

Table of Contents

U.S. Senate Date: Wednesday, April 13, 2016

Committee on Environment
and Public Works Washington, D.C.

STATEMENT OF:	PAGE:
THE HONORABLE JAMES M. INHOFE, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA	3
THE HONORABLE BARBARA BOXER, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	7
REV. DR. J. HERBERT NELSON II, DIRECTOR, PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH U.S.A. OFFICE OF PUBLIC WITNESS	12
MICHAEL BREEN, PRESIDENT, TRUMAN NATIONAL SECURITY PROJECT	17
FATHER ROBERT A. SIRICO, PRESIDENT, ACTON INSTITUTE	23
MAJOR GENERAL (RET.) ROBERT SCALES, SENIOR MILITARY ANALYST	28
ALEX EPSTEIN, PRESIDENT, CENTER FOR INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS	33

HEARING ON EXAMINING THE ROLE OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES ON
ACCESS TO ENERGY AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Wednesday, April 13, 2016

United States Senate

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:34 a.m. in room 406, Dirksen Senate Office Building, the Honorable James Inhofe [chairman of the committee] presiding.

Present: Senators Inhofe, Boxer, Barrasso, Capito, Crapo, Fischer, Rounds, Sullivan, Whitehouse, Gillibrand, Booker and Markey.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JAMES M. INHOFE, A UNITED STATES
SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Senator Inhofe. Our hearing will come to order.

Today we have a very distinguished panel. They are all five distinguished, but the two on the right I just don't know as well as I know the other three.

Senator Boxer. Yes, because they are our witnesses.

Senator Inhofe. I know it. I know that, Barbara. And we are very happy that they are here.

First of all, the three that I have known before for a long period of time, Father Sirico and General Scales, General Scales, the reason for his military success is that he got his training at Fort Sill in Oklahoma. And Alex Epstein, whose book I have not finished, but I have it.

During the State of the Union address, the President said, "No challenge poses a greater threat to future generations than climate change." Well, he is wrong. The far greater threat is what the Obama Administration is implementing in the name of climate change. This Administration has spent significant time and taxpayer dollars promoting a sense of fear and urgency around climate change, exploiting any recent catastrophic event to justify Obama's economically devastating policies.

For example, his statement tying terrorism to climate change, those statements are not only dangerous, but demean the

men and women who have pledged their lives to keep this Country safe. His climate change policies aren't protecting this Country; they are killing the coal industry, undermining our global competitiveness, putting thousands of Americans out of work while shipping their jobs overseas, and costing hardworking taxpayers hundreds of billions of dollars that will take generations to pay down.

Rhetoric aside, President Obama's climate policies have nothing to do with the environment. The EPA did not even bother to assess whether the so-called Clean Power Plan, that is what he has been talking about over in Paris, and that is the centerpiece of the President's entire climate agenda, and the EPA didn't even bother to talk about that and what the source would be and how he would accomplish it. In fact, it cost hundreds of billions of dollars each year and have miniscule benefits that would be completely undone by a few months of economic activity in China.

The President's claims that his efforts are about protecting the health of this Country or national security are equally disingenuous. In fact, they stand to undermine our economic well-being, which is the foundation of this Country's domestic success and global respect. A Children's Health Watch study from May of 2013 found that high energy costs can cause

families to go without needed medical care and increase the risk of eviction and homelessness.

Recently there has been a fad to demonize fossil fuels. But fossil fuel development has been a game changer for economic opportunity around the world and also is integral from a strategic military perspective. Fossil fuels help lift communities out of abject poverty. The aggressive regulating by the Obama Administration to promote his climate change agenda, such as the Climate Action Plan and the Paris Agreement, will do more to harm than good to vulnerable communities. Incidentally, we had a hearing on this yesterday and were able to get into this issue.

Of course, climate is always changing, we understand that. But whether you believe that it is man that is causing it or not, it is in our best interest, from any perspective, to continue to use fossil fuels because they are important to our economy, our military, and our quality of life.

But the existence of abundant fossil fuel resources in this Country alongside American ingenuity and innovation have fueled our path to becoming the global powerhouse we are today. The American people understand the value of fossil fuels, which is why they have consistently rejected costly climate policies, and the Congress has acted accordingly.

Clearly, the true purpose of the President's climate policies have nothing to do with protecting the interests of the American people. Instead, they are meant to line the pocketbooks of his political patrons while promoting his self-proclaimed climate legacy.

So we appreciate all of you being here and I want you to know we are going to have a much better attendance today. I think some of our colleagues want to wait until our opening statements are over before they show up. They have other things to do.

Senator Boxer?

