

benefits in the future or perhaps how much longer they should be extended. Those are important questions worthy of more debate. But in the meantime, Congress simply must provide some temporary relief for those who are unemployed.

Paying for these benefits would be the best approach. Congress could have taken the harder road to figure out the way to do that before departing for the holiday break and leaving millions of Americans hanging, but it did not. So let's pass this short-term extension and focus on a more fiscally responsible solution for the longer term.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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

The Senator from Oklahoma.

GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I think we are going to have a lot of discussions on the floor concerning a number of things that happened in the last couple of weeks, not the least of which is what is going on in Antarctica right now, and the fact that some people had to be lifted out of there.

It is kind of interesting, and I don't want anyone to misunderstand me and think that I am reviving a lot of the previous interest concerning the issue of global warming for any reason other than the fact that right now, after it has been determined, without any doubt, that the House and Senate would never pass anything like cap and trade, the President is attempting to do through regulation what he could not do through legislation. What I am concerned about is the expense, and in a minute I will talk about the cost of these issues.

We have a real serious problem in this country. People are concerned about the spending and about what is happening with our military. They are concerned about a lot of issues, but the cost of the overregulation that has taken place in our society is overlooked quite often.

If you ask anyone associated with the farm bureau or anyone in the agricultural community what their major problem is, they will tell you it is the overregulation by the Environmental Protection Agency that is really making it difficult for them to survive. It is the same thing with manufacturers, producers, and others. When we look at the crown jewel of all regulations, it is cap and trade. Cap and trade would constitute the largest tax increase in the history of this country.

I think it is kind of interesting that what is happening right now up in the Antarctic is something that has been happening for quite a long period of time. While there has been a concerted

effort of people who believe that global warming is taking place and that we are all going to die, and all of that, at the same time the evidence out there is almost laughable.

In January of 2004, when Al Gore held a global warming rally in New York City, I remember that it was one of the coldest days in New York City in its history. In March of 2007, a Capitol Hill media briefing on the Senate climate bill was canceled due to a snowstorm. In April of 2007, global warming rallies were greeted by unseasonable snow, and as a result several of them were canceled. In October of 2007, Gore's global warming speech at Harvard University coincided with temperatures that nearly broke a 125-year temperature record. In October of 2007, the British House of Commons held a marathon debate on global warming during London's first October snowfall since 1932.

In December 2008, Al Gore spoke to an audience in Milan, Italy—by the way, I attended that meeting—about global warming, and outside it was snowing, which is a rare event for that area. Snow and freezing rain also struck Rome, Naples, Palermo, and Sicily.

A lot of people are not aware that among those who were responsible for the whole global warming movement was the United Nations. It was an effort—I will not go into it now unless it becomes appropriate and I have more time to talk about it. But the United Nations has one big party every year—usually in December—and it is what we call the global warming party. It is where all the countries come to attend, and they have all-you-can-eat and all-you-can-drink. It is the biggest party of the year.

I can remember going to one of these annual parties when there was someone from Benin, which is a Sub-Saharan African country. I went up to this person and said: You can't tell me you believe all this stuff. The whole idea was to have the 192 countries that go to this party every year believe global warming is taking place, and we are all going to have to stop doing things to try to preclude it from happening, and that would destroy our economies. His response was: Oh, no, but this is the biggest party of the year.

That took place, as I said, in Milan, Italy in 2008. I always remember that one because they had my picture on telephone poles saying "Wanted." I saved several of those and brought them back to the United States so I could distribute it to the people who were enjoying it quite a bit. Anyway, the meeting in Milan was about global warming. Yet there were records set on snowfall and freezing rain.

In March of 2009, NANCY PELOSI—at that time she was the Speaker of the House—had a big global warming rally that was supposed to be the largest one that had ever taken place in this country, and it was snowed out.

In February of 2010, the Senate EPW, Environment and Public Works Com-

mittee—at that time I was the ranking member of the Environment and Public Works Committee—had a hearing entitled "The Global Warming Impacts, Including Public Health, in the United States," and it was canceled due to a major snowstorm. This goes on and on.

One thing that is not on the list, which should be on this list, is what happened in Copenhagen in 2009, and that was the annual party of the United Nations. I remember it so well because people were trying to go over there and say that the United States of America was going to pass cap and trade, and that we would encourage all of them to do it. I am going from memory now, but I am quite sure that Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, NANCY PELOSI, Barack Obama, and John Kerry were all there. At that time, John Kerry was a Member of the Senate. All of them assured these people—these 191 countries—that we were going to pass cap and trade.

