



THE WEEKLY CLOSER

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

FRIDAY, MAY 26, 2006

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 13

THE WEEK IN REVIEW...

- [Opening Statement: Climate Roundtable Exploring Greenhouse Gas Technologies](#)
- [EPW Committee Passes Wastewater Security Legislation](#)
- [Senator Clinton's Rhetoric Doesn't Match Her Record](#)
- [Opening Statement: Business Meeting](#)
- [Written Statement by Chairman Inhofe: Eco-Terrorism](#)

IN CASE YOU MISSED IT...

- ["Scientific Consensus On Global Warming A Manufactured Hoax" \(Senator Inhofe, The Examiner, Washington DC\)](#)

EPW RESOURCES

- [Majority Press Releases](#)
- [Speeches](#)
- [Fact of the Day Archive](#)
- [Weekly Closer Archive](#)

QUOTE OF THE WEEK...

"This manufactured scientific consensus, propped up by a multimillion-dollar campaign of disinformation that preys upon your fear, is the primary reason why I have long believed that claims of a consensus that man is causing global warming is the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the American people."

"Scientific Consensus On Global Warming A Manufactured Hoax"
Senator James M. Inhofe
Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works
The Examiner, Washington DC
May 26, 2006

IN THE NEWS...

OPENING STATEMENT: CLIMATE ROUNDTABLE EXPLORING GREENHOUSE GAS TECHNOLOGIES

Thursday, May 25, 2006

I'd like to welcome everyone to today's Senate Environment and Public Works Committee roundtable on the interrelationship between greenhouse gas emissions and technology. As you all know, I do not believe that man is responsible for the modest warming over the last few decades, and I have said that attempts to ration energy in our country based on the supposed threat of global warming constitutes the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the American people. If you watched the FOX News special last Sunday, you know I have not changed my mind.

Clearly, some of my colleagues in the minority disagree. But today's roundtable moves beyond this basic disagreement of the science and of whether greenhouse gases should be regulated. It is my view that while greenhouse gas emissions continue to decline in relation to the economy, cost-effective technologies do not exist to that will reduce greenhouse gases in a growing economy.

Here in the U.S., there has been an enormous education campaign to encourage companies to help their bottom lines by becoming more energy efficiency and reducing unnecessarily wasted energy. And abroad, developing countries can benefit from our experience that reducing energy waste can help the bottom line – for instance, many older coal plants in China emit

- [Schedule](#)
- [Past Hearings](#)
- [Multimedia](#)

significantly more air pollution as well as carbon dioxide emissions for every megawatt of power generated simply because they are so inefficient. Improving efficiency not only means the plants get more energy for every ton of coal burned, it means fewer emissions of harmful pollutants such as NOx and SO₂, for every megawatt generated.

Cost-effectively reducing the amount of greenhouse gases in the United States, however, cannot be achieved either through efficiencies or by technologies near deployment. That undertaking would require new technologies to come onto the market that are currently only in the conceptual phase at best.

What is unique about today's discussion on Capitol Hill is that – instead of focusing on individual points of view as to what policy Congress should or should not adopt, or whether it should adopt any new policy at all – the focus of the discussion is on the underlying factors that are at the root of these policy discussions, but which rarely receive the attention they deserve in a politically charged environment.

As the Committee with jurisdiction over air pollution as well as the issue of climate change, it is important that the Environment and Public Works Committee obtains a better understanding of the technologies that drive emission reductions. Too often claims about the costs and availability of technologies are thrown around during debates on legislative proposals. It is my hope that today we can shed some light on some of the claims.

Our format today is a closed door roundtable discussion, with other interested parties observing. We have held similar roundtable discussions in the past on such topics as nanotechnology, Hurricane Katrina, and multi-emissions. The information we receive today will help frame the debate over technologies in the future. I do want to make it clear that while I do not anticipate climate legislation passing the Senate, I do believe the debate will continue. When I became Chairman of this Committee I stated my three goals; sound science, cost/benefit analysis, and improving the bureaucracy. I believe we need the best available information in order to inform the debate. I want to thank everyone for attending and for your open dialogue on this issue.