[The prepared statement of Senator Inhofe follows:]

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE BARBARA BOXER, A UNITED STATES
SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Senator Boxer. Thanks.

Well, I have to remind myself this is the Environment Committee, because listening to you, Mr. Chairman, it sounds like the pollution committee to me. Now, I would say if 9 out of 10 doctors tell you you need a heart operation, you wouldn't listen to the one outlier; you would get the operation. You wouldn't yell at the doctors and say they were liars and stupid and on somebody else's payroll; you would get the operation.

Well, 97 percent of respected scientists, respected scientists tell us there are dangers to climate change and that our activities are causing it, most of it. So let's stop all this posturing and attacking President Obama, who has a 50 percent approval rate. His approval rating is higher than Ronald Reagan's was at his time in the presidency, when the Republican Congress has 18 percent and, in addition to that, big majority support action on climate change.

People are smart. They don't care how you mock people. They know 2015 was the hottest year on record, and 15 of the 16 warmest years on record have occurred in the 21st century. Just this year scientists reported sea levels are rising many times faster than they have in 2,800 years. The 2015 wildfire season was the costliest, just ask my State, with a record \$1.71

billion spent. So we see that climate poses a risk to our national security.

How about the Department of Defense? We have a military expert here. He may disagree. But the Department of Defense's 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review linked climate change with national security: "Climate change poses a significant challenge for the United States and the world at large. The pressures caused by it will influence resource competition, place additional burdens on economic society and governance institutions. These effects are threat multipliers that will aggravate stressors abroad, such as poverty, environmental degradation, political instability, and social tensions, conditions that can enable terrorist activity and other forms of violence."

So don't say it is the President out of context who is talking about violence and terrorism. It is the Department of Defense.

Now, thank goodness we have an Administration that isn't cowed by the kinds of rhetoric that we heard from my Chairman, who I really like. But the fact is his words just don't make sense to me. The efforts undertaken as part of the President's Climate Action Plan include: new fuel economy standards for cars and heavy duty trucks; finalizing the Clean Power Plan, which will cut carbon pollution 32 percent.

And I would ask to put my whole statement into the record, and I will finish my last couple of minutes this way.

The American public understands the need to act. According to a New York Times poll, two-thirds of Americans support the United States being part of an international treaty to limit the impacts of climate change. So the Republicans on this Committee are so out of step with the American people. It is unreal. A recent poll found 60 percent of American voters support the Clean Power Plan and 70 percent of voters want their State to cooperate and develop a plan to implement these new standards.

While we face rhetoric like we heard on the Floor, trying to go after the President's plans, the people are with the President, and the President's approval rates show that people think he is going in the right direction.

And there are benefits. I want to read you the benefits. Here is the point. Sometimes when there is a problem the solution brings other problems. In this case, the solution, reducing carbon pollution, has co-benefits, and they have been quantified. By 2030, just the Clean Power Plan alone will prevent 1,500 to 3,600 premature deaths because we are cleaning up the air; up to 1,700 heart attacks; 90,000 asthma attacks in children; and how about this, 300,000 missed work days and school days by 2030.

Look, I often say this, if you can't breathe, you can't work. And when we take the carbon out of the air, we are taking all these other pollutants out of the air; and no one, and I don't think anyone has had this situation where a constituent comes up and says, Barbara, the air is too clean, please make it dirtier. No. They want me to continue to clean up the air because it has so many benefits.

So I haven't even gone into the number of clean energy jobs that await us, all kinds of good things. And, yes, in the dislocations we have to be prepared to help those who are dislocated. But if we took this attitude, we never would have moved to the automobile because all those people who drew the horse-drawn carriages would be unemployed. We can make sure that people are brought along.

So I am excited about what the President is doing and I am not excited about my colleague's opening statement, but he did it probably even better than he has ever done it before. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Senator Boxer follows:]

Senator Inhofe. Oh, thank you. That is very nice.

I want all of you to know that Barbara Boxer and I get along great on roads and highways and infrastructure and a lot of things.

All right, I am going to start over here with you, Reverend Nelson, and what I would like to ask you to do, we will have more members coming here. We do have staff present representing members, and I would like to ask you if you could hold to your five-minute opening statement, it would be appreciated.

STATEMENT OF REV. DR. J. HERBERT NELSON II, DIRECTOR,
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH U.S.A. OFFICE OF PUBLIC WITNESS

Rev. Nelson. Hello, my name is Reverend Doctor J. Herbert Nelson II. I direct the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. Office of Public Witness here in Washington, D.C. Chairman Inhofe and Member Boxer and Committee members, thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

I come to you today not only with 30 years of pastoral experience in a community that bore the harmful impacts of industrial pollution, not only as the director of the denomination's national advocacy office, but as a representative of an ecumenical Christian community that understands the urgent moral imperative to act on climate change and protect God's creation.

