

approaches. I have been discussing with my constituents in town hall meetings the idea that if we are to have a system that works for everybody in terms of affordable quality health care, I am prepared to say that an individual should, every time they use a medical service, if they are not destitute, have to make a payment on the spot so as to ensure that there is a clear requirement of personal responsibility. Certainly, that will be controversial, but that is the kind of issue that has to be discussed with respect to health reform.

Finally, I think the question of addressing health care—and particularly Senator HATCH and I have tried to do it in a bipartisan way—means you have to get beyond the blame game. Sometimes when you have a discussion about health care, the topic comes up that Republicans say it is the trial lawyers' fault; nail the trial lawyers and everything is going to be fine. Then you go meet with Democrats and Democrats say, yes, we have to have health reform. Go nail the insurance companies; do that and everything will be fine. I think—and Senator HATCH and I have talked about this—if we are going to have a health care program that works for all Americans, we are going to have to get beyond the blame game. You bet changes need to be made in the insurance sector, because they do skim the cream and take the healthy people, and they do send sick people to Government programs that are sicker than they are. There do need to be changes in those insurance practices. I think we also understand that there are frivolous cases and abuses in the legal sector, and changes would be necessary there if we are to have meaningful reform and a health care program that works for all Americans.

It seems to me this is an issue that we cannot duck because come 2010, 2011, 2012, medical costs will clearly consume just about everything in sight. I submit that the problems we are seeing today in terms of small business premium hikes, folks falling between the cracks—they are not old enough for Medicare or not poor enough for Medicaid; our Medicare providers are understandably frustrated by the reimbursement system—if we keep nibbling at the Medicare health care system, the problems we are seeing today are going to seem like small potatoes compared to what happens in 2010, 2011, and 2012. On New Year's Day in 2008, this demographic influx, in effect, of 7 million-plus retirees we will see over the next few years is going to start to retire. That happens New Year's Day 2008. So the reason I have come to the floor this afternoon is I wanted to outline a number of steps—four, specifically—that I thought Congress could tackle in a bipartisan way that would make a meaningful difference right now: the legislation Senator SNOWE and I have authored in terms of prescription drug cost containment, using marketplace forces to

hold down prescription drug costs; catastrophic illness, and looking particularly at ideas that Senators KERRY and FRIST have talked about; the question of mental health parity; childhood obesity. Again, we can build where there is a bipartisan foundation for congressional action. These are steps we ought to take now. Then we ought to use the next couple of years—as Senator HATCH and I have tried to do in a bipartisan kind of way—to build a health care system that works for all Americans. Our legislation is moving ahead.

The Government Accountability Office is appointing the Citizens' Health Care Working Group right now. The \$3 million appropriated for the legislation—and I am grateful to Senators SPECTER and HARKIN for that particular work—is going to allow us, in our Health Care That Works For All Americans Act, to take a very different approach to break this spiral which dates back to 1945, tried by Harry Truman in the 81st Congress, and continued literally up through the time of President Clinton. Making sure the public has the facts is the first task of the Citizens' Health Care Working Group established in the legislation I have authored with Senator HATCH. Second is to make sure the public gets a chance to weigh in. Finally, to ensure public accountability, the Congress is under a requirement to move forward with hearings after the Citizens' Working Group has reported.

So I think it is appropriate on this first day of the new session to zero in on the health care issue. I have been very closely following the discussions colleagues on both sides of the aisle have made with respect to the tragedy that has taken place overseas. I am very pleased to hear that Majority Leader FRIST is leading a trip to the area and will come back with ideas for bipartisan action on that terrible tragedy. I wanted to talk about what I think is the most pressing issue at home, the health care challenge, and particularly to outline bipartisan steps that could be taken now. I also look forward to working with my colleagues as the legislation I have authored with Senator HATCH is implemented in the weeks ahead.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFEE). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for up to 45 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first let me say to my friend, Senator WYDEN, he has always been a champion of that cause. A lot of us with different political philosophies rely on his judgment, his experience, his background, and those things he has accomplished in the field of health care. I look forward to working with him in this coming year.

GLOBAL WARMING DEBATE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, as I said on the Senate floor on July 28, 2003, much of the debate over global warming is predicated on fear rather than science. I am the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee. In addition to its normal expected jurisdictions, the committee also has a lot to do with the Energy bill. We have probably as many provisions in the Energy bill as the Energy Committee does. It is one with which we have great concern.

We recognize we have an energy crisis in America. The House passed a very good Energy bill last year. We should have passed it in the Senate. We did not. I hope we will pass it this time. In the meantime, we need to do what I committed to do when I became chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee 2 years ago. We are going to encourage decisions that are made in Government to be made on sound science.

Many times that is not the case, and such a case is the hoax referred to as "global warming." I called the threat of catastrophic global warming the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the American people in a statement, to put it mildly, that was not viewed very kindly by the environmental extremists and their elitist organizations.

I also pointed out in a lengthy committee report that those same environmental extremists exploit the issue for fundraising purposes, raking in millions of dollars, even using Federal taxpayers' dollars to finance the campaigns.

For these groups, the issue of catastrophic global warming is not just a favored fundraising tool. In truth, it is more fundamental than that. Put simply, man-induced global warming is an article of religious faith to the radical far left alarmists. Therefore, contending that its central tenets are flawed to them is heresy and of the most despicable kind. Furthermore, scientists who challenge its tenets are attacked sometimes personally for blindly ignoring the so-called scientific consensus. That is not all. Because of their skeptical views, they are contemptuous, dismissed for being "out of the mainstream."

This seems to me highly ironic. Aren't scientists to be nonconforming and question consensus? Nevertheless, it is not hard to read between the lines. "Skeptic" and "out of mainstream" are their thinly veiled code phrases meaning anyone who doubts the alarmists' orthodoxy is, in short, a quack.

I have insisted all along that the climate change debate should be based on fundamental principles and science, not religion. Ultimately, I hope it will be decided by hard facts and data and by serious scientists committed to the principles of sound science instead of censoring skeptical viewpoints, as my alarmist friends favor.

