



# THE WEEKLY CLOSER

MAJORITY PRESS RELEASES

FACT OF THE DAY

SPEECHES

U.S. SENATE ENVIRONMENT & PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MAJORITY PRESS OFFICE

FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 2006

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 10

## THE WEEK IN REVIEW...

- [Chairman Inhofe's Floor Statement On Democrat Obstructionism And High Energy Prices](#)
- [Inhofe Calls On Democrats To Stop Obstructionist Tactics](#)
- [Opening Statement By Chairman Inhofe Business Meeting](#)
- [Inhofe Applauds President Bush's Plan To Address High Gas Prices](#)

## IN CASE YOU MISSED IT...

- [Law's Implementation Should Be Improved, By Chairman Inhofe Roll Call](#)
- [Climate Of Fear By, Richard Lindzen Wall Street Journal](#)

## DID YOU KNOW?

- [Motorists Hurt By Elimination Of MTBE](#)

## QUOTE OF THE WEEK...

"We were at 100 percent refining capacity even before Katrina. This is a serious problem. In our committee, we marked up a refinery bill, a very sophisticated bill, very moderate. It would allow those cities where they had closed military bases to use those closed military bases along with EDA grants to establish refineries. It is something that would enhance our refinery capacity and give us new refineries, and it was killed right down party lines. Every Democrat voted against it."

"Democrat Obstructionism and High Energy Prices"  
Floor Statement by Senator James Inhofe  
April 27, 2006

## CHAIRMAN INHOFE'S FLOOR STATEMENT ON DEMOCRAT OBSTRUCTIONISM AND HIGH ENERGY PRICES

April 27, 2006

Mr. President, it is my understanding we have 15 minutes equally divided. I ask the Chair, after 6 minutes has elapsed, to advise me.

First, let me say there is nothing new to the problem we have had in this country by not having an energy policy. I can remember when Don Hodel was Secretary of Energy and later Secretary of the Interior. We had a dog-and-pony show where we went around the country during the Reagan administration and tried to talk about how serious this was--the fact that our dependence upon foreign countries, or our ability to fight a war, was not an energy problem; it was a national security problem.

We found the message didn't sell. I was critical of the Reagan administration. Later on, when the first Bush administration came along, I thought, surely, out of the oil patch he would want to have an energy policy, but he didn't either. And during the Clinton administration, he did not. When the second George Bush came into office, the first thing he did was say we are going to have an energy policy. Keep in mind that our dependency at that time, when I was active around the country with Don Hodel, was 36 to 37 percent. Now we are up to twice that. It is much worse now than it was before.

We are in the middle of our second gulf war and people should realize what a threat this is. I chair the Environment and Public Works Committee, which

has most of the jurisdiction over many energy issues, and certainly the air issues. I remember making every effort to get drilling on ANWR. The distinguished President pro tempore has spent his life trying to get production in the northern part of his State. It is something that would resolve the problem.

Yesterday, on this floor, one of the Senators on the Democratic side said it would take 10 years before we would see any of that production. I don't believe that is true. But if it were true, I remind my colleagues that on November 20, 1995, we passed in both Chambers drilling in ANWR, and President Clinton vetoed the bill. We would have it today. We would not be having this problem.

I suggest also that there is one other facet that has not been talked about enough, and that is, we could have all the production, all the exploration in the world, but if we don't have the refining capacity, it doesn't do any good. We were at 100 percent refining capacity even before Katrina. This is a serious problem. In our committee, we marked up a refinery bill, a very sophisticated bill, very moderate. It would allow those cities where they had closed military bases to use those closed military bases along with EDA grants to establish refineries. It is something that would enhance our refining capacity and give us new refineries, and it was killed right down party lines. Every Democrat voted against it.

I will read what one of the papers, the Topeka Capital Journal, said: "Politics played a crucial role in Democrat opposition. If gas prices are high next year"--this is next year now—"the GOP will be blamed. .... even though it is the Democrats who are responsible for it."

So we have those problems that are looming at the same time.

I will say this: Democrats did offer an alternative when they killed the refinery bill. All eight Democrats on the Environment and Public Works Committee, the committee I chair, voted in favor of an alternative that would put the Environmental Protection Agency in charge of siting, constructing, and operating oil facilities. In other words, socializing that particular sector of our economy, which is something they apparently believe Government can operate better than people.

It is not true. When we had the LIHEAP program, I had an amendment that would have improved the permitting process for ethanol plants, as well as oil refineries and coal liquid facilities. Again, killed right down party lines. I guess what I am saying is, we go through this and we see what is happening, and it is always down party lines when we try to enhance our ability to have natural gas. Ask farmers anywhere in America what is causing the cost of fertilizer to go up. It is a shortage of natural gas.