Psalm 24:1 and 2: "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, the world and those who live in it; for he has founded it on the seas, and established it on the rivers." We must discuss environmental policy in tandem with economic policy, the care of creation and all of creation, including our neighbors' health and economic well-being. It is central to our concern in addressing climate change.

I served as a pastor in a poor inner city congregation in Memphis, Tennessee before coming to Washington, D.C. I shared my home and my community with some of the most intense

industrial pollution in this Country from a chemical plant to a coal-fired power generating station and an oil refinery. Ours was a predominantly African-American community which, like so many low-income communities of color in our Nation, suffered disproportionately under the health burdens that oftentimes deals with the issues of industrial zones in our Nation. It was widely reported at the time that African-Americans were 79 percent more likely than whites to live in neighborhoods where industrial pollution was suspected of posing the greatest health danger.

Memphis residents were often sick and were forced to miss school and work because of chronic asthma caused by pollutants. I recall one activist I knew, Doris Bradshaw, who lived on land contaminated by near military storage facility. After her grandmother's untimely death from an aggressive cervical cancer, which doctors told her was environmentally induced, Ms. Bradshaw delved into her own investigation of the contaminants of the land and air. She was shocked to find a laundry list of chemicals that had been improperly disposed and stored there, and those responsible for the disposal had not been accountable.

I am certain that the CEOs and profiteers of those companies did not live in the areas where the air and water made their family ill. As pastor, I conducted funerals of people who died before their time, made countless hospital visits for

maladies my flock should not have had to endure, and engaged in organizing to bring justice to those afflicted by careless environmental practices. We seek an earth restored, where economic development is not paid for with the health of our most vulnerable sisters and brothers.

Presbyterians have established since 1981 that we have an ethical obligation to secure a livable planet for present and future generations. A report approved by the 218th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. entitled *The Power to Change: U.S. Energy Policy and Global Warming* states emphatically that we have both a spiritual and moral obligation and responsibility to address this issue of climate change.

In order to do this in the Reformed tradition, we believe that repentance is required. Repentance in our biblical understanding calls for individuals to stop the actions that are contrary to God's desires for sustainable human life and sustaining human life, while turning to a new way of living that promotes what John 10:10 requires, a vision of an abundant life. With God's grace, we can receive the power to change.

The Presbyterian Church U.S.A. recognizes that there is no greater measure than God's provision for energy, the earth, the sun, and the wind. And, therefore, we speak very candidly about the issues of subsidizing the financial incentives away from fossil fuels extraction and towards renewable energy

infrastructure in order to protect the affordable energy prices that many low-income families rely on that are inexpensive and that the way we should be stunned by the cost of human health reclamation of God's damaged creation were reflected in the utility bills of everyday Americans. We know not what we do.

I sit here today not just representing Presbyterian Church U.S.A., but I do represent faith leaders from across the Nation and also communities of faith from across the community, one of the 21 who have signed an agreement dealing with the issues of carbon emission. Given that my time is running out, I will submit my report to you and respectfully submit the letter that you already have, actually, and also other information regarding those who are supporting.

I know that there has been a great deal of concern regarding whether or not faith communities are standing with this particular issue. I am here to say that the petition that has been signed, the letters that have been given to you, we are seriously involved in this because it is not only a mandate of our holy books, but it is the way that we are called as responsible stewards of this earth to be caretakers for what God has given to us and to be assured that, quite frankly, we have a planet to leave to those who are coming behind.

[The prepared statement of Rev. Nelson follows:]

Senator Inhofe. Thank you, Reverend Nelson.

Rev. Nelson. Thank you so much.

Senator Inhofe. Mr. Breen?

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL BREEN, PRESIDENT, TRUMAN NATIONAL SECURITY
PROJECT

Mr. Breen. Thank you, Chairman Inhofe, Ranking Member Boxer, and distinguished members of the Committee. I thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

I come before you, first and foremost, as a fellow citizen with a shared concern for the security and the prosperity of our great Nation. Like many in the post-9/11 generation, I am no stranger to the costs and consequences of war. While I am currently the President and CEO of the Truman Project and Truman Center, I previously had the privilege to lead American soldiers in combat in both Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, and to train at Fort Sill, Oklahoma.

National security leadership, on the battlefield or in Washington, means taking seriously the risks to those you are charged with protecting. As a combat leader in Afghanistan and Iraq, I often received intelligence that indicated lethal danger to my unit and my mission. Regardless of whether or not I personally believed in the conclusions drawn from that intelligence or the sources from which it came, I would have committed a serious error if I did not act decisively to minimize the risk.