[Return to the top](#) 

SENATOR CLINTON'S RHETORIC DOESN'T MATCH HER RECORD

Chairman Inhofe responded to Senator Clinton's energy proposal outlined in a speech given Tuesday morning at the National Press Club.

“Senator Clinton's rhetoric doesn't match her Senate record. Just a few months ago, Senator Clinton voted against my Gas PRICE Act, legislation supported by a wide range of groups including the Renewable Fuels Association and the National Mining Association, which would significantly increase domestic bio-refining capacity. Instead, Senator Clinton supported the Democrat alternative, which would essentially socialize refining capacity by placing the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in charge of designing, constructing

and operating refineries. Clearly this is not a solution. Thankfully, the Democrat alternative was defeated down a straight party-line vote in committee last year.

“Today in Washington DC, Senator Clinton called for policies that will increase the demand for natural gas, yet at the same time, she and her Democrat colleagues continue to block construction of LNG terminals in the Northeast. Senator Clinton should be ashamed of this gross hypocrisy and failure to propose workable solutions that will actually bring down high energy prices, not raise them.

“Neither Senator Clinton’s proposal today nor the Senate Democrat Leadership’s energy proposal last week will do anything except gain a few headlines in a few newspapers. If Democrats are truly serious about bringing down energy prices, they will end their obstruction in the Senate and work with Republicans to pass meaningful energy legislation.”

[Return to the top](#) 

EPW COMMITTEE PASSES WASTEWATER SECURITY LEGISLATION

Chairman of the Environment & Public Works Committee, commented on the EPW Committee’s 10-8 partisan vote to pass wastewater security legislation.

“For the second time in three years, the EPW Committee passed important legislation that will bolster our security at wastewater treatment plants all across the country,” Senator Inhofe said. “My bill seeks to work with local governments and wastewater treatment plants to provide needed support and additional tools to help ensure these facilities are secure from a potential terrorist attack and able to respond to, and recover quickly from, natural disasters.

“An amendment offered by Committee Democrats today, defeated along party-lines, presumed that those in Washington, DC know more about wastewater security than local officials. I firmly believe, however, that wastewater treatment plants need our assistance, not burdensome unfunded mandates from the Federal Government. The Democrat amendment would also eliminate the use of chlorine and require plants to spend thousands, even millions, of dollars to switch to a federally mandated alternative. Additionally, during these times of aging systems and growing federal regulations, cost is an important consideration. Chlorine is by far the most effective, least expensive, disinfectant available.

“As a former Mayor, I understand the tremendous problems these unfunded mandates would cause for local governments. A March 2006 Government Accountability Office report found that a majority of the largest wastewater facilities had switched from chlorine to other technologies after a careful review of their facility, including the effectiveness and cost of alternatives. They did so without a federal mandate. Rather than assume our local officials do not care about their constituents or their own families, my bill seeks to

work with them to address their security needs.

“Senate Democrats now have a choice: they can continue to obstruct national security legislation that will provide necessary support to our nation’s wastewater security plants, or they can join their colleagues in the House who unanimously supported similar legislation in the 107th Congress and overwhelmingly supported it again in the 108th by a 413 to 2 vote. For the sake of our national security, I urge them to end their obstruction and support my wastewater security legislation.”

[Return to the top](#) 

OPENING STATEMENT: BUSINESS MEETING

May 23, 2006

Today we have a very full agenda, but one that I believe we can get through quickly. We have a number of bills, resolutions and nominations to vote on. The Committee will consider the following bills:

- S. 2735 - reauthorizing the national dam safety program
- S. 2832 - amendments to the Appalachian Regional Development Act
- S. 2430 - the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act
- S. 1509 - the Captive Primate Safety Act
- S. 2041 - the Ed Fountain Park Expansion Act
- S. 2197 - to redesignate the Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge in Virginia as the “Elizabeth Hartwell Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge”
- S. Res. 301 - Commemorating Audubon Society’s 100th Anniversary
- S. 2781 - the Wastewater Treatment Works Security Act
- S. 2650 - to designate the Carroll A. Campbell Jr. Federal Courthouse
- S. 801 - to designate the John Milton Simpson United States Courthouse
- S. 2912 - the Great Lakes Coordination and Oversight Act; and
- S. 2023 - amendments to the Oil Pollution Act of 1990.