I went all the way over and all the way back to spend 3 hours on the ground—and I have to say it was probably the most enjoyable 3 hours I ever spent—to tell them that under no circumstance was the United States going to pass the largest tax increase in history based on trying to stop something they were calling at that time—global warming. The 191 countries which attended that meeting had one thing in common, and that was that they all hated me.

Nonetheless, I was telling them the truth, and they tried to pass it again and again. There probably aren't 35 votes in the Senate right now that would vote for a cap-and-trade bill which would constitute the largest tax increase in the history of this country.

All of that had taken place over a long period of time, and now we are up to 2013 and 2014. In November, President Obama issued an executive order on climate change stating "excessively high temperatures" are "already" harming natural resources, economies, and public health nationwide.

I guess if you say something long enough, sooner or later people are going to believe it because they assume if the President says it, it must be true.

On January 6, AccuWeather issued a warning that a "blast of arctic air will deliver some of the coldest weather in 20 years" to the midsection of the United States.

Meteorologist Ryan Maue of Florida said about the historic cold outbreak: "If you're under 40 [years old], you've not seen this stuff before."

The National Weather Service reported that the temperature at Chicago's O'Hare International Airport hit 16 degrees below zero on January 6, breaking the negative 14-degree record in 1884. This makes Chicago colder than the South Pole where it was 11 degrees below zero. The average temperature in the United States on January 6 was 12.8 degrees.

I say all of this because this is kind of a predicate to what is happening

now. On November 27, the research expedition to gauge the effect of climate change on Antarctica began. This was in the news today.

On December 24, the day before Christmas, a Russian ship carrying climate scientists, journalists, tourists, and crew members for the expedition became trapped in deep ice up to 10-feet thick. An Australian icebreaker was sent to rescue the ship, but on December 30 efforts were suspended due to bad weather.

On January 2, a Chinese icebreaker—and here come the Chinese now—called the *Xue Long*, sent a helicopter that airlifted 52 passengers from the Russian ship to safety to the Australian icebreaker. The Chinese vessel is now also stuck in ice along with the Russian vessel. There are 22 Russian crew members who are still on board the Russian ship, and an unreported number of crew members remain on the Chinese ship.

On January 5, the U.S. Coast Guard was called to assist the ships which were stuck in the Antarctic.

That is what is happening today. Let's go back and relive a little bit of history when I was under a lot of criticism because I was opposed to assertions by Al Gore which the New York Times said might arguably be the first environmental billionaire.

In December 2008, Gore said, "The entire North Polarized cap will disappear in five years." It is 5 years later, and it hasn't disappeared yet. In fact, we have been reading about it.

On December 13, the BBC reported that the Arctic ice cap coverage is "close to 50% more than in the corresponding period of 2012," which means it has increased by 50 percent over this period of time. That means it is increasing by 50 percent over this period of time. This is the same icecap Al Gore said was going to disappear 5 years ago.

President Obama, in May of this last year: "The climate is warming faster than anybody anticipated five or 10 years ago."

To contrast with *The Economist*, they said: "Over the past 15 years, air temperatures on the Earth's surface have been flat. . . ."

Gina McCarthy, recently sworn in as the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, said: "Extreme weather events are proof enough for me to show why action is necessary."

We are talking about action on CO₂.

According to preliminary reports, 2013 turned out to be one of the least extreme weather years on record, which is right after she made that statement. But the one I enjoyed so much was—I have a lot of respect for Gina's predecessor, Lisa Jackson. Lisa Jackson came in as Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and I remember her very well because I asked her the question—keep in mind she was appointed by President Obama. Her job is to make people think global

warming is taking place and all of these extreme things are going to happen. I asked her the question: In the event that we did the action—at that time, there were two or three cap-and-trade bills offered in the House and in the Senate. So I said: Let's assume one of these bills passes. Would this reduce CO₂ worldwide? Her reaction was: No, because this is just in the United States. This is not where the problem is.

So by their own admission, even if we were to sustain the economic disaster we would have to have in the event we passed one of these bills, it would not impact or reduce the levels of CO₂.

The other recent study—15 year pause—from *Nature* magazine, said:

For this period, [1998–2012], the observed trend of [temperatures] is . . . not significantly different from zero [and] suggests a temporary 'hiatus' in global warming.

This is a publication that was kind of leading the charge at one time.