At the same time, we had an opportunity to do something in Massachusetts. Two Congressmen from Massachusetts, Frank and McGovern, put a provision in the Transportation bill that blocks the construction of an already-approved liquefied natural gas facility.

What I am saying is--and I know I am down to 1 minute, Mr. President--it doesn't seem to matter to the Democrats whether we are trying to do something with fossil fuels, trying to do something with oil and gas, trying to do something with clean coal technology, or trying to do something with nuclear energy. It always is killed right down party lines. Now the crisis is here, and we are going to have to face it.  
I yield the floor.

[Return to the top](#) 

## **INHOFE CALLS ON DEMOCRATS TO STOP OBSTRUCTIONIST TACTICS**

Chairman Inhofe commented Wednesday on the 10-8 party-line Committee vote in favor of William Wehrum to head the Environment Protection Agency (EPA) Office of Air and Radiation. The Committee today favorably reported three nominees to the Senate.

“Unfortunately, the Democrats' record proves their willingness to obstruct qualified nominees in order to appease liberal special interest groups,” Inhofe said. “I hope that will not be the case with Bill Wehrum. His qualifications are unchallenged and he has a proven record of accomplishment on clean air.

“The bottom line is that the air is cleaner because of this Administration's policies, and in large part thanks to Bill Wehrum. While at EPA, Mr. Wehrum worked to help craft legislation designed to reduce power plant pollution by 70% - the most dramatic reduction in power plant emissions ever proposed. When the legislation was blocked by Democrats over an unrelated issue, he helped craft a collection of Clean Air rules to accomplish as much of the reductions as allowed under the current Clean Air Act. Together, these rules will dramatically reduce pollution from older, dirtier power plants. One of these rules represents the first time ever that mercury emissions have been regulated. In addition, Mr. Wehrum helped craft the diesel rules now going into effect, which will virtually eliminate sulfur emissions from diesel engines, cutting emissions by 97%. These rules will not only make the black soot coming out of buses and trucks a thing of the past; it will do the same thing for construction and other off-road equipment.

“With the Committee voting in favor of the nominations today, I call on Senate Democrats not to engage in obstructionist tactics and urge the Senate to vote in favor of Mr. Wehrum's nomination.”

The Committee also considered the nominations of Richard Capka to be Administrator at the Federal Highway Administration and James Gulliford to be an Assistant Administrator at the EPA. Both nominations passed by voice vote.

[Return to the top](#) 

## **OPENING STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN INHOFE BUSINESS MEETING**

Wednesday, April 26, 2006

Today we will consider the President's nominees for three vital positions within the Administration, including the head of the Federal Highway Administration and two Assistant Administrator positions at EPA: General Richard Capka, has been nominated to be the Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration. Rick Capka is a very good choice to head the FHWA. He is a career engineer, beginning his career at the Army Corps of Engineers after he graduating from West Point. After 29 years of military service for our country, he retired as a Brigadier General. He then went over to the Massachusetts Toll Authority before being tapped as serve this country again as the Deputy Administrator of FHWA.

Jim Gulliford has been nominated to head the EPA Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances. Since 2001, Mr. Gulliford has been based in Kansas City as EPA's Regional Administrator for Region 7. As Regional Administrator, Mr. Gulliford is the chief for all technical and administrative operations of the EPA in Region 7 - comprising the states of Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas and Missouri. Prior to joining EPA, Mr. Gulliford was the Director for Iowa's Department of Soil Conservation.

And lastly, Bill Wehrum, who has been nominated to head the EPA Office of Air and Radiation. Mr. Wehrum is the current Acting Assistant Administrator to this office. Prior to him assuming the Acting role, he was served in EPA as both Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator and Counsel to the Assistant Administrator in the Office of Air and Radiation. Mr. Wehrum has come under continual attacks from the extremist environmental groups because of his good work at EPA. Now that, in and of itself, is enough for me to support his nomination, but his record also stands up to any non-partisan scrutiny. The bottom line is that the air is cleaner because of this Administration's policies. While at EPA, Mr. Wehrum worked to help craft legislation designed to reduce power plant pollution by 70% - the most dramatic reduction in power plant emissions ever proposed. When the legislation was blocked by Democrats over an unrelated issue, he helped craft a collection of Clean Air rules to accomplish as much of the reductions as allowed under the current Clean Air Act. Together, these rules will dramatically reduce pollution from older, dirtier power plants. One of these rules represents the first time ever that mercury emissions have been regulated. In addition, Mr. Wehrum helped craft the diesel rules now going into effect, which will virtually eliminate sulfur emissions from diesel engines, cutting emissions by 97%. These rules will not only make the black soot coming out of buses and trucks a thing of the past, it will do the same thing for construction and other off-road equipment. The bottom line is that the air is cleaner because of Bill Wehrum.