These scientists must be heard, and I will do my part to make sure they are

heard. I am sure the Presiding Officer from Rhode Island is very much concerned with the sound science with which we address this subject.

Since my detailed climate change speech in 2003, so-called skeptics continue to speak out. What they are saying is devastating to the alarmists. They amassed additional scientific evidence convincingly refuting the alarmists' most cherished assumptions and beliefs. New evidence has emerged that further undermines their conclusions, most notably those of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, IPCC, one of the major pillars of the authorities cited by the extremists and climate alarmists.

I guess what I am saying is we are going to be looking at this new evidence. Just since we have adjourned and have come back in today to swear in our new Members, the scientists are almost entirely on the side that there is no sound science behind the idea that, No. 1, the climate is changing and, No. 2, if it is that it is the result of manmade gases. Evidence has come to light in very interesting times.

Just last month, the 10th Conference of the Parties—that is called the COP-10—to the Framework Convention on Climate Change met in Buenos Aires to discuss Kyoto's implementation and measures to pursue beyond Kyoto.

As most of my colleagues know, Kyoto goes into effect on February 16. I think, with the exception of Russia, an exception I will explain later, the nations that ratified Kyoto and agreed to submit to its mandates are making a very serious mistake.

I went to this meeting, the conference, COP-9, last year in Milan, Italy. It was shocking to see what was actually going on there. I was involved in a mission in west Africa. I saw a person I deal with on a regular basis from a little country in west Africa who was there. It happens that his title in his country's government is Minister of the Environment. I said: What are you doing here? Do you really believe in this Kyoto stuff?

He said: Oh, no, this is the biggest party of the year.

These people are paid for by the United Nations and paid for by this country, in an inordinate amount, percentage, to come up with and have big parties for 3, 4, 5 days in some of the most exotic places in the world just to show support for Kyoto. It is outrageous.

In addition, last month, a popular author, Dr. Michael Crichton, who has questioned the wisdom of those who trumpet a scientific consensus, released a new book called "State of Fear." You all know who Dr. Michael Crichton is. He is a medical doctor as well as a scientist and best-selling author. This is all premised on the global warming debate.

I am happy to report Dr. Crichton's new book reached No. 3 on the New York Times bestseller list. I highly recommend this book to the Presiding Of-

ficer. I will supply him with this book because I think it is imperative people see some of what is going on right now and how public opinion is catching on to this hoax that has permeated our country for so long.

Dr. Crichton, as I said, is a medical doctor and scientist. He very cleverly weaved a very compelling presentation of the scientific facts of climate change—with ample footnotes and documentation throughout, I might add—into a gripping plot. From what I can gather Dr. Crichton's book is designed to bring some sanity to the global warming debate. In the author's message at the end of his book, he refreshingly states what scientists have suspected for years. He says:

We are also in the midst of a natural warming trend that began about 1850—

I do not know who will argue with that.

—as we emerged from a 400 year cold spell known as the Little Ice Age.

Dr. Crichton states that "nobody knows how much of the present warming trend might be a natural phenomenon," and "Nobody knows how much of the present trend might be man-made."

For those who see impending disaster in the coming century, Dr. Crichton writes:

I suspect that people of 2100 will be much richer than we are, consume much more energy, have a smaller global population, and enjoy more wilderness than we have today. I don't think we have to worry about them.

For those who do worry or induce such worries in others, "State of Fear" has a very simple message: Stop worrying and stop spreading fear. Throughout the book, fictional environmental organizations are more focused on raising money, principally by scaring potential contributors with bogus scientific claims and predictions of the global apocalypse, than they are with saving the environment.

As the saying goes, here we have art imitating life. As my colleagues will remember from a floor speech I gave last year, this is part and parcel of what these organizations peddle to the general public. Their fearmongering knows no bounds. Just consider the debate over mercury emissions. President Bush proposed the first ever cap to reduce mercury emissions from powerplants by 70 percent. True to form, these groups said he was allowing more mercury into the air. Now stop and think about it. Right now there is no cap on mercury. It is proposed by this President for the first time.

As I mentioned earlier, several nations, including the United States, met in Buenos Aires in December for the 10th round of the international climate change negotiations. I am happy to report that the U.S. delegation held firm both in its categorical rejection of Kyoto and the questionable science behind it.

Paula Dobriansky, Under Secretary of State for Global Affairs and the leader of the U.S. delegation, put it very well when she told the conference:

Science tells us that we cannot say with any certainty what constitutes a dangerous level of warming, and therefore what level must be avoided.

Ms. Dobriansky and her team also rebuffed attempts by the European Union to drag the United States into discussions concerning post-Kyoto climate change commitments. With the ink barely dry on Kyoto ratification, not to mention what the science of climate change is telling us, Ms. Dobriansky was right in dubbing post-2012 talks premature.

It was clear from discussions in Buenos Aires that Kyoto supporters desperately want the United States to impose on itself mandatory greenhouse emissions controls. Moreover, there was considerable discussion but no apparent resolution over how to address emissions from developing countries such as India and especially China, which over the coming decades will be the world's leading emitter of greenhouse gases.

Developing nations, most notably China, remained adamant in Buenos Aires in opposing any mandatory greenhouse gas reductions now or any time in the future. Securing this commitment was a necessary component for the U.S. ratification of Kyoto.

Now, some may not have been here at the time, but 2 years ago we passed the Byrd-Hagel resolution that said that if Kyoto treats developing nations any different than developed nations, we will not ratify it. That passed 95 to 0. Every Senator voted that way, and it was very clear. So I think one can say with that commitment at least in the United States that Kyoto is dead.

Kyoto goes into force on February 16. According to the European Union Environmental Ministry, most EU member states will not meet their Kyoto targets. That is kind of interesting because the very people who are behind it and are so adamant that, yes, we must do this, are the ones who have not met their voluntary targets and have no real intention of doing so. They may do so only on paper due to Russia's ratification of the treaty.

Russia, of course, ratified Kyoto not because its government believes in catastrophic global warming—it does not—but because ratification was Russia's key to joining the World Trade Organization. Also, under Kyoto, Russia can profit from selling emission credits to the European Union and continue business as usual without undertaking economically harmful emissions reductions.