So we see these things that are happening and we see that even though, time and time again, just the reverse is true, that we are going through this thing—I always have to go from memory when I go back. I remember the earlier years of this, some 12 years ago when they were looking at the Kyoto treaty. We remember the Kyoto treaty, I say to the Presiding Officer, which was an agreement we would sign on to—an international treaty, the Kyoto treaty—and we would agree to reduce all the CO₂ in this country and all of that. Of course, that didn't happen, but the cost was discussed at that time. I remember back when Republicans were in the majority, I chaired the committee called the Environment and Public Works Committee, and some 12 years ago, about the time of Kyoto, I believed it was true—everybody said global warming was coming and we were all going to die. So I assumed it was true until I started exploring a little bit and hearing quietly from some of the scientists who said: Look. The whole thing is rigged and the science is not the same as the United Nations would have us believe. So one by one they started coming forth. I stood at this podium for about a 3-year period and started naming all of the scientists who said the U.N. scientists, the IPCC, were not being honest and that they had their own agenda they were trying to support. At that time, a group of several universities—MIT was one of them, the Wharton School—a lot of their scientists said what the cost would be if we were to pass global warming legislation that had been proposed. It would be between \$300 billion and \$400 billion a year.

Now, \$300 billion to \$400 billion a year, yes, that would constitute the largest tax increase. I took this to my State of Oklahoma. I did my calculation as I always do. I get the number of people who file Federal tax returns and have them pay taxes and it would be about \$3,000 a year per family. Yet, by their own admission, as Lisa Jackson

said, it would not reduce overall temperatures, even if one believes that is a problem, which I don't.

Anyway, the cost—Charles River came along with a very similar cost—\$350 billion a year. So with all of those costs, we wanted to look at it and see if, in fact, the science was there, and we determined it was not.

If we look at the regulations at the EPA right now—the National Association of Manufacturers has a cumulative impact study, not including ozone or the greenhouse gases, of \$630 billion annually and some 9 million jobs lost. As per the regulations for ozone, 77 counties would be out of attainment in my State of Oklahoma and 7 million jobs lost. That is all of our counties. That means we would have job losses in all of those. Utility MACT, that cost is \$100 billion, and that has already been implemented. That affected all the coal States in a major way. The Boiler MACT cost would be \$63 billion. I mentioned the BLM. The hydraulic fracking regulations would cost about \$100,000 per well. That is an increase everyone else would have to pay in terms of producing right now. Greenhouse gas costs would be between \$300 billion and \$400 billion, as I mentioned before.

If we just take these regulations—the list is a lot longer than that, but this is a huge issue. This is the major problem we are having with the economy right now. Nobody seems to understand it. No one seems to care. I think that a time to bring this up as an issue is right now because of what is happening, what has been publicized recently, so it is our intention to continue to do that.

This has been a relentless 4½-, 5-year war the President has on fossil fuels. It is not just coal, but it is coal, oil, gas, and other fossil fuels. The sad part of this is we could be completely independent from all other countries—certainly from the Middle East—from any other country in terms of supplying our own energy in this country. All we would have to do is do the same thing—allow drilling exploration on Federal public lands as we are doing throughout the country. Right now, we have had a 40-percent surge, increase, in exploration and in production in this country, and at the same time we have had a 40-percent increase overall. That is on State land and on private land. We have had a reduction on Federal land. So we have an exclusion to the problem there, and I think one of the things we can do to help people understand is to let them know that what they have been listening to—what the EPA has been telling our people, what our kids are learning in school on global warming—people are now realizing this is something that is not factual.

We are so inundated right now with problems. We have problems in Afghanistan. We have problems with our foreign policy in the Middle East. We are all concerned about the problems around the world. The area people

aren't talking about is the cost of over-regulation in America that is doing probably as much damage as all the rest of the problems are doing at this time.

So I only wish to submit for the RECORD that some things are happening today that I think the American people need to look at. I think those statements made, which I will come to the floor and talk about later on, from 10 years ago are now becoming a reality.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

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

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, there is no doubt our employment situation in America is not good. Unemployment remains consistently high long after the administration has told us the recession is over. The growth that has been projected year after year has not been at the level the experts had projected. CBO has missed the growth levels. The Federal Reserve has missed the growth levels. We have come in below that consistently. Growth is not where we need it to be; there is no doubt about it. So we have a serious unemployment situation.

Perhaps the most grim concept we need to be well aware of is that workforce participation; that is, the percentage of Americans in the working age group who are actually working is lower today than at any time since the 1970s. That is a stunning statistic. Not since women entered the workforce in large numbers have we seen such low workforce participation numbers.

I believe, first and foremost, that an unemployment extension bill is treating the symptoms of the problem. It is an aspirin for a fever, but the fever has been raging for weeks now. Something is causing it, and we need to deal with the cause of it rather than continuing to treat the symptoms. I think that is so important for us to remember.

Also, this Nation is struggling economically for a number of reasons.

One of them clearly is the size of our debt. Our debt is so large—\$17-plus trillion—now that it is causing uncertainty in the economic markets. We have to get our spending under control. We have to do that. Every time we have a desire to do something good, we cannot continue to borrow the money to pay for it.

The unemployment bill that is before us today makes no attempt whatsoever to find spending reductions in other

areas of this monstrosity of a government but borrows every penny of it. They say it is \$6 billion. Well, it is \$6 billion for 90 days—3 months. It is \$26 billion over the full year. That is a huge sum of money.

We just had a big dispute over cutting retirement pay that our military people have earned, and it was a dispute over \$4 billion. That was over 10 years—\$4 billion over 10 years. This is \$6 billion over 3 months. So this is a lot of money, and effort should have been made to try to find offsetting reductions in wasteful spending that occur throughout here before we go again to treat a symptom of a disease.

But the tragedy is—the tragedy is—that the policies of this administration are driving this poor growth record. It just is. First and foremost, the proposals have been to tax, tax, tax—tax more. Taxing the private sector will not create growth, no matter whom you tax. It will not be a growth-producing idea to tax the economy. Experts tell us that. The Congressional Budget Office tells us that.

So this is what we have been seeing every year. The budget that passed out of this Senate, the budget that was proposed by the President of the United States—the budget that passed the Senate with I think virtually every single Democratic Senator voting for it and all Republicans opposing it would have increased taxes \$1 trillion and increased spending \$1 trillion. The taxes were not used to reduce our deficit, as the balanced approach seems to suggest. “We have a balanced approach to reduce our deficits. We are going to tax some and cut spending some.” Oh, no, they did not cut spending at all. Their 10-year budget plan called for raising taxes \$1 trillion and raising spending \$1 trillion. Tax and spend—that is what it was. It was on the floor of the Senate. There is no dispute about that. No one argues about it. But we have agreed to a certain level of spending here to try to bring our economy under control—the Budget Control Act—and we have acknowledged on both sides of the aisle, as have independent experts, that we need to reduce spending and we need to contain the growth of spending and we need to reduce the deficits that are adding to the weakness of our economy and the uncertainty in our economy and creating risks in our economy.

So this bill borrows every penny of it—just a total violation of promised fiscal responsibility. It just is. I wish it were not so. I wish we could just do this and it would not cost anything. But it will cost, and it will hamper growth in our country.

There are other problems. We need more American energy. Energy produced in America creates jobs in America. It creates wealth in America. It keeps us from exporting large amounts—billions and billions of dollars—to Venezuela and the Middle East and other places around the globe. We could be producing that energy here,

creating jobs here, keeping that wealth at home, strengthening our economy, and creating growth. That is what we should be doing.

The administration has blocked American energy. They have dragged their feet in every shape, form, and fashion, whether it is moratoriums in the gulf or blocking in Alaska, blocking the pipeline for our neighbors in Canada, or blocking production on public lands. This is not the way to create an economy.

We need a tax system that is not always going up but is more growth-oriented, simpler, more focused on creating growth. We need to eliminate every unnecessary regulation that burdens the American competitive marketplace and makes us less competitive globally instead of adding to them, and we have never seen anything like the plethora of new regulations being issued day after day, week after week, month after month, many of them challengeable constitutionally as being beyond the power of bureaucrats to issue because Congress did not pass the law to justify it. It is driving up the cost of energy, and it is driving up the cost of production in widgets in America, making us less able to compete with foreign competitors.

We need to stand up for American workers and American manufacturing on the world stage. It is time to tell our trading partners: We are willing to trade with you, big boy, but you have to play by the rules. This idea that you can violate the rules and we are still going to treat you as a great trading partner has to be over. We need to stand up for the American worker on the world stage. It has to be done.

Finally, at a time of high unemployment, should we not ask ourselves why the President of the United States and virtually every Democrat and a number of Republicans voted to double the number of workers who were coming to America under this comprehensive immigration bill? We admit a million a year legally. We believe in immigration, we support immigration, but at some point you are bringing in workers to take jobs from unemployed Americans. So now we are here trying to extend unemployment benefits to help unemployed Americans. Is there no common sense in this body? How can this possibly be? But that is the deal.

I know Senator REID and Senator LEAHY were on the floor earlier today, and they said we have to pass this comprehensive immigration bill. It would not end the illegality. It would reduce it only by about 40 percent, according to the Congressional Budget Office, but it would double the number of guest workers coming in. Guest workers, by definition, are people coming to take jobs.

Why are wages down? One reason is—Professor Borjas at Harvard, who has studied this extensively; the Federal Reserve in Atlanta, which has examined this extensively; the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, which has examined it—what do they find? They find