I urge the Committee to support all three nominees.

Today, we will also be voting on a change of the Committee rules with regard to the naming of public buildings and facilities - Rule 7 D. This proposal is intended as an opportunity to allow a frank, open, and non-partisan discussion of the possibility of allowing the naming of public buildings after judges over age 70 who are still living and are either serving on the bench - in "senior" status - or retired. Needless to say, the adoption of this proposed amendment

to the rule would not mean that every naming proposal would have to be granted. I would certainly consider each naming proposal individually, based on a number of criteria. It doubtless occurs to every member of this Committee the implications of a judge presiding in a courthouse named after him- or herself. I look forward to an honest discussion of this important subject.

[Return to the top ↑](#)

## **INHOFE APPLAUDS PRESIDENT BUSH'S PLAN TO ADDRESS HIGH GAS PRICES**

***“NOW IS THE TIME FOR THE DEMOCRATS TO PUT THEIR SHOWMANSHIP AND OBSTRUCTIONISM ASIDE AND FOR CONGRESS TO FOLLOW THE PRESIDENT'S LEAD”***

Chairman Inhofe on Tuesday applauded President Bush's speech outlining the Administration's efforts to lower high gas prices. The President spoke Tuesday morning to the Renewable Fuels Association in Washington D.C.

“President Bush on Tuesday outlined his plan to address the high cost of gasoline in the near and long term, a far cry from my Democrat colleagues' empty political rhetoric. In particular, I wholeheartedly support the President's plan to lower gas prices by directing EPA to grant fuel waivers, continuing support for offshore drilling, opening up ANWR and calling for an increase in petroleum and bio-refinery capacity.

“I commend the President for his continued commitment to increasing domestic refining capacity. Over the past year, I have introduced the [Gas PRICE Act](#) and [Energy Price Reduction Act](#), legislation designed to increase refining capacity for gasoline and boutique fuels, only to see Senate Democrats block and obstruct reasonable legislation. As the President said today, increased refining capacity can go a long way in addressing the nation's short-, mid-, and long-term fuels challenges. My refining legislation does so by establishing greater regulatory certainty without changing any environmental law, through improving efficiency, and by establishing a future for the use of ultra-clean transportation fuels derived from abundant domestic resources.

“Whereas the President today offered a bold plan of action to bring down gas prices, Congressional Democrats offer only their tired rhetoric and obstruction. Now is the time for the Democrats to put their showmanship and obstructionism aside and for Congress to follow the President's lead.”

[Return to the top ↑](#)

## **IN CASE YOU MISSED IT...**

**Roll Call**

**Law's Implementation Should Be Improved**

**By Senator James Inhofe**

**April 24, 2006**

Enacted in 1973, the Endangered Species Act has not been reauthorized in more than two decades, and an update is long overdue. Today, many claim the act is a success in having kept thousands of animals and plants from extinction. Still others judge the act as an utter failure, citing that only 10 percent of the 1,300 species on the list have ever been recovered. Regardless of how you present the data or what rhetoric you employ, I believe an objective view of the act's implementation leads the reasonable person to conclude that we clearly can do better.

In the past year, I have worked in a bipartisan fashion with Sens. Jim Jeffords (I-Vt.), Lincoln Chafee (R-R.I.) and Hillary Rodham Clinton (D-N.Y.) in an effort to better understand the problems and concerns associated with ESA's current implementation, as well those associated with changing it. Last year, the Environment and Public Works Committee held three hearings and convened numerous stakeholder "scoping-sessions," listening to viewpoints from all facets of the regulated and conservation communities. We also commissioned a nonpartisan, consensus-based study through the Keystone Center of the ESA and in particular its habitat protection mechanism known as "critical habitat." In each instance, the message that the ESA could be improved rang loud and clear.

The disagreements have arisen over exactly how Congress should update the act. Some advocate that throwing more money at the problem will cause the act to function better. Others say we need to scrap the ESA entirely and find another way. Neither of these responses will result in a more efficient program. The Senate has been publicly encouraged to abdicate its responsibility to update the act because they fear the end product that could result from a conference with the House. I refuse to listen to this extreme message and have fought to keep bipartisan negotiations going.

