

years about the legislation proposed ever since the Kyoto treaty on legislative cap and trade. Every time there is an analysis made—whether by MIT, or by the Wharton School, Charles Rivers, or any of the rest of them—the range of the cost of cap and trade legislatively is always between \$300 billion and \$400 billion a year. We found out that if you do it by regulation, it is going to be far more than that. These are Democrats who are on record as saying that. Lisa Jackson, for whom I have a great deal of respect, is the Obama-appointed Director of the Environmental Protection Agency. Every time I ask her a question, she gives me an honest answer. She said:

I have said over and over, as has the President, that we do understand that there are costs to the economy of addressing global warming emissions, and that the best way to address them is through a gradual move to a market-based program like cap and trade.

Yes, they would cost a lot of money. Nobody refutes the \$300 billion to \$400 billion figure.

JOHN KERRY said this:

If Congress does not pass legislation dealing with climate change, the administration will use the Environmental Protection Agency to impose new regulations.

These regulations would be more expensive. I think the EPA admitted that if they were able to accomplish this through regulations, they would need to hire an additional 230,000 employees and spend an additional \$21 billion to implement its greenhouse gas regime.

All of this economic pain is for no gain. As EPA Administrator Jackson also admitted before the EPA committee, these regulations will have no effect on the climate. I want to mention that. That is significant. A lot of people disagree with me in terms of the impact of CO₂ emissions and all of that.

Let me say this. Two things having to do with that issue are very important. One is that if we were to pass legislation or do something through regulation that would be aimed at reducing greenhouse gases, would this have an effect on the reduction of emissions worldwide? I asked that question to Lisa Jackson, and her answer was “no.” Obviously, the problem is not here in the United States, it is in China, India, and other places.

In looking at it that way, I have to also mention that we all know what happened with climategate. We all know, when we went in and started an endangerment finding, it was based on the science that came from the IPCC, which has now been totally discredited. When I have more time, I will go into the details as to how that was discredited. For example, this was such a great scandal, the Daily Telegraph said:

This scandal could well be the greatest in modern science.

So that is what was happening. They were cooking the science at the United Nations and the IPCC. Now we are at the point where we asked for an inspector general opinion as to whether the EPA had followed the proper guidelines

in trying to regulate greenhouse gases, and, in fact, they did not follow the right guidelines.

So I would only say that the inspector general's investigation uncovered that the EPA failed to engage in the required record-keeping process leading up to the endangerment finding decision, and it also did not follow its own peer review procedures to ensure that the science behind the decision was sound science. EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson readily admitted the science that was used was flawed, the science used by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

So I would say this: We are concerned about what is going to happen now. We are concerned about the overregulations. We are concerned about the process that has been used and how regulations are used to support an agenda the President has.

I will mention one last thing, and that is a regulation I didn't mention before. Of the five most expensive regulations, this isn't one of them, but it could end up costing the most. We know for a fact that the United States of America—we have a report now that shows that with all the findings and with all the good things that are happening in the shale throughout the United States and elsewhere in the Northern Hemisphere, we could be totally free from dependency on any other country if we would just get politicians out of the way and develop our own resources.

We have enough natural gas to meet America's demand for 90 years and enough oil for 50 years, but in order to do this, they have to use a process called hydraulic fracturing. Ironically, that was started in my State of Oklahoma in 1949 and has been used ever since that time, and there has never been a confirmed case of groundwater contamination. Nonetheless, right now we see that they are going through this process of saying: We are going to take over the regulation of hydraulic fracturing from the States and place it with the Federal Government. I have to be suspicious that there is motive behind that, and that motive is to restrict the use of hydraulic fracturing.

We could open the east coast, the west coast, the gulf coast, the northern slope, and everything else, but if we can't use that process, we will not be able to achieve energy independence, which we can do. We don't have to use anything new that is out there other than oil, gas, and coal. With what is happening right now with hydrogen, we have an opportunity to become self-sufficient.

