

a healthy life. We don't have to let greedy health insurance executives drag down our future, but that is what they are doing and have done.

I, once again, urge Republicans to work with us in good faith to fix our broken system. The President has reached out: Come on down. Tell us what plans you have. I encourage those Republicans to listen to the American people, two-thirds of whom said last week they want Congress to finish the job we started with health care reform. I encourage every Senator to condemn this insurance company's greed. If they are not willing to do so, perhaps they would be willing to call the Californians who can no longer afford coverage and explain why corporate profits are more important than their health.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wish to make a unanimous consent request: that on the Democratic side, the sequence be Senator KAUFMAN of Delaware, Senator HARKIN from Iowa, and then that I be third in line; and then if there are any Republicans who come to the floor seeking recognition, that they be taken in sequence so that there will be a Democrat speaker followed by a Republican speaker.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if I might ask my friend from Illinois that the order be changed a little to allow Senator KAUFMAN to go first, and then the Senator from Illinois go second, and then I will be glad to go third, if this would be OK with the Senator.

Mr. DURBIN. Sure.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

CHIEFS OF STAFF

Mr. KAUFMAN. Mr. President, I am going to speak today once more on my weekly tribute to great Federal employees. Before I begin, I wish to say that I was quite moved by the Republican leader's speech today about Kyle

Simmons. I don't know Kyle Simmons, but I must say that over the 19 years I was a chief of staff and for over a year that I have been a Senator, I recognize Kyle Simmons and so many good chiefs of staff I have known over the years.

The way the Republican leader described Kyle Simmons just brought back so many memories of great people in the Senate, but especially chiefs of staff who do everything in the office from opening the door in the morning to closing it at night, to worrying about everything from the interns to the CEOs of corporations in their home States, and labor leaders.

So I wish to add my voice to say I am so proud of folks who have worked in the Senate and especially, because of personal experience, those who have been chiefs of staff. I cannot speak of a better letter than the one that was written from Kyle Simmons to Billy Piper to explain what it is to be a great Senate staffer and a great chief of staff.

IN PRAISE OF TERRENCE LUTES

Mr. KAUFMAN. Now I wish to speak about another great Federal employee.

Across the country, Americans are receiving their W-2 forms and taking stock of their finances in advance of April's tax filing deadline. For families, the ritual of filing income taxes repeats itself each year, and, admittedly, it isn't very much fun.

Taxes have been an emotional and thorny subject in American history ever since colonial patriots rallied around the cry of "No Taxation Without Representation." Indeed, though federal tax rates for personal income are low compared to most other developed countries, complaining about paying taxes remains one of our national pastimes.

This is understandable. It is linked to the strong national attitude in our country that taxpayers' money should never go to waste. When Americans grumble about taxes, I believe it is not because they oppose them in general; rather, it is because they want to make sure that their money is spent wisely, fairly, and without unnecessary waste.

One of the chief complaints about taxes in years past was that filing was a time-consuming and confusing process. Many can remember those days sitting in front of a pile of forms and receipts, punching away at a calculator, pencil in hand, and a 1040-form covered in eraser marks.

Thankfully, because of this week's honoree, most Americans—more than 95 million filers—avoided this headache last year by filing their taxes electronically.

Terrence Lutes was awarded the 2005 Service to America Medal for Citizen Services for leading the development of the Internal Revenue Service's e-File program.

Terry, who spent nearly 30 years working at the IRS, served as associate chief information officer for IT Services before retiring five years ago.

E-File not only makes it easy for taxpayers to file online and receive a refund in as little as ten days; it also cuts processing costs by 90 percent compared to paper filing. This benefits the taxpayers two-fold. They save time and energy individually and reduce the amount of their own money spent collecting their taxes.

Terry, who holds degrees from Eastern Kentucky University and the University of Colorado, first became involved with electronic filing in 1996. As the head of the IRS's Electronic Tax Administration, he became the government's evangelist for online tax filing. E-File had been available for years, but it was costly for the IRS to operate and difficult for taxpayers to navigate.