Just stop and think about this now. We are talking about the huge, massive country of Russia. I have been active in aviation for 48 years now, and I had occasion a few years ago to fly an airplane around the world, replicating the flight of Wiley Post. In doing so, I went all the way across Siberia. I can remember going not just hour after hour but time zone after time zone, seeing no signs of civilization, just great forests. Well, they ended up getting credits for all of that. When I talked to the

Russian people last year in Milan, Italy, they were very straightforward, saying: No, there is no science to it, but we stand to make millions of dollars if we sign on to this thing.

That was my first indication that they were going to do so.

So as the talks in Buenos Aires revealed, if alarmists cannot get what they want at the negotiating table, they will try other means. I was told by reliable sources that some delegation members of the European Union suddenly hinted that America's rejection of Kyoto could be grounds for a challenge under WTO. I surely hope this was just a hypothetical suggestion and not something our European friends are actively and seriously considering. I predict such a move would be devastating to the United States and the United States-European Union relations, not to mention the WTO itself.

I suspect it is not just hypothetical. The lawsuit is the stock and trade of environmental activists. We are witnessing a new crop of global warming lawsuits now being leveled at individual U.S. companies and at the United States itself.

In Buenos Aires, Earth Justice, a San Francisco-based environmental group, and the Center for International Law announced plans to seek a ruling from the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights that the U.S., because of its supposed contribution to global warming, is causing environmental degradation in the Arctic and therefore violating the human rights of Alaska's Inuits, or Eskimos. As the New York Times wrote:

The commission, an investigative arm of the Organization of American States, has no enforcement powers. But a declaration that the United States has violated the Inuits' rights could create the foundation for an eventual lawsuit, either against the United States in an international court or against American companies in a U.S. court, said a number of legal experts, including some aligned with industry.

The Times did not mention that such lawsuits already have been filed with the U.S.

Eliot Spitzer, New York's State attorney general, along with eight other State attorneys general, mainly from the Northeast, last year sued five coal burning electric utilities in the Midwest. The reason: "Given that these are among the largest carbon dioxide polluters in the world," Mr. Spitzer wrote, "it is essential that the court direct them to reduce their emissions."

To me, this is a clear-cut sign of desperation by the alarmists, but I am not surprised. President Bush has rejected Kyoto. The Senate has rejected Kyoto 95 to 0. The Senate rejected the McCain-Lieberman bill by 55 to 43, and there is little hope that Congress will pass mandatory greenhouse gas reduction, at least not in the near future. So resorting to the courts is their last hope. I hope the courts have enough sense in moderation to reject these lawsuits out of hand.

I am interested, for one, to see how Mr. Spitzer quantifies with scientific precision just how these particular companies have contributed to climate change. How is it, one might ask, that emissions, specifically from American Electric Power, are causing rising sea levels, droughts, or hurricanes? Such efforts fly in the face of compelling new scientific evidence that makes a mockery of these lawsuits.

By now most everyone familiar with the climate change debate knows about the hockey stick graph constructed by Dr. Michael Mann and his colleagues which shows that temperatures in the Northern Hemisphere remained relatively stable over 900 years and then spiked upward in the 20th century. The hockey stick graph was featured prominently in IPCC's third assessment report published in 2001. The conclusion inferred from the hockey stick is that industrialization, which spawned widespread use of fossil fuels, is causing the planet to warm.

I spent considerable time examining this work in my 2003 speech because Dr. Michael Mann effectively erased the well-known phenomena of the medieval warming period. In other words, he never even recognized—I wish we had the chart because I have a chart that shows this, and one can see the shaft of the hockey stick over 900 years go like this, but all of a sudden in the 20th century it starts up like this, and they failed to realize that there was another blade in the hockey stick that was the medieval warming period where the temperatures were warmer than they are today. This has been going on since creation. I think the fact that he did it—I was challenged in a speech that I made in Italy on this subject. I said I believe Michael Mann must have intentionally left that off because that completely destroys the credibility of his findings.

But don't take my word for it. Just ask Dr. Hans Von Storch, a noted German climate researcher, who, along with colleagues, published a devastating finding in the Sept. 30, 2004 issue of Science magazine. As the authors wrote: "We were able to show in a publication in Science that this [hockey stick] graph contains assumptions that are not permissible. Methodologically it is wrong: Rubbish."

Dr. Von Storch and colleagues discovered that the Mann hockey stick had severely underestimated past climate variability. In a commentary on Dr. von Storch's paper, T.J. Osborn and K.R. Briffa, prominent paleoclimatologists from the University of East Anglia, stressed the importance of the findings. As they wrote, "The message of the study by von Storch et al. is that existing reconstructions of the NH [northern hemisphere] temperature of recent centuries may systematically underestimate the true centennial variability of climate" . . . and, "If the true natural variability of NH [northern hemisphere] temperature is indeed greater than is currently accepted, the

extent to which recent warming can be viewed as 'unusual' would need to be reassessed." In other words, in obliterating the Medieval Warm Period and the Little Ice Age, Mann's hockey stick just doesn't pass muster.

Dr. Von Storch is one of many critics of Michael Mann's hockey stick. To recount just one example, three geophysicists from the University of Utah, in the April 7, 2004 issue of Geophysical Research Letters, concluded that Mann's methods used to create his temperature reconstruction were deeply flawed. In fact, their judgment is harsher than that. As they wrote, Mann's results are "based on using end points in computing changes in an oscillating series" and are "just bad science." I repeat: "just bad science."

As to the arctic climate assessment, these findings, alongside a spate of new reports, at least in the eyes of the media supposedly confirm the "consensus" on global warming. "The Arctic Climate Impact Assessment," released last fall, perfectly fits that mold. "Arctic Perils Seen in Warming," blared a headline by the New York Times. As the Times wrote: "The findings support the broad but politically controversial scientific consensus that global warming is caused mainly by rising atmosphere concentrations of heat-trapping greenhouse gases, and that the Arctic is the first region to feel its effects."