Our approach focuses upon those elements of the current law and its implementation that have contributed the most to species' protection and recovery, while also looking at ways to reduce obstacles and cut down on litigation. For example, there is widespread consensus that we should encourage more private landowners, through incentives, to work in partnership with the government to protect species. After all, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service reports that at least two-thirds of threatened and endangered species reside on private land. There are some programs already in place to do this, but most have proved over time to be far too expensive for small farmers and ranchers. Thus, in updating the act, we must create a menu of incentives so that both large and small landowners have options appropriate to their capabilities and operations.

Over the years, we have also learned that private landowners, on whom these species often rely, might actually know best how to care for them. At a committee hearing last July, a Colorado farmer told us about the mountain plover, a small shorebird found in the western Great Plains proposed for listing under the ESA in 1999. Scientists believed that conversion to

agricultural lands destroyed plover habitat. Weighing the prospect of Draconian land-use restrictions against their fears of allowing federal scientists on their land, the Colorado farmers agreed to a study of the plover in partnership with state and federal agencies. Remarkably, researchers found that agricultural lands actually provided an important nesting habitat for the species rather than destroying the habitat, as the scientist once thought. Furthermore, the study concluded that many of the agricultural practices that would have been restricted under an ESA listing actually were beneficial for the plovers.

Taking the “plover lesson” to heart, the ESA needs to be updated to ensure that the science used by the services is indeed the best. This means that science used to underpin regulatory decisions must be robust, credible, transparent and readily available to all interested parties. It also means that the services need to explain their use of data. We need to be honest about what we don’t know about species. Regulating on mistaken information can have disastrous effects not only for Americans, but also for the very species we aim to protect.

Another critical concern is that private landowners often have little or no say in the ESA process. American farmers are routinely told that they can no longer utilize portions of their land because a certain species has chosen, or even may choose in the future, to call that space home. There is an empty seat at the table, and it often belongs to the private landowner. The act must be modernized so that all governmental decisions are made in an inclusive and transparent manner with full participation of all stakeholders, particularly those most directly affected.

Any update of the act also must focus in the area of “recovery planning.” Current law requires the USFWS and the National Marine Fisheries Service to “develop and implement plans for the conservation and survival” of endangered and threatened species. This includes site-specific management actions, time and cost estimates and recovery criteria. However, a recent Government Accountability Office report found that from a random sample of 107 recovery plans, 73 did not have time estimates for recovery, and 87 did not have cost estimates. Only five plans included the necessary criteria needed to list the species as endangered in the first place. Besides being incomplete, these plans often languish without any substantial changes even if more is known about how the species might be recovered. For example, in Oklahoma the American burying beetle was listed as endangered in 1989. The USFWS established a recovery plan in 1991. There have been no changes to that recovery plan in the past 15 years despite extensive recovery efforts, research and updated monitoring that could certainly improve the original plan. There clearly needs to be a more dynamic recovery planning process that takes into account species change and new scientific data.

Again, the message is simple: We can and should do better. I am committed to trying to find the best way, the right way, to update the Endangered Species Act to better serve the species and the people involved.

Click [here](#) for the full text of the Op/Ed

[Return to the top](#) 

# The Wall Street Journal

## Climate Of Fear

By Richard Lindzen

April 12, 2006

*Mr. Lindzen is Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Atmospheric Science at MIT.*

There have been repeated claims that this past year's hurricane activity was another sign of human-induced climate change. Everything from the heat wave in Paris to heavy snows in Buffalo has been blamed on people burning gasoline to fuel their cars, and coal and natural gas to heat, cool and electrify their homes. Yet how can a barely discernible, one-degree increase in the recorded global mean temperature since the late 19th century possibly gain public acceptance as the source of recent weather catastrophes? And how can it translate into unlikely claims about future catastrophes?

The answer has much to do with misunderstanding the science of climate, plus a willingness to debase climate science into a triangle of alarmism. Ambiguous scientific statements about climate are hyped by those with a vested interest in alarm, thus raising the political stakes for policy makers who provide funds for more science research to feed more alarm to increase the political stakes. After all, who puts money into science -- whether for AIDS, or space, or climate -- where there is nothing really alarming? Indeed, the success of climate alarmism can be counted in the increased federal spending on climate research from a few hundred million dollars pre-1990 to \$1.7 billion today. It can also be seen in heightened spending on solar, wind, hydrogen, ethanol and clean coal technologies, as well as on other energy-investment decisions.

But there is a more sinister side to this feeding frenzy. Scientists who dissent from the alarmism have seen their grant funds disappear, their work derided, and themselves libeled as industry stooges, scientific hacks or worse. Consequently, lies about climate change gain credence even when they fly in the face of the science that supposedly is their basis.