With that, I will yield the floor so my good friend can make his comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO THE 389TH EXPEDITIONARY FIGHTER SQUADRON

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, I rise today to recognize the valor and ac-

complishments of the 389th Expeditionary Fighter Squadron. The 389th—better known as the T-Bolts—is part of the 366th Fighter Wing based at Mountain Home Air Force Base in Idaho. At Mountain Home, the squadron is composed of 80 airmen from across the United States, including aviators and essential ground personnel. While deployed, the squadron grew to over 400, including maintainers, intelligence personnel, and support staff from the 366th.

In May 2011, the T-Bolts deployed to Bagram airbase in Afghanistan, with 18 F-15E Strike Eagles to support Operation Enduring Freedom. In the process, they demonstrated resolve and what can be accomplished through fierce loyalty to each other and to our country. The T-Bolts prosecuted 3,100 combat missions and dropped 800 tons of ordnance. They supported 3,700 ground missions by American and allied forces and responded to 820 “troops in contact” emergency combat support calls. In addition, they worked directly with special operations forces to destroy 170 enemy weapons caches and capture 620 detainees, including 90 high-value individuals.

The diligence of the maintainers and ground personnel ensured that the 389th met 100 percent of their taskings without missing a single sortie. And the pilots and weapons system officers broke the F-15E deployment record, flying more than 14,000 hours in just over 6 months.

Through their excellence and determination, the 389th kept relentless pressure on the al-Qaida network, killing key members of their senior leadership. Additionally, they directly supported numerous large-scale coalition ground operations with kinetic and non-kinetic effects as they provided lethal close air support across Afghanistan.

The men and women of the 389th made a real and substantial contribution to the safety of America, the success of the global war on terror, and the destruction of al-Qaida and those who would do us harm. By successfully taking the fight to the enemy, the T-Bolts helped write the history of the early 21st century through their tenacity and courage.

No one summed it up better or more eloquently than the commander of the 366th Fighter Wing, COL Ron Buckley, who said of his airmen:

I am incredibly proud of the professionalism and dedication our gunfighters displayed while flawlessly executing their mission to deliver precise combat air power for joint operations on the ground. From aircrews to maintainers to support, the T-Bolts carried on the incredible legacy of the gunfighters and answered our Nation's call.

I also want to take this important opportunity to honor America's unsung heroes by recognizing and commending the families and loved ones of those who serve in the 389th. We are also

proud of their service, their commitment, and the immense sacrifices they made and continue to make on behalf of our country.

The T-Bolts served honorably in defense of a grateful nation, and I am pleased today to recognize the heroic members of the 389th for their valorous service while deployed in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

I am reminded of the core values of the Air Force: integrity first, service before self, and excellence in all you do. There is no better example than the airmen of the 389th Expeditionary Fighter Squadron. With consummate bravery and boldness, the T-Bolts honor every American through a spirit of dedication and a sense of duty to defend a cause larger than one's self. For their efforts, we and future generations are forever indebted and eternally grateful.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EPA REGULATIONS

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I apologize to the Chair. I had a misunderstanding as to where we were, and I only wanted to try to get the point across, which I think I failed to do, regarding the cost of these regulations.

I think I used as an example the five—I mentioned, actually, six when you consider hydraulic fracturing also as one of the regulations. By far, the one that is the most expensive is the regulation that would be for the greenhouse gases. I think we have pretty much established the cost to do a cap-and-trade bill and the range being from \$300 billion to \$400 billion. The quotes I used, which I won't repeat now, were from Administrator Jackson and Senator KERRY and others stating that doing it through regulation would be far more expensive. So I think we need to be looking at it in terms of about \$400 billion a year. This would be a tax on the American people. This would be the cost to our GDP.

I remember back in 1993 when we had the Clinton-Gore tax increase. It was the largest one in four decades at that time. It was an increase in the death tax, an increase in marginal rates, an increase in capital gains—an increase in almost all taxes—and it was a \$30 billion tax increase. What we are talking about here is a tax increase that is 10 times that great—10 times. We are using the figure now of \$400 billion because we know that through regulation, it will cost more.