What do we really know about temperatures in the Arctic? Let's take a closer look. As Oregon State University climatologist George Taylor has shown, Arctic temperatures are actually slightly cooler today than they were in the 1930s. As Dr. Taylor has explained, it's all relative—in other words, it depends on the specific time period chosen in making temperature comparisons. The Arctic Climate Impact Assessment, Dr. Taylor wrote: "appears to be guilty of selective use of data. Many of the trends described in the document begin in the 1960s or 1970s—cool decades in much of the world—and end in the warmer 1990s or early 2000s. So, for example, temperatures have warmed in the last 40 years, and the implication, 'if present trends continue,' is that massive warming will occur in the next century."

Dr. Taylor concluded this way: "Yet data are readily available for the 1930s and early 1940s, when temperatures were comparable to (and probably higher than) those observed today. Why not start the trend there? Because there is no net warming over the last 65 years?"

This is pretty convincing stuff. But, one might say, this is only one scientist, while nearly 300 scientists in several countries, including the United States, signed onto the Arctic report. I want to submit for the record a list of scientists, compiled by the Center For Science and Public Policy, from several countries, including the United States, whose published work shows current Arctic temperature is no higher than temperatures in 1930s and 1940s.

For example, according to a group of 7 scientists in a 2003 issue of the *Journal of Climate*: “In contrast to the global and hemispheric temperature, the maritime Arctic temperature was higher in the late 1930s through the early 1940s than in the 1990s.” Or how about this excerpt from the 2000 *International Journal of Climatology*, by Dr. Rajmund Przybylak, of Nicholas Copernicus University, in Torun, Poland: “The highest temperatures since the beginning of instrumental observation occurred clearly in the 1930s and can be attributed to changes in atmospheric circulation.”

I ask unanimous consent the list of scientists be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[See exhibit 1.]

Mr. INHOFE. Despite this evidence, alarmism is live and well. As you can see behind me, the *Washington Post* today ran an editorial cartoon that, yes, actually blames the Sumatra tsunami on global warming. Are we to believe now that global warming is causing earthquakes? The tsunami, of course, was caused by an earthquake off Sumatra's coast deep beneath the sea floor, completely disconnected from whatever the climate was doing at the surface. Regrettably, the tsunami-warming connection merely confirms the state of fear extremists are so eager to create. As Terence Corcoran of *Canada's Financial Post* wrote: “The urge to capitalize on the horror in Asia is just too great for some to resist if it might help their cause . . . Green Web sites are already filling up with references to tsunami risks associated with global warming.”

There is something inhumane about that, that they would capitalize on the tragedy of a hundred thousand people to push a hoax like global warming.

To address this, let's ask some simple questions: Is global warming causing more extreme weather events of greater intensity, and is it causing sea levels to rise? The answer to all of these is emphatically no. Just look at this chart behind me. It's titled “Climate Related Disasters in Asia: 1900 to 1990s.” What does it show? It shows the number of such disasters in Asia, and the deaths attributed to them, declining fairly sharply over the last 30 years.

Let's take hurricanes. Alarmists linked last year's hurricanes that devastated parts of Florida to global warming. But this is patently false. Credible meteorologists were quick to dismiss such claims. Hugh Willoughby, senior scientist at the International Hurricane Research Center of Florida International University stated plainly: “This isn't a global-warming sort of thing. . . It's a natural cycle.” A team led by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Dr. Christopher Landsea concluded that the relationship of global temperatures to the number of intense land-falling hur-

ricanes is either non-existent or very weak. In this chart you can see that the overall number of hurricanes and the number of the strongest hurricanes fluctuated greatly during the last century, with a great number in the 1940s. In fact, through the last decade, the intensity of these storms has declined somewhat.

What about sea level rise? Alarmists have claimed for years that sea level, because of anthropogenic warming, is rising rapidly. Based on modeling, the IPCC estimated that sea level will rise 1.8 millimeters annually, or about one-fourteenth of an inch.

But in a study published this year in *Global and Planetary Change*, Dr. Nils-Axel Morner of Sweden found that sea level rise hysteria was overblown. In his study, which relied not only on observational records, but also on satellites he concluded that: “there is a total absence of any recent ‘acceleration in sea level rise’ as often claimed by IPCC and related groups.” Yet we still hear of a future world overwhelmed by floods due to global warming. Such claims are completely out of touch with science. As Sweden's Morner puts it, “there is no fear of massive future flooding as claimed in most global warming scenarios.”

What I have outlined today will not appear in the *New York Times*. Instead you will read much about “consensus” and Kyoto and hand wringing by its editorial writers that unrestricted carbon dioxide emissions from the United States are harming the planet. You will read nothing, of course, about how Kyoto-like policies harm Americans, especially the poor and minorities, causing higher energy prices, reduced economic growth, and fewer jobs. After all, that is the real purpose behind Kyoto, as Morgot Wallstrom, the EU's environment minister, said in a moment of candor. To her, Kyoto is about “leveling the playing field” for businesses worldwide—in other words, we can't compete, so let's use a feel-good treaty, based on shoddy science, fear, and alarmism, which will have no perceptible impact on the environment, to restrict America's economic growth and prosperity. Unfortunately for Ms. Wallstrom and Kyoto's staunchest advocates, America was wise to the scheme, and it has rejected Kyoto and similar policies convincingly. Whatever Kyoto is about—to some, such as French President Jacques Chirac, it's about forming “an authentic global governance”—it's the wrong policy and it won't work, as many participants in Buenos Aires conceded.

I recommend—and I will include at the end of my remarks—the economic study which was done by the Wharton School of Economics talking about what would happen to America and the cost of global warming. If we should sign on to Kyoto, what would it cost? They go into detail. They talk about doubling the price of energy. They talk about the price of fuel more than doubling.

Keep in mind this is the economic survey. They talk about the cost to the average family of four in America being \$2,715 a year by 2010.

People have to understand that the economic destruction of our country is something that would inure to the benefit of the European Union and many others who are in competition with us. We have to understand that there is an economic motive behind it which one would have to seriously consider.

Despite the bias, omissions, and distortions by the media and extremist groups, the real story about global warming is being told and, judging by the success of Michael Crichton's “*State of Fear*,” much to the dismay of certain groups, it is now being told to the American public.