While redesigning the e-File system, Terry and his team focused on creating innovative public-private partnerships to reduce—and eventually eliminate—the direct cost to the taxpayer of filing online. He oversaw a workforce of over 6,500 employees, and carefully managed a budget of \$1.5 billion. Terry cultivated relationships with software companies and tax-preparation businesses, and the results paid off.

In 2005, when Terry retired after a long and distinguished career in public service, more than half of all tax returns were filed online for the first time. Today, this number continues to rise. For most Americans, what used to be a stressful experience is now fast, simple, and less expensive.

Thanks to Terry, the way Americans pay their taxes is forever changed.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., one of the great Supreme Court justices of the early twentieth century, once said that "taxes are the price we pay for a civilized society." I am glad to know that great Federal employees such as Terrence Lutes at the IRS continue to work hard every day ensuring that our tax collection system is as efficient and responsive as possible.

When I go online to file my own tax return this year, I will be thinking of these outstanding public servants at the IRS and all who work in the Federal government.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. KAUFMAN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. KAUFMAN, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. LIEBERMAN pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 415 are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

(The remarks of Mr. KAUFMAN pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 417 are located in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first, let me identify and agree with the remarks of both the Senators concerning Iran and consider myself as part of that program.

I believe it is already the order, but in the event it is not, I ask unanimous

consent that I be recognized for up to 25 minutes as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, today I want to highlight several recent media reports uncovering very serious errors and possible fraud by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

First of all, let me define what we are talking about here, because it has been around for a long time but a lot of people have forgotten. Way back in 1988, the United Nations formed the IPCC—the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. The whole idea was to try to determine whether manmade gases—anthropogenic gases, CO₂, and methane—caused global warming, and if in fact global warming is taking place.

It is hard on a day such as today, and the last few days, to be talking about global warming. I often say: Where is it when you need it? But nonetheless, you need to know three things about the IPCC: No. 1, the Obama administration calls it the gold standard of climate change science; No. 2, some say its reports on climate change represent the so-called consensus of scientific opinion about global warming; and No. 3, the IPCC and Al Gore were awarded the Nobel prize in 2007 for “their efforts to build up and disseminate greater knowledge about manmade climate change.”

Put simply, what this means is that in elite circles the IPCC is a big deal. So when ABC News, The Economist, Time magazine, and the Times of London, among many others, report that the IPCC’s research contains embarrassing flaws and that the IPCC chairman and scientists knew of the flaws but published them anyway—well, you have the makings of a major scientific scandal.

In fact, when Climategate first came out and it was discovered that they had been cooking the science at the IPCC, the UK Telegraph said: This is very likely the greatest scientific scandal of our generation.

So where to begin? Well, how about with the IPCC’s claim that the Himalayan glaciers would melt by 2035. It is not true. That is right; it is simply false. Yet it was put into the IPCC’s fourth assessment report. These assessment reports come out every year, and that is what the media normally get. They are not scientific reports, they are assessments that are made for policymakers. Here is what we know:

According to the Sunday Times, the claim about the Himalayas was based on—keep in mind we are talking about their statement that by 2035 the glaciers would melt—that claim was based on a 1999 story in a news magazine which in turn was based on a short

telephone interview with someone named Syed Hasnain, who is a very little-known Indian scientist.

Next, in 2005, the activist group World Wildlife Fund cited the story in one of its climate change reports. Yet despite the fact that the World Wildlife Fund report was not scientifically peer reviewed, it was still referenced by the IPCC. It was still in their report.

Third, according to the Times:

The Himalayan glaciers are so thick and at such high altitude that most glaciologists believe it would take several hundred years to melt at the present rate. Some are actually growing and many show little sign of change.

Lastly, when finally published, the Sunday Times wrote:

The IPCC report did give its source as the World Wildlife Fund study but went further, suggesting the likelihood of the glaciers melting was “very high.”

The IPCC, by the way, defines this as having a probability of greater than 90 percent.

