

and we have more doctors right now in the Senate. This is the time to make these changes and really accomplish things. But that is not why I am here.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND PARIS AGREEMENT

Mr. President, I noticed in the news this morning one more of these incidents happened where they had groups of people going to either the Antarctic or the Arctic to try to reaffirm their positions that somehow the world is coming to an end because of global warming and global warming is because of manmade gases, which, of course, we know is not the case. The interesting thing about yesterday was that a group of some scientists, some individuals, and some environmental extremist activists was going to the Arctic to show that things were melting, and they got stuck in the ice. This is the fourth time this has happened in the last 4 years because they didn't anticipate the fact that we have actually some areas where it is increasing.

I thought, well, it is time to make one last compliment to the President when he had the courage to pull out of the Paris climate agreement.

A lot of people don't know what these climate agreements are. This was the 21st year we had a climate agreement. It was all started by the United Nations some 21 years ago. The idea was to go to exotic places around the world and invite all 192 countries to come in to convince them that they need to reduce their own greenhouse gases, their CO₂ emissions.

Toward the end of the Obama administration, after eight such meetings they decided this wasn't going to work. They finally decided they would go ahead and try to make one look like an agreement, and, hence, there was the Paris Agreement—not a treaty but an agreement, not anything that would come through ratification, obviously.

I have been over there for some of these meetings. What is interesting about this is that most of the 192 countries involved in these meetings think that if the President says something, it is going to happen. They forget about the fact that we have another branch of government called Congress, and we have to ratify some of these decisions.

So I do want to make a couple of comments about what the President has accomplished by getting out of this agreement.

First, since there is a deliberate effort to make people who are reluctant to believe one narrow view, in terms that the world is coming to an end is a reality, they try to make it change into the argument that as to climate change, anyone who is against the idea that we are having these problems out there is opposed to the idea of climate change.

Look, we have said so many times on the floor that the climate has always changed. All the evidence—historic evidence, scriptural evidence, archeological evidence—shows very clearly that climate is always changing. The arrogance is that somehow climate

change can be managed by man. Did man ever cause the ice age or any of the other extreme weather patterns the Earth has seen just over the last few thousand years? The answer is no.

But earlier this year, a climate change study was released which found that little agreement is found with climate modeling simulations and consistently overstate recent summer warming and underestimate preindustrial temperature changes. That was the study. It is no surprise they found forecasts to be inaccurate. According to the environmental extremists, every summer is going to be the hottest. I have yet to see a summer that wasn't going to be the hottest. Every year they say that is going to take place.

In one of the charts from the study I have here, all you have to do is go back and look historically at what has happened in this country. We go through warming periods. We go through ice ages. I will tell you what is interesting about this chart. The largest increase we had in global warming happened right after World War II, in 1945. That was the year we had the largest number of CO₂ emissions that took place. Historically, no one disagrees. That precipitated not a warming period but a 20-year cooling period. So we have been going through this for a very long period of time now.

Essentially, the findings of the study show that the climate patterns we see now are not significant in the grand scheme of things, as we can see by this chart. People like to vilify those of us who talk about this subject and openly question the inaccurate statements and so-called findings of fearmongering scientists who tell everyone the world is ending because of manmade gases. They think that just because many of us recognize that science is not settled and we question exactly how much man affects climate change, corruption must be involved, and so forth.

But we look at the real science. I have not yet met him personally, but I know about a guy named Dr. Richard Lindzen. Dr. Richard Lindzen is an MIT professor. He arguably could be considered the most knowledgeable person in this field. He made this statement: Regulating CO₂ is a bureaucrats dream. If you regulate CO, you regulate life. So that is what is behind this, and we have watched this play out now for about 20 years. To question the idea that man is single-handedly responsible for the changes in climate and doomsday is near due to the fact that we burn fossil fuels is entirely inappropriate and, frankly, unnecessary.