I think one thing which we all have to understand in this body is we have to recognize the fact that we have an energy crisis in America today. Right now, there are a few people around the country who are now catching on that it is true. We need all forms of energy to run this great machine called America. Our forms of energy can be nuclear, they can be renewable, they can be fossil fuel, coal, oil, gas, all of the above. It is what we will have to have in order to be competitive.

Chairing the committee and being active in the upcoming energy bill, we anticipate being realistic in thinking about not just ourselves today—not just my four kids or my 12 grandchildren and future generations—but you are going to have to run this most successful, highly industrialized machine ever conceived in the history of the world. And you can't do it sitting around closing the door on all opportunities that we have for energy. Certainly one is coal.

Certainly we need to look at this whole issue of global warming and what the real motives are of these people who are behind this.

I gave a speech on this floor the last session and talked about the amount of money—I am also going to insert that for the RECORD—being paid to elect people, money that is being filtered through a lot of these organizations. There is a lot of money made out there by causing people to be fearful, by making people afraid, by making people feel that the world is coming to an end. It is not.

EXHIBIT I
SCIENTIST

Rajmund Przybylak, Department of Climatology, Nicholas Copernicus University, Torun, Poland

PAPER

Temporal and spatial variance of surface air temperature over the period of instrumental observations in the Arctic, *International Journal of Climatology*, 20, 587–614, 2000.

KEY QUOTE OR SYNOPSIS

“A detailed analysis of the spatial and temporal changes in mean seasonal and annual surface air temperatures over the period of instrumental observations in the Arctic is presented . . . The presented analysis

shows that the observed variations in air temperature in the real Arctic (defined on the basis of climate as opposed to other criteria, e.g. astronomical or botanical) are in many aspects not consistent with the projected climatic changes computed by climatic models for the enhanced greenhouse effect. The highest temperatures since the beginning of instrumental observation occurred clearly in the 1930s and can be attributed to changes in atmospheric circulation. The second phase of contemporary global warming (after 1975) is, at most, weakly marked in the Arctic. For example, the mean rate of warming for the period 1991–1995 was 2–3 times lower in the Arctic than the global average. Temperature levels observed in Greenland in the last 10–20 years are similar to those observed in the 19th century.”

SCIENTISTS

Igor V. Polyakov, Roman V. Bekryaev, Uma S. Bhatt, Roger L. Colony, Alexander P. Maskhshtas, David Walsh, International Arctic Research Center, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks, Alaska

Genrikh V. Alekseev, Arctic and Antarctic Research Institute, St. Petersburg, Russia

Mark A. Johnson, Institute of Marine Science, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks, Alaska

PAPER

Variability and trends of air temperature and pressure in the Maritime Arctic, 1875–2000, *Journal of Climate*, 16, 2086–2092, 2003.

KEY QUOTE OR SYNOPSIS

“Arctic atmospheric variability during the industrial era (1875–2000) is assessed using spatially averaged surface air temperature (SAT) and sea level pressure (SLP) records. Air temperature and pressure display strong multidecadal variability on timescales of 50–80 yr. Associated with this variability, the Arctic SAT record shows two maxima: in the 1930s–40s and in recent decades, with two colder periods in between. In contrast to the global and hemispheric temperature, the maritime Arctic temperature was higher in the late 1930s through the early 1940s than in the 1990s.”

SCIENTISTS

James. E. Overland, Harold O. Mofjeld, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Pacific Marine Laboratory, Seattle, Washington

Michael C. Spillane, Donald B. Percival, Muyin Wang, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

PAPER

Seasonal and regional variation of pan-arctic surface air temperature over the instrumental record. *Journal of Climate*, 17, 3263–3282, 2003.

KEY QUOTE OR SYNOPSIS

This paper presents results that show that there are seasonal and regional differences in the patterns of historical temperature in the Arctic. With the exception of spring, the authors report that the current climate in the Arctic is not unique in the instrumental record (which begins in the late 1800s).

SCIENTISTS

Vladimir A. Semenov, Lennart Bengtsson, Max Plank Institute for Meteorology, Hamburg, Germany

PAPER

Modes of the wintertime Arctic air temperature variability. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 30, 1781–1784, 2003.

KEY QUOTE OR SYNOPSIS

The researchers present results which show that average Arctic temperature undergoes

large variations, driven by the dominance of different internal modes. The most recent temperature rise is shown to be related to atmospheric circulation factors in the North Atlantic Ocean while an early 20th century warming of nearly equal magnitude was possibly related to long-term sea ice variations.

TOPIC: RECENT CLIMATE CHANGE IN ALASKA

As a U.S. Senator, you were rightly concerned about the state of the conditions in Alaska, and on repeated instances you asked for specifics about observed climate changes there. On each and every occasion, you only received a partial collection of facts about historical temperature and temperature trends that would lead an interested listener to believe that anthropogenic global warming was responsible for the large change in Alaskan temperatures observed over the past 30 to 40 years. In fact, a natural climate shift in the Pacific Ocean that occurred in 1976 is responsible for the observed climate changes in Alaska. Below is a list of researchers, many from the Alaska Climate Research Center at the University of Alaska, who could have supplied you with these facts that were missing from your hearing:

SCIENTISTS

Gerd Wendler, Director and Professor Emeritus, Martin Stuefer, Research Associate, Martha Shulski, Climatologist, Brian Hartmann, Assistant Climatologist, Alaska Climate Research Center, University of Alaska Fairbanks, 903 Koyukuk Drive, P.O. Box 757320, Fairbanks, AK 99775–7320

WEB SITE

Temperature Change in Alaska, 1949–2003, <http://climate.gi.aaska.edu/ClimTrends/Change/4903Change.html>

KEY QUOTE OR SYNOPSIS

“The topic of climate change has attracted widespread attention in recent years and is an issue that numerous scientists study on various time and space scales. One thing for sure is that the earth’s climate has and will continue to change as a result of various natural and anthropogenic forcing mechanisms.