Again, I go back and repeat the quote we had from Administrator Jackson of the EPA, who said in response to my

question, live in our committee, if we were to pass legislation—at that time, I think it was the Waxman-Markey bill, although it doesn't really matter because cap and trade is cap and trade—would that reduce overall emissions, and she said no because it would only apply to the United States.

I would carry it one step further. If we were to pass or do anything through regulation here, all it will do is cause our manufacturing base to go out and find the energy necessary to operate. And where do they go? They go to places such as China, India, and Mexico—places that have almost no emission standards. So if there is a pollution problem, it becomes much greater, not less, in terms of overall emissions.

Another situation I often talk about is the time before I left to go to the Copenhagen United Nations event, where they were going to try to convince the rest of the world that we were going to pass legislation that would be cap and trade and impose this tax on the American people.

In a committee hearing, I said to Administrator Jackson: I have a feeling that as soon as I leave town, you are going to have an endangerment finding.

Sure enough, that is what happened. I said: When you have an endangerment finding, it has to be based on science. So what science would you be using?

She said: By and large, it would be the science developed by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

Ironically, right after that, climategate came up and really destroyed the legitimacy of the IPCC.

I have read some of the quotes that were given by different people when they talked about climategate. One of them is a British writer George Monbiot, who is known for his environmental and political activism, and he is on the other side of this. He writes a weekly column for the Guardian. He said:

Pretending that this isn't a real crisis isn't going to make it go away.

Here, he is referring to climategate and the fact that they were cooking the science.

Nor is an attempt to justify the emails with technicalities.

Again talking about the participants in IPCC.

We'll be able to get past this only by grasping reality, apologizing where appropriate and demonstrating that it cannot happen again.

I also mentioned the Daily Telegraph in the UK. Quoting from it:

This scandal could well be the greatest in modern science.

Then the Atlantic Magazine, which generally is editorializing the other side of this issue, said:

The closed-mindedness of these supposed men of science, their willingness to go to any lengths to defend a preconceived message, is surprising even to me. The stink of intellectual corruption is overpowering.

That was the loss of credibility of the whole idea of the science that was put together by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change at the United Nations. But to make it even worse, we requested that the inspector general do a study and report back as to the science and how the science was developed by the IPCC and whether it followed the guidelines that were necessary. They came back just 1 week ago with a report that says the EPA has failed to follow the responsible guidelines. In fact, even before the scope of the study was finalized today, the EPA was already collecting data samples at the undisclosed fracking sites, so they are going in now to using the same type of flawed science and going after other parts of their agenda. In this case, it would be hydraulic fracturing, which I mentioned just a few minutes ago, is an attempt to stop our ability to develop our own resources.

In the course of this overregulation, I think we have to keep in mind and to keep talking about these six greatest and most costly regulatory problems that we have out there and how much it is going to cost the American people. Again, the one that is the most serious right now is trying to regulate and do a cap-and-trade through the regulations as opposed to doing it through legislation.

We are going to keep talking about that. It is not going to go away. People think time will make people forget. But we don't forget something of that magnitude.

I did a calculation in my State of Oklahoma; as I always do, I get the number of families who file a tax return each year. When something comes along that will cost something, I do the calculation and I do the math and then I go back to the American people and say: Get ready. This is what it is going to cost.

If we were to have passed any of the bills that were like the Kyoto Protocol, and the last one being the Waxman-Markey bill, the cost would have been at least \$300 billion. If we take that annual cost, that would cost my tax-paying families in Oklahoma in excess of \$3,000 a family, and they get nothing for it.

We can do an awful lot of talking about the deficits and the spending of this administration. Let's don't overlook perhaps the most expensive thing to the American people; that is, the overregulation that makes us non-competitive with the rest of the world.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

PUBLIC DEFENDER JOHN J. HARDIMAN

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise to pay tribute to John Hardiman, public defender for the State of Rhode Island, who passed away several days ago.

John was, frankly, the finest public servant I have ever seen in my entire