So there you have that. But there is more. According to the Times:

The chairman [Rajendra Pachauri] of the leading climate change watchdog was informed that claims about melting Himalayan glaciers were false before the Copenhagen summit.

We all remember that Copenhagen summit in the middle of December. I was there for 2 hours; many were there for 2 weeks. Now to continue to quote from the Times article:

... [he] was told that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change assessment that the glaciers would disappear by 2035 was wrong, but he waited 2 months to correct it. He failed to act despite learning that the claim had been refuted by several leading glaciologists.

So why was the Himalayan error included? We now know from the very IPCC scientist who edited the report’s section on Asia that it was done for political purposes. It was inserted to induce China, India, and other countries—this was at Copenhagen—to take action on global warming. According to the UK’s Sunday Mail, Murari Lal, the scientist in charge of the IPCC’s chapter on Asia, said this:

We thought that if we can highlight it, it will impact policymakers and politicians and encourage them to take some concrete action.

In other words, that is the motive she did it for. In other words, the Sunday Mail wrote that Lal “admitted the glacier alarmism was indeed purely to put political pressure on world leaders.”

This is what we have suspected and has been documented in the recent Climategate scandal. But there is still more. The glaciologist, Dr. Hasnain, who originally made the alarmist 2035 claim, works for Dr. Pachauri at his think tank in India. According to ABC News:

The glaciologist now works at the Energy and Resources Institute in New Delhi, whose director is none other than Rajendra Pachauri. Could this explain why Pachauri suppressed the error in the Himalayan passage of the IPCC report for so long?

Specifically, after the meeting in Copenhagen. So what has the IPCC done to correct this fiasco? I went into the IPCC report to see if a correction had been made. Well, the 2035 claim is still there. It is still there now. It has been denied, but it is still there. There is a note attached that says the following:

It has, however, recently come to our attention that a paragraph in the 938-page Working Group II contribution to the underlying assessment refers to poorly substantiated estimates of rate of recession and date for the disappearance of Himalayan glaciers. In drafting the paragraph in question, the clear and well-established standards of evidence, required by the IPCC procedures, were not applied properly.

I had to read this twice to understand what it said. The IPCC says the glacier alarmism came about because of poorly substantiated estimates. Well, that is one way of putting it. To me, from what we know now, the leadership of the IPCC lied about the Himalayas. They knew it was false, but for political purposes they kept it in.

I could go on and on, but let me cite a few more examples. The UK Telegraph recently uncovered more problems. This is the entity that said that is probably the greatest scientific scandal of our generation. The IPCC’s report from 2007 found observed reductions in mountain ice in the Andes, Alps, and Africa—all caused, of course, by global warming. In an article entitled “UN Climate Change Panel Based Claims On Student Dissertation and Magazine Article,” the Telegraph reported the following:

One of the sources quoted was a feature article published in a popular magazine for climbers which was based on anecdotal evidence from mountaineers about the changes they were witnessing on the mountainsides around them. The other was a dissertation written by a geography student, studying for the equivalent of a master’s degree at the University of Berne in Switzerland that quoted interviews with mountain guides in the Alps.

So that is the source they had. The article further reveals:

The IPCC report made use of 16 nonpeer reviewed WWF reports. One claim, which stated that coral reefs near mangrove forests contained up to 25 times more fish numbers than those without mangroves nearby, quoted a feature article on the WWF website. In fact, the data contained within the WWF article originated from a paper published in 2004 in the respected Journal Nature. In another example a WWF paper on forest fires was used to illustrate the impact of reduced rainfall in the Amazon rainforest, but the data was from another Nature paper published in 1999.

On top of this, we find that the IPCC was exaggerating claims about the Amazon. The report said that 40 percent of the Amazon rain forest was endangered by global warming. But again, as we have seen, this was taken from a study by the WWF—the World Wildlife Federation—and one that had nothing to do with global warming. Even worse, it was written by a green activist.

That is the statement they made—40 percent of the Amazon rain forest was