America's military leaders have already come to understand that climate change is a risk to our national security. The

2010 Quadrennial Defense Review, a document of military strategy, not partisan political design, identified climate change as an "accelerant of instability" that would place a "burden to respond" on the Department of Defense. The next review, in 2014, designated climate change a threat multiplier because its impacts "increase the frequency, scale, and complexity of future missions."

Moreover, the Center for Naval Analysis Military Advisory Board, which includes 16 retired, high-ranking military leaders including former Army Chief of Staff General Gordon Sullivan and former Marine Corps Commandant General James T. Conway, recently argued in a report co-signed by former Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff and former Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta that "the nature and pace of observed climate changes pose severe risks for our national security."

Those severe risks include drought, famine, flooding, sea level rise, extreme weather events, mass migration, and increasingly intense resource competition. Each of these phenomena is currently fueling violence and instability around the world, and will for years to come.

According to the Department of the Navy, the United States receives a request for humanitarian assistance from somewhere in the world "on an average of once every two weeks." Given that our fiercest enemies prey on human misery, the United States

cannot afford, strategically nor morally, to leave these calls for help unanswered. Unfortunately, climate change makes such requests all the more taxing on our military. Disasters are increasing in size, scope, and frequency, often ravaging the most fragile of communities and pushing feeble governments into chaos to the benefit of terrorists.

I am reminded of a senior Bangladeshi military officer I met years ago who recognized climate change as a threat to not only his nation's security, but its very integrity. A full one-fifth of Bangladesh's landmass would be under water with little more than a three foot rise in sea level, threatening to displace more than 22 million people into nearby India.

Our democratic ally has, in turn, planned for this eventuality by building an eight foot fence along 70 percent of its 2,500 mile border. This creates the very real possibility of millions of Bangladeshis frantically fleeing a catastrophe only to be repelled from India by force. These nations fought a war over the same territory just decades ago.

NATO, along with senior leaders in our own military, have expressed concerns about prospects for conflict in the Arctic, where melting ice is giving way to new strategically valuable waterways. Russia has accordingly increased its military exercises and a number of military bases in use in the Arctic considerably since 2007. These newly open sea lanes will surely

be a source of tension between the United States and an increasingly nationalist Russia.

I will close with a reminder that we are experiencing climate change on the home front as well. More than 11,000 and 50,000 men and women of the National Guard deployed to our own cities during Hurricanes Sandy and Katrina, respectively, leading relief efforts that cost our Nation a combined \$151 billion in repairs and rebuilding.

Extreme heat and wildfires have halted live fire training exercises in Alaska and have required mobilization for emergency assistance throughout the Country, such as in Idaho and Oklahoma. And sea levels rising at twice the global rate threaten, of all things, our own Naval Headquarters at Norfolk, Virginia. I repeat, rising sea levels threaten our largest naval base.

Climate change is a risk factor that makes many of the other threats we face both more likely and more dangerous from terrorist organizations that prey on fragile and failing states to rising resurgent major powers who are hostile to our values. Demanding that we act to address either the threat of climate change or the threat posed by a given enemy, but not both, is a deeply misguided false choice. The United States fought and won a two-front, two-ocean war on behalf of the world. Surely we can confront threats in both the short- and long-term now.

I urge the Congress to do what it has always done when our Nation has been tested throughout history: heed the threat, listen to the risk assessment our military leaders make, and grant them the tools they need to minimize risk to our service members, our citizens, our Nation, and our allies around the world.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Breen follows:]

Senator Inhofe. Thank you, Mr. Breen.

Father Sirico, you are recognized.

STATEMENT OF FATHER ROBERT A. SIRICO, PRESIDENT, ACTON INSTITUTE

Father Sirico. Thank you very much, Senator Inhofe, Senator Boxer, for the invitation to be with you today. I am the President of the Acton Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty. We study the interpenetration of ethics, theology, and market economics. I am also the pastor of a parish in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

The recent promulgation of the encyclical by His Holiness, Pope Francis, *Laudato Si'*, dealing with the care of our common home, has occasioned a great deal of discussion, so I would like to address myself to that and then some applications of how that might be seen in the real world and for your consideration in the development of policy.

It is important at the outset that I first affirm the goals that the Holy Father sets out in his encyclical, namely, "to protect our common home" and "to bring the whole human family together to seek a sustainable and integral development." The Pope is right to give attention to these matters, obviously. He is also right when he says that there is a need for an honest and forthright debate on these matters.

I would like to outline for you what the social teaching of the Catholic Church is because, as I have heard the discussion, there is a great deal of confusion over this. The Church's teaching authority claims that its Magisterium might be called a

privileged insight into matters of faith and morals. The Church intentionally limