Vice President Gore's biggest worry is becoming a reality right now, and that is that all these scientists who were on his side 10 years or so ago are now on the other side saying: Wait a minute, we thought we were right at that time.

The 60 scientists who were advising the Prime Minister of Canada and advised him back in the middle 1990s to sign onto the Kyoto Treaty, after re-evaluating, they said:

If, back in the mid 1990s, we knew what we know today about climate, Kyoto would almost certainly not exist, because we would have concluded it was not necessary.

So you get back to the 60 scientists who advised the Prime Minister at that time to join in the Kyoto Treaty, and right now they have all signed a letter advising Prime Minister Harper not to join on or sign onto any successor of the Kyoto Treaty.

So when we talk about Claude Allegra from France, David Bellamy from the U.K., and Nir Shaviv from Israel, these are people who were on the other side who have come over.

I think that in my 2-plus-hour presentation I made last Friday, I covered most of the things—the objections that were given on the floor by my good friend, Senator BOXER. I see my friend from New Mexico is here. If he would like me to yield the remainder of my time to him, I say to Senator DOMENICI, I would be glad to do so.

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator, how much time is that?

Mr. INHOFE. I don't know.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). About 4½ minutes remain.

Mr. DOMENICI. I appreciate that. First, I wish to thank the Senator. I wish to say to the Senate, I talked to Senator LOTT, and I understand that when the 4½ minutes is up, the regular order will be that we return to Amtrak; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator indicated to me he was next with some

amendments, but he would be willing to give me about 5 minutes. Now, we can do it either way. We can say, I would like 5 minutes before—what I have been given here, plus 5 before we go to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator seek unanimous consent?

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. That means I can go up to 9½. I am not sure I will, but who knows. This is a favorite subject, so I might talk all night if you let me.

ENERGY

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am here because the distinguished majority leader spoke today, and I wasn't here when he talked about the two Energy bills that are outstanding—maybe it is three. The House has a couple of Energy bills and we have one, and they are languishing, so to speak, because there is no conference, no official conference. The distinguished majority leader used the phrase, saying we ought to marry the two bills. Now, the leader knows I have every bit of respect for him, and I have talked with him about this Energy bill at least 10 times. I have even suggested in writing some ideas about how we might have a conference that is not a conference but accomplishes the same thing. With that, I wish to say right off, Mr. Leader and fellow Senators, these two bills are so different, so different, that they are incompatible.

So you cannot say marry them, because that marriage cannot last. You cannot start it because the bills are diametrically different, with the exception of a few pieces that are not terribly relevant that are the same. What they have, we don't have; what we have, they don't have. You cannot marry them. It is a hard job to work a bill when you don't have a conference.

I will repeat what I have suggested. At least 2 Republican Senators who were part of the big bill—maybe myself from the Energy Committee, and maybe Senator STEVENS from Commerce—have to be part of negotiating every part of the bill or it is going to be very difficult to get 60 votes in the Senate. I cannot make it any clearer. That is what I have told them. I still say that. I don't know where we do it, but maybe we could informally agree to something like that. So don't bring up a big piece of the bill that has been negotiated out between some House Members and Senate Members but you have not worked it with the Senators who put together the basic pieces of the big bill in the Senate.

As a member of the Senate Energy Committee for 30 years, I have learned a lot about what it takes to pass a comprehensive, bipartisan energy bill and get it signed. As chairman in 2005, I shepherded through the Senate the