“This page features the trends in mean annual and seasonal temperatures for Alaska’s first-order observing stations since 1949 (Fig. 1), the time period for which reliable meteorological data are available. The temperature change varies from one climatic zone to another as well as for different seasons. If a linear trend is taken through mean annual temperatures, the average change over the last 5 decades is about 3.0°F. However, when analyzing the trends for the four seasons, it can be seen that most of the change has occurred in winter and spring, with less of a change in summer and even slight cooling in autumn (see Table below).

“Considering just a linear trend can mask some important variability characteristics in the time series. Figure 2 shows clearly that this trend is non-linear: a linear trend might have been expected from the fairly steady observed increase of CO₂ during this time period. The figure shows the temperature departure from the long-term mean (1949–2003) for the average of all stations. It can be seen that there are large variations from year to year and the 5-year moving average demonstrates cyclical behavior. The period 1949 to 1975 was substantially colder than the period from 1977 to 2003, however since 1977 no additional warming has occurred in Alaska with the exception of Barrow and a few other locations. In 1976, a stepwise shift appears in the temperature data, which corresponds to a phase shift of the Pacific Decadal Oscillation from a negative phase to a positive phase. Synoptic con-

ditions with the positive phase tend to consist of increased southerly flow and warm air advection into Alaska during the winter, resulting in positive temperature anomalies. Click on the table above to see temperature change after the 1976 shift, and for other time periods.”

SCIENTISTS

Brian Hartmann, Gerd Wendler, Alaska Climate Research Center, University of Alaska, Fairbanks, Alaska

PAPER

Manifestations of the Pacific Decadal Oscillation shift of 1976 within Alaskan climatology. Seventh Conference on Polar Meteorology and Oceanography and Joint Symposium on High-Latitude Climate Variations. May 12–16, 2003.

KEY QUOTE OR SYNOPSIS

“During the year of 1976, the index of the PDO [Pacific Decadal Oscillation] underwent a shift from one of strongly negative phase to one of strongly positive phase. The general circulation and temperature differences witnessed during each of the phases is generally well known, but a fine scale study to understand specific climatological effects within Alaska, including the differing regional effects and responses to the abrupt change, has not been conducted. The present study is an effort to clearly discern the specific manner in which the regime shift was experienced throughout Alaska.”

“The magnitude and sudden nature of the shift in the PDO Index is paralleled by strong local temperature increases in Alaska, suggesting that significant local changes in other meteorological variables should be seen as well . . .

“[Atmospheric circulation patterns associated with the 1976 PDO regime shift] explain the immense warming of 10 °C observed in January from one decade to the next in the Interior, a value far beyond that which can be explained by increased CO₂ and other greenhouse gases.”

SCIENTISTS

Brian Hartmann, Gerd Wendler, Alaska Climate Research Center, Geophysical Institute, University of Alaska, Fairbanks, Alaska

PAPER

On the significance of the 1976 Pacific climate shift in the climatology of Alaska, *Journal of Climate*, under review.

KEY QUOTE OR SYNOPSIS

“The 1976 Pacific climate shift is examined and its manifestations and significance in Alaskan climatology during the last half-century are demonstrated. The regime shift is quantified by the Pacific Decadal Oscillation Index shift in 1976 from dominantly negative values for the 25-year time period 1951–1975 to dominantly positive values for the period 1977–2001.

“Mean annual and seasonal temperatures for the positive phase were up to 3.1 °C higher than for the negative phase. Likewise, mean cloudiness, wind speeds, and precipitation amounts increased while mean sea level pressure and geopotential heights decreased. The pressure decrease resulted in a deepening of the Aleutian Low in winter and spring. The intensification of the Aleutian Low increased the advection of relatively warm and moist air to Alaska and storminess over the state.

“The regime shift is also examined for its effect on the long-term temperature trends throughout the state. The trends that have shown climatic warming are strongly biased by the sudden shift from the cooler regime to a warmer regime in 1976. When analyzing the

total time period from 1951 to 2001, warming is observed, however the 25-year period trend analyses before 1976 (1951–1975) and thereafter (1977–2001) both display cooling. In this paper we emphasize the importance of taking into account the sudden changes that result from abrupt climatic shifts, persistent regimes and the possibility of cyclic oscillations, such as the PDO, in the analysis of long-term climate change in Alaska.”

SCIENTISTS

Feng Sheng Hu, University of Illinois, Urbana Illinois

Emi Ito, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Thomas A. Brown, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California

B. Brandon Curry, Illinois State Geological Survey, Champaign, Illinois

Daniel R. Engstrom, Science Museum of Minnesota, St. Croix, Minnesota

PAPER

Pronounced climatic variations in Alaska during the last two millennia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 98, 10552–10556, 2001.

KEY QUOTE OR SYNOPSIS

“We conducted multiproxy geochemical analysis of a sediment core from Farewell Lake (62° 33' N, 153° 38' W, 320m altitude) in the northwestern foothills of the Alaska Range. These analysis provide the first high-resolution (multidecadal) quantitative record of Alaskan climate variations that spans the last two millennia. . . . Our SWT [surface water temperature] reconstruction at Farewell Lake indicates that although the 20th century, represented by the uppermost three samples, was among the warmest periods of the past two millennia, two earlier intervals may have been comparably warm (A.D. 0–300 and A.D. 850–1200). These data agree with tree-ring evidence from Fennoscandia, indicating that the recent warmth is not atypical of the past 1000 years.”

TOPIC: SEA ICE DECLINES

During your Senate Committee hearing, you also heard testimony about the observed declines in Arctic sea ice during the past several decades and how that in some climate model prognostications, summer sea ice totally disappears from the northern oceans by the end of the 21st century. However, no one told you that a large portion of the observed sea ice declines is related to natural variability, or that in some regions it does not appear that current conditions are any more or less unusual than sea ice condition during the 19th century. Had you invited the scientists below to testify, you would have been made aware of these opinions.

SCIENTISTS:

James E. Overland, Pacific Marine Laboratory, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Seattle, Washington

Kevin Wood, Arctic Research Office, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Silver Spring, Maryland

PAPER

Accounts from 19th-century Canadian Arctic Explorers' Logs Reflect Present Climate Conditions, *EOS Transactions of the American Geophysical Union*, 84, October 7, 2003.