The Committee will also consider a GSA resolution for its 2007 Capital Investment and Leasing Program as well as four Army Corps Study Resolutions: the Cedar River, Time Check Area, Cedar Rapids, Iowa; the Pawcatuck River, Little Narragansett Bay, and Watch Hill Cove, Rhode Island and Connecticut; -Kansas River Basin, Kansas, Colorado and Nebraska; and - Port of San Francisco

We will also be voting to report out the four pending nominations that include Molly O’Neill to be an EPA Assistant Administrator and three nominees to be members of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission - they are: Dr. Dale Klein, Dr. Gregory Jaczko and Dr. Pete Lyons. The nominees have completed all required paperwork and have appeared before the Committee. Each nominee has also responded adequately to the questions required by the Committee.

The vast majority of the items on this agenda are without controversy or objection and I don’t believe we will need more than two roll call votes, so we

should be able to dispense of this morning's business in short order.

[Return to the top](#) 

WRITTEN STATEMENT: ECO-TERRORISM

Chairman Inhofe Written Statement on Eco-Terrorism
Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security
Committee of the Judiciary
U.S. House of Representatives

May 23, 2006

Today this Subcommittee will take up the issue of Eco-terrorism and what the Congress can do to address this dangerous movement in the United States. Eco-terrorism is not unlike any other form of terrorism, in which people with an agenda -- in this case, in the name of the environment or animals -- use force and violence to influence individuals, companies, and governments to adopt a particular policy. Animal rights extremists in particular use tactics such as bombings, arson, sabotage, stalking, and harassment, to frighten individuals and, in turn, the companies they work for into abandoning the use of animals for research. If this is not bad enough, the terror tactics are not limited to the companies that use animals for research but extend also to companies that do business with companies that use animals for research. This radical system of activism is called "tertiary targeting" and has unfortunately proven to be highly effective. Employees with nothing to do with research on animals, but work for a company that provides insurance or courier services or banking services to companies that conduct research on animals have been viciously targeted. In some cases, these employees have been watched in their homes and followed for weeks on end with their every move documented by the animal rights extremists and posted on their website. Information such as where their children go to school, what sports their children play and where, and the exact routes they drive to and from work are examples of the personal information that these activists post on their website with a call for their membership to "teach them a lesson."

Supplementing the intimidation and harassment tactics, groups like the Animal Liberation Front, the Earth Liberation Front ("ELF"), and Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty ("SHAC") have also been responsible for bombings in California and arsons across the country with over 1,200 acts of violence and \$200 million in damages. As Chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, I have held two hearings on Eco-terrorism and have received testimony from multiple victims, as well as the FBI, ATF, and DOJ, all of whom impressed upon the need for legislation to stop the horrible infringement of the rights of citizens who are just trying to make a lawful living. I even heard testimony from the animal rights groups. During my questioning of Dr. Jerry Vlasak, the spokesman for ALF, he actually defended a statement he made when he was speaking to an animal rights convention -- that the assassination of research scientists would be a good tactic to scare scientists away from conducting research on animals. Dr. Vlasak also believes that a mouse is "the moral equivalent to a child."

Belief systems like this -- that value a child equal to a mouse -- lead these extremists to relentlessly assault those they believe are mistreating animals. This includes scientists looking for cures to cancer, Alzheimer's disease, and hundreds of other conditions that take our loved ones from us. This is why I wrote and introduced Senate Bill S.1926, the Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act. This bill, which Congressman Petri introduced in the House -- H.R. 4239 -- will help protect those working to develop science by providing the necessary tools to federal law enforcement so that they may adequately investigate, apprehend, and prosecute these offenders. I urge this Committee to support this legislation and I thank Chairman Coble for your leadership on this issue in the House.

[Return to the top](#) 

IN CASE YOU MISSED IT...