So how is it that we don't have more scientists speaking up about this junk science? It's my belief that many scientists have been cowed not merely by money but by fear...

All of which starkly contrasts to the silence of the scientific community when anti-alarmists were in the crosshairs of then-Sen. Al Gore. In 1992, he ran two congressional hearings during which he tried to bully dissenting scientists, including myself, into changing our views and supporting his climate alarmism. Nor did the scientific community complain when Mr. Gore, as vice president, tried to enlist Ted Koppel in a witch hunt to discredit anti-alarmist scientists -- a request that Mr. Koppel deemed publicly inappropriate. And they were mum when subsequent articles and books by Ross Gelbspan libelously labeled

scientists who differed with Mr. Gore as stooges of the fossil-fuel industry.

Sadly, this is only the tip of a non-melting iceberg. In Europe, Henk Tennekes was dismissed as research director of the Royal Dutch Meteorological Society after questioning the scientific underpinnings of global warming. Aksel Winn-Nielsen, former director of the U.N.'s World Meteorological Organization, was tarred by Bert Bolin, first head of the IPCC, as a tool of the coal industry for questioning climate alarmism. Respected Italian professors Alfonso Sutera and Antonio Speranza disappeared from the debate in 1991, apparently losing climate-research funding for raising questions.

And then there are the peculiar standards in place in scientific journals for articles submitted by those who raise questions about accepted climate wisdom. At *Science* and *Nature*, such papers are commonly refused without review as being without interest. However, even when such papers are published, standards shift. When I, with some colleagues at NASA, attempted to determine how clouds behave under varying temperatures, we discovered what we called an "Iris Effect," wherein upper-level cirrus clouds contracted with increased temperature, providing a very strong negative climate feedback sufficient to greatly reduce the response to increasing CO<sub>2</sub>. Normally, criticism of papers appears in the form of letters to the journal to which the original authors can respond immediately. However, in this case (and others) a flurry of hastily prepared papers appeared, claiming errors in our study, with our responses delayed months and longer. The delay permitted our paper to be commonly referred to as "discredited." Indeed, there is a strange reluctance to actually find out how climate really behaves. In 2003, when the draft of the U.S. National Climate Plan urged a high priority for improving our knowledge of climate sensitivity, the National Research Council instead urged support to look at the *impacts* of the warming -- not whether it would *actually happen*.

Alarm rather than genuine scientific curiosity, it appears, is essential to maintaining funding. And only the most senior scientists today can stand up against this alarmist gale, and defy the iron triangle of climate scientists, advocates and policymakers.

Click [here](#) for the full text of the Op/Ed

[Return to the top ↑](#)

## DID YOU KNOW?

### **MOTORISTS HURT BY ELIMINATION OF MTBE**

#### ***Democrats' Obstruction Felt by Consumers at the Gas Pump***

Last month, the United States Senate Environment and Public Works Committee held [An Oversight Hearing on the Impact of the Elimination of MTBE](#). The hearing focused on concerns raised in a report by the Energy Information Agency titled [Eliminating MTBE in Gasoline in 2006](#) regarding shortages that could occur as refiners switch from MTBE to ethanol. A senior Minority member at the hearing flatly stated, "I do not believe that the elimination of MTBE will have a significant impact on the gasoline market."

**FACT:** As widely reported over the past week, the elimination of MTBE is causing significant disruptions in several cities across the country today. Reuters reports in an article, *Gasoline supply problems hit U.S. East Coast*, that consumers are now facing the consequences of the shift from MTBE to ethanol. The article states:

The Energy Department has reported shortages at terminals near Richmond, Virginia, as well as the Tidewater area near Chesapeake Bay and Virginia Beach which distribute gasoline to service stations.

Some gasoline distribution terminals from Virginia to Massachusetts are seeing shortages as the industry phases out a water-polluting additive, the U.S. Energy Department said on Thursday.

It is critical for the nation to increase its petroleum and bio-refinery capacity. Chairman Inhofe's legislation – the Gas PRICE Act and Energy Price Reduction Act amendment to the LIHEAP bill – would have assisted with the transition away from MTBE. The legislation would have expedited the permitting process for traditional as well as renewable fuel infrastructure so that regions of the country would not have to face the temporary supply shortfalls and corresponding price increases now affecting motorists.

Unfortunately for consumers at the pump today, Senate Democrats succeeded in stalling the Gas PRICE Act in Committee and objected to the LIHEAP amendment. Undoubtedly, next time consumers go to the voting booth they will remember who in the Senate kept them from filling-up today and who continues to obstruct legislation that provides real solutions.

[Return to the top](#) 

---

Matt Dempsey, Press Secretary