KEY QUOTE OR SYNOPSIS

“The widely perceived failure of 19th-century expeditions to find and transit the Northwest Passage in the Canadian Arctic is often attributed to extraordinary cold climate conditions associated with the “Little Ice Age” evident in proxy records. However, examination of 44 explorers' logs for the western Arctic from 1818 to 1910 reveals that

climate indicators such as navigability, the distribution and thickness of annual sea ice, monthly surface air temperatures, and the onset of melt and freeze were within the present range of variability.”

SCIENTISTS

Ignatius G. Rigor, John M. Wallace, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington
Roger L. Colony, University of Alaska, Fairbanks, Alaska

PAPER

Response of Sea Ice to the Arctic Oscillation, *Journal of Climate*, 15, 2648–2663, 2002.

KEY QUOTE OR SYNOPSIS

“Increased advection of the ice away from the coast during winter during high-index conditions of the AO [Arctic Oscillation] enhanced the production of thin ice in the flaw leads of the East Siberian and Laptev Seas. The cyclonic SIM [sea ice motion] anomaly also enhances the production of thin ice during winter because of the increase in divergence over the eastern Arctic. Both of these processes contribute to thinning of sea ice. These changes in SIM have contributed to the observed trends in sea ice, such as the decreases in ice area and extent, and the thinning of sea ice.

“The changes in SIM also appear to be at least partially responsible for the trends in SAT [surface air temperature] reported by Rigor et al. (2000); that is, the increased latent heat released during the formation of new ice in the diverging leads, and the increased heat flux through thinner ice have contributed to the pronounced warming that has been observed in the East Siberian and Laptev portions of the warm anomaly. Intuitively, one might have expected the warming trends in SAT to cause the thinning of sea ice, but the results presented in this study imply the inverse causality; that is, the thinning ice has warmed SAT by increasing the heat flux from the ocean.”

SCIENTISTS

Greg Holloway, Tessa Sou, Institute of Ocean Sciences, Sidney, British Columbia

PAPER

Has Arctic Sea Ice Rapidly Thinned? *Journal of Climate*, 15, 1691–1701, 2002.

KEY QUOTE OR SYNOPSIS

“Reports based on submarine sonar data have suggested Arctic sea ice has thinned nearly by half in recent decades. Such rapid thinning is a concern for detection of global change and for Arctic regional impacts. Including atmospheric time series, ocean currents and river runoff into an ocean-ice-snow model show that the inferred rapid thinning was unlikely. The problem stems from undersampling. Varying winds that readily redistribute Arctic ice create a recurring pattern whereby ice shifts between the central Arctic and peripheral regions, especially in the Canadian sector. Timing and tracks of the submarine surveys missed this dominant mode of variability.”

SCIENTIST

P. Windsor, Department of Oceanography, Earth Sciences Centre, Göteborg University, Göteborg, Sweden

PAPER

Arctic Sea Ice Thickness Remained Constant during the 1990s. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 28, 1039–1041, 2001.

KEY QUOTE OR SYNOPSIS

“The ice cover of the Arctic Ocean is considered to be a sensitive indicator of global climate change. Recent research, using submarine-based observations, suggests that the

Arctic ice cover was thinner in the 1990s compared to an earlier period (1958–1979), and that it continued to decrease in thickness in the 1990s. Here I analyze subsurface ice thickness (draft) of Arctic sea ice from six submarine cruises from 1991 to 1997. This extensive data set shows that there was no trend towards a thinning ice cover during the 1990s. Data from the North Pole shows a slight increase in mean ice thickness, whereas the Beaufort Sea shows a small decrease, none of which are significant. Transects between the two areas from 76 N to 90 N also show near constant ice thicknesses, with a general spatial decrease from the Pole towards the Beaufort Sea. Combining the present results with those of an earlier study, I conclude that the mean ice thickness has remained on a near-constant level around the North Pole from 1986 to 1997.”

SCIENTIST

Torgny Vijne, Norwegian Polar Institute, Oslo, Norway

PAPER

Anomalies and Trends of Sea-Ice Extent and Atmospheric Circulation in the Nordic Seas during the Period 1864–1998. *Journal of Climate*, 14, 255–254, 2001.

KEY QUOTE OR SYNOPSIS

Vinje constructed a 135-yr time series of sea ice extent in the Nordic Seas and found that while April sea ice extent has declined by about 33 percent during this period, more than half of the decline occurred before 1900. Vinje concluded that “the time series indicates that we are in a state of continued recovery from the cooling effects of the Little Ice Age, during which a maximum sea-ice expansion was observed around 1800, both in the Iceland Sea and the Barents Sea.”

SCIENTISTS

Igor V. Polyakov, Mark A. Johnson, University of Alaska, Fairbanks, Alaska

PAPER

Arctic decadal and interdecadal variability, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 27, 4097–4100, 2000.

KEY QUOTE OR SYNOPSIS:

“The rapid reduction of arctic ice thickness in the 1990s may be one manifestation of the intense atmosphere and ice cyclonic circulation regime due to the synchronous actions of the AO [Arctic Oscillation] and LFO [low-frequency oscillation]. Our results suggest that the decadal AO and multi-decadal LFO drive large amplitude natural variability in the Arctic making a detection of possible long-term trends induced by greenhouse gas warming most difficult.”

TOPIC: GREENLAND MELTING

Another topic one which you heard testimony was the rapid melting of Greenland ice sheets and their potential contribution to rapid global sea level rise. However, none of the panelists told you that there has been an overall decline in Greenland temperatures during the past 60s years, and that despite the warming trend in Greenland during the last decade or so, temperatures still have not reached levels as high there as they were during the 1930s and 1940s.

SCIENTISTS

Petr Chylek, Space and Remote Sensing Sciences, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico

Jason E. Box, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico

Glen Lesins, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia

PAPER

Global Warming and the Greenland Ice Sheet, *Climatic Change*, 63, 201–221, 2004.