The Examiner, Washington DC

SCIENTIFIC CONSENSUS ON GLOBAL WARMING A MANUFACTURED HOAX

By Chairman Inhofe

May 26, 2006

WASHINGTON - A new multimillion-dollar coordinated campaign by global warming alarmists is under way to scare the American public into believing that global warming is the greatest threat facing humanity.

Along with the premier of his Hollywood movie this week, Al Gore announced the creation of a new group dedicated to spending millions of dollars to push global-warming alarmism.

This explains the recent media frenzy over global warming featuring cover stories like the one in Time magazine, news specials on TBS and HBO, an Ad Council campaign, and of course, Al Gore's very own Hollywood movie.

Not to be outdone, former President Clinton made headlines last weekend declaring that global warming is a more serious threat than terrorism.

Global-warming alarmists are turning to their political and Hollywood connections to raise millions of dollars to intensify the rhetoric in order to convince the American people the science is settled regarding man-made global warming.

One major problem — scientists themselves do not believe that a scientific consensus exists.

Just last month, 60 scientists sent a letter to the Prime Minister of Canada

calling on the Canadian government to re-open the debate over Kyoto. The letter states:

“ ‘Climate change is real’ is a meaningless phrase used repeatedly by activists to convince the public that a climate catastrophe is looming and humanity is the cause. Neither of these fears is justified. Global climate changes occur all the time due to natural causes and the human impact still remains impossible to distinguish from this natural ‘noise.’ ”

The most flagrant distortion of science by global-warming alarmists is their claims that the recent hurricane devastation in the Gulf Coast region is linked to global warming.

Leading experts such as Dr. Christopher Landsea (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration), Dr. William Gray (Colorado State University) and Dr. Robert Sheets, (Director of the National Hurricane Center from 1987 to 1995), are part of the vast majority of scientists who reject claims that man was responsible for these violent storms.

This, however, didn't stop Robert Kennedy Jr. just days after Hurricane Katrina devastated New Orleans from declaring that the hurricane was due to global warming. It's precisely what promoters of Gore's film lead you to believe in order to push their agenda.

This manufactured scientific consensus, propped up by a multimillion-dollar campaign of disinformation that preys upon your fear, is the primary reason why I have long believed that claims of a consensus that man is causing global warming is the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the American people.

International Momentum Shifting Away From Cap-And-Trade Approach

It is little wonder that alarmists have intensified their rhetoric about the impending doom of the planet. Longtime supporters of cap-and-trade programs are slowly coming to grips with the realization that these programs are unworkable and unsustainable.

Last summer, Prime Minister Tony Blair made a stunning statement that initially went unreported by the press. Blair, as the London Telegraph reported, made a “U-turn” on Kyoto. The Telegraph reports, “Mr. Blair, who has been seen up to now as a strong supporter of the Kyoto Treaty, effectively tore the document up and admitted that rows over its implementation will ‘never be resolved.’ Regarding future Kyoto-like plans Blair stated, “To be honest, I don't think people are going, at least in the short term, to start negotiating another major treaty like Kyoto.” Prime Minister Blair's “U-turn” comes as Europe struggles to meet the limits imposed by Kyoto.

Legislative proposals to cap emissions continue to lose support here in the United States as well. Last summer, the United States Senate rejected cap-and-trade legislation by soundly defeating the McCain-Lieberman bill 38-60, losing by five votes more than the previous time it was voted on.

The momentum shift away from a cap-and-trade program is not surprising.

Cap-and-trade proposals are all cost and no reduction.

Wharton Econometrics Forecasting Associates estimates that Kyoto would cost an American family of four \$2,700 annually, yet only reduce temperature by .06C.

The rejected McCain-Lieberman proposal would have cost American households an additional \$810 a year and more than 1 million jobs would have been lost. Electricity prices would have increased 20 percent. The difference in temperature? 0.029 Celsius.

An Inconvenient Truth

The state of science continues to evolve on every frontier. So ask yourself: Is it really possible that the most complex scientific question ever to face mankind is settled?

So next time someone trying to sell you a “global-warming solution” tells you the science is settled, tell them you won’t fall for that hoax.

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

[Return to the top](#) 

Matthew Dempsey, Press Secretary