I remember very well a climate fanatic named Michael Mann. I mentioned that Paris was the 21st meeting the United Nations has had. In 2009, that meeting was held in Copenhagen. At that time, I chaired the Environment and Public Works Committee. The first year of the Obama administration, I remember getting ready to go to Copenhagen to explain to people

they had been lied to. At that time, Obama was going over, Hillary Clinton was going over, John Kerry was going over, and all the rest, saying we in the United States were going to pass cap and trade. I wanted to make sure they knew we were not going to be passing cap and trade.

I was getting ready to go over. Lisa Jackson was the first Obama designee to be the Director of the EPA. I looked at her, and I said: I have a feeling that as soon as I leave town, you are going to have an endangerment finding so you can start regulating this stuff. She kind of smiled. I said: When that happens, it has to be based on science. So tell me, what science will you base this on? She said: Well, it is going to be based on the IPCC.

IPCC stands for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. That is the United Nations.

As luck would have it, right after that, a matter of days after that statement was made by her, we had climategate. Do you remember climategate? Not many people remember it because the media didn't play it up here like they did in Europe and around the world. Climategate was where they caught two scientists—one was Michael Mann and one was Phil Jones—who had rigged—there was evidence of this through communications that were disclosed—they were actually rigging the science. They didn't pay much attention to it here in the United States, but I remember at the time that Christopher Booker of the UK Telegraph—that is one of the biggest communication operations in the UK—they called this the worst scientific scandal of our generation. That is climategate. That is cooking the books on science to make people believe things that weren't true.

Clive Cook of the Financial Times said:

The close-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 is the science on which they have relied for a long period of time. In fact, to give you an example of the hockey stick—that was what Michael Mann came up with in trying to show, instead of what we are showing on this chart here, that somehow this all happened in a recent period of time. It is another research exploration that was wrong.

I started off talking about what happened on the climate change research exploration that just took place in the last few days. Many of these were postponed in the Arctic because of the unusual amount of ice that has taken place. Before a research team could embark on their exploration to study climate change—keep in mind, this group went there to try to show what things are happening, that ice is melting all over the world. Their ship, the Canadian research icebreaker Amundsen, had to be borrowed by the Canadian Coast Guard for search and rescue

efforts to help fishing boats and supply ships that were trapped in the unexpected, large amount of ice.

This is at least the fourth time this has happened in recent years to research ships around the world. There was a situation a few years ago where a Russian ship carrying climate scientists and journalists and activists and tourists and an entire crew became trapped in ice that was at least 10 feet thick. An Australian icebreaker arrived 6 days later to rescue them, but it was unable to do so because of the ice. A few days after that, a Chinese icebreaker sent out a helicopter that was able to airlift 52 of the passengers from the Russian ship to safety on the Australian icebreaker. Unfortunately, during the rescue effort, the Chinese icebreaker became trapped as well.

I tell you these stories because all of these expeditions that were going to the various ports were doing so to try to prove that ice was not accumulating, and they got stuck in the ice.

Most of the predictions that have been published over the last few decades have been widely inaccurate, but most have been accepted by the environmental groups and some of the extremists because they are maintaining their war on fossil fuels, although Trump has ended that.

I have to say that one of the reasons I go back to my State of Oklahoma every weekend is to talk to real people. They will ask a question. I remember that during the Obama administration, he had a war on fossil fuels—fossil fuels are coal, oil, and gas—but he also didn't like nuclear. You don't get these questions asked in Washington. They asked me: Inhofe, explain this to me. We have a President who is trying to do away with fossil fuels—coal, oil, and gas—and nuclear, and we are currently dependent upon coal, oil, gas, and nuclear for 89 percent of the power it takes to run this machine called America. What is going to happen if we are not able to do it?

Of course, as I said, you don't hear those questions around Washington.

Anyway, by fearmongering techniques, environmental extremists and the Al Gore fan club can easily convince a large number of people that regulatory burdens like the EPA's Clean Power Plan, the Quad OA, the venting and flaring rules, and the waters of the United States rule are a good thing and that we can save the Earth without any consideration of the effect these rules have on energy.

By the way, for any conservatives who are out there, I would like to remind them that even though it didn't get much play in the media, this President in the first 100 days in office has been able to do away with some 47 of the regulations. The two ways of doing away with a regulation—one is through Executive order, and the other is the CRA, the Congressional Review Act. In fact, I was proud that the first signing ceremony our new President had was signing a bill that I had passed. It is

one that has really made an effort to try to save enough of the oil and gas industry to run this machine, as I mentioned, called America.

Now we are actively working to face the problems inherited from the previous administration. For the past 8 years under the Obama administration, the American economy suffered under the effects of his climate agenda. That era is over. President Trump has delivered on his campaign promises since he was sworn in. The strongest signal of this was President Trump's decision to pull out of the Paris climate accord.

It was just a few weeks ago that I was on the Senate floor urging President Trump to pull out of this Paris Agreement. That same day, 21 of my Senate colleagues and I sent a letter to the White House with that same request. Our message resonated with the President, and it was clear that our voices were heard because it was exactly 1 week later that the President announced to the world he was getting out of a bad deal.

Let me mention one thing about this Paris Agreement. The Paris Agreement supposedly is something that 192 countries—each said what it was going to do to reduce greenhouse gases, their CO₂ emissions. For example, the agreement President Obama said at that time—he said: We commit that we will reduce our CO₂ emissions by between 26 and 28 percent by 2026.

The interesting thing about that is that it can't be done. In fact, immediately after he made that statement, we had a televised public hearing of the EPA to ask them how in the world we could reduce by some 27 percent greenhouse gases in the United States of America. They said it is impossible and we couldn't do it. So what the President was doing then was telling people that we in the United States were able to do something—we were going to do something that was very meaningful by our reduction, even though he knew at the time it could not be done.

Then we have the other countries—China, for example. China is the second largest emitter of CO₂. Currently, as we speak right now, they are cranking out one coal-fired powerplant every 10 days. What did they agree to in this Paris accord? They said: Well, we will continue to increase our output in China. We will continue to have a new powerplant every 10 days or so until 2025. At that time, we will consider reducing it.

Then along comes India, the third largest emitter of CO₂. India said: Yes, as long as we get \$2.5 trillion, we are willing to do it. Well, where would that \$2.5 trillion come from? The good old United States. The big green fund.

That is how ridiculous that whole thing was. It was the right decision for him to make this a reality.

Many believe that if we lose our ability to negotiate with other nations—this is the only legitimate complaint I have gotten that I really heard during the time. They said: Well, if we don't

have a place at the table, then we are not going to be able to be in on any future discussions.

That was wrong, and those who are using that argument were wrong because the agreement that gave us a seat at the table has already been ratified by the United States, meaning the Senate gave its advice and consent. It is known as the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. This was in the 1992 treaty that supports all of the big parties that are held every December. We are still at that table. That decision was made a long period of time ago. We will be at any future activities that take place.

I will wrap up by saying that this was the right thing to do. Stop and think about it. The previous speaker on the floor, the junior Senator from Georgia, was talking about the dilemma we have in this country, the spending dilemma, and how we are going to have to do something about it. We are going to eventually have to get to some of the entitlements, the big spending items.

If we had stayed with the program that the President had outlined and had committed to the other 192 countries, that would have constituted arguably the largest single tax increase in the history of America, and there would have been nothing that would have been accomplished by it.

My final thought. I would like to thank President Trump for pulling out of the Paris Agreement. It is the right decision, and it will without question help the United States in the long run.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to address the Senate as in morning business.

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

COUNTERING IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES BILL

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I joined our colleagues today at lunch, and one of the conversations I had with one of my Democratic colleagues was how surprising, perhaps, but certainly how pleasing it was that today the Senate, in a bipartisan fashion, addressed some contentious issues related to sanctions in regard to Iran; issues related to sanctions in regard to Russia. Both of those issues, because of the political climate and because of past history, could be fraught with great opportunity for partisanship to be exhibited in full force. The conversation I had with my colleague was how surprising and, more importantly, how pleasing it was that didn't happen.