KEY QUOTE OR SYNOPSIS

"The Greenland surface air temperature trends over the past 50 years do not show persistent warming, in contrast to global average surface air temperatures. The Greenland coastal stations temperature trends over the second half of the past century generally exhibit a cooling tendency with superimposed decadal scale oscillations related to the NAO. At the Greenland ice sheet summit, the temperature record shows a decrease in the summer average temperature at the rate of about 2.2° C/decade, suggesting that the Greenland ice sheet at high elevations does not follow the global warming trend either.

"A significant and rapid temperature increase was observed at all Greenland stations between 1920 and 1930. The average annual temperature rose between 2 and 4 °C in less than ten years. Since the change in anthropogenic production of greenhouses gases at that time was considerably lower than today, this rapid temperature increase suggests a large natural variability of the regional climate.

"High anticorrelations ($r = -0.84$ to -0.93) between the NAO index and the Greenland temperature records suggest a physical link between these processes. The recent negative shift of the NAO correlates with 1990s warming in Greenland. The NAO may play a crucial role in determining local Greenland climate during the 21st century; resulting in a local climate that may defy the global climate change. This possibility should be considered in models of ice sheet melt and future sea level rise. Forecasting changes in the NAO may be a primary factor in predicting the future Greenland ice sheet mass balance."

SCIENTISTS

Edward Hanna, Institute of Marine Studies, University of Plymouth

John Cappelen, Danish Meteorological Institute, Copenhagen, Denmark

PAPER

Recent cooling in coastal southern Greenland and relation with the North Atlantic Oscillation, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 30, doi:10.1029/2002GL015797, 2003.

KEY QUOTE OR SYNOPSIS

"Analysis of new data for eight stations in coastal southern Greenland, 1958–2001, shows a significant cooling (trend-line change -1.29 °C for the 44 years), as do sea-surface temperatures in the adjacent part of the Labrador Sea, in contrast to global warming ($+0.53$ °C over the same period). The land and sea temperature series follow similar patterns and are strongly correlated but with no obvious lead/lag either way. This cooling is significantly inversely correlated with an increased phase of the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) over the past few decades ($r = -0.76$), and will probably have significantly affected the mass balance of the Greenland Ice Sheet."

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ASIAN TSUNAMI

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the world's thoughts and prayers continue

to be focused on the victims of the Asian tsunami. The international community, including governments, private businesses, and ordinary citizens, is providing financial aid and material assistance to affected countries in that region. President Bush and other world leaders deserve praise for quickly providing substantial assistance and resources to disaster response efforts across that region. They have brought hope and relief in the midst of despair.

I want to recognize in particular Japan's substantial pledge to ongoing relief efforts. As chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I intend to continue to work closely with the administration in the days and weeks to come to assess damage and provide targeted relief.

Let me close with an observation on Burma. Predictably, information on the extent of damage in Burma is unknown—this is the way the Burmese junta operates—with the official casualty tally placed by the illegitimate State Peace and Development Council at 59 people. Do international donors, regional governments, or humanitarian NGOs trust this figure? The simple answer, as articulated by Secretary Powell earlier today, is we don't. We don't trust the figure. We don't have any idea how many people either died or are suffering in Burma.

The lack of action or interest in the welfare of the people of Burma, by the military junta, should not be lost on all of the ASEAN members and their dialog partners ahead of the SPDC's chairmanship of that organization in 2006.

I thank everybody on the ground—from personnel at the State Department, USAID, and the Department of Defense to the dedicated staff of humanitarian organizations—for working around the clock with respective governments in those hard-hit countries. Their efforts have not gone unnoticed in the Senate. As we move forward with this relief effort in the near future, our prayers are for those efforts that are being made to ease the incalculable suffering of the people affected by the tsunami.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TRIBUTE TO DAVID ARMAND DEKEYSER

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a great American, Armand DeKeyser, my chief of staff for 8 years, who is going out into the commercial world. This is a big event for me. It is painful, indeed, to lose one with whom I have been so closely associated for so long. I have

known him and worked with him for more than 25 years. We met as we served together for nearly 10 years in the U.S. Army Reserve in Mobile, AL, the 1184th Transportation Terminal Unit. We went to annual training together and became good friends. Armand and his wife Beverly had returned to Mobile after he completed his Active-Duty service with the U.S. Army in Germany. He first, after he returned, worked in the seafood business, Star Fish and Oyster Company, that had been in his family for over 80 years. After another business experience, I hired him as a law enforcement coordinator when I became U.S. attorney for the Southern District of Alabama.

Perhaps his most important contribution there was his leadership for the Weed and Seed Program that revitalized the Martin Luther King neighborhood in Mobile, AL. He helped get the citizens of the community together and drew up a plan for a neighborhood redevelopment program. The city, the county, and the Federal Government all worked together. He did a superb job.

It was a great success. Today that neighborhood is an entirely different community than it was in the early 1990s. I later told him, when they put you in the ground, this is one achievement you know made the world better.

In 1994, I was elected attorney general of Alabama, and the office was in the midst of a funding crisis—and I mean crisis; I do not mean a 1, 2, or 3-percent shortfall. Spending was on track to exceed the funds available to the office by \$5 million, and the budget was a \$10 million budget.

I chose Armand to be our administrative officer, and his performance was superb. Automobiles were sold, all of them—virtually all of them. Offsite offices were closed. Nonmerit system employees were let go. One-third of the office, virtually all nonmerit employees, had to be terminated—one-third of the Office of the Attorney General. The workload had to be completely reorganized as a result, and Armand's work during that time was nothing short of heroic.

Then in 1996, I was elected to the Senate, and I asked him to serve as my chief of staff. What a great decision that was. He and Beverly agreed to come to Washington—after he and I lived together and shared an apartment together here for a while, a three-story walkup—to take on the task of helping this new and inexperienced Senator get started.

He worked harder and longer during his 8 years than any other employee on our staff. He knows people all over our State, and they like and trust him. He managed so ably we were able to return to the U.S. Treasury each year a substantial portion of the funds given to our office by the Senate.

Most of all, he helped me and others on our staff achieve our best. He subordinated himself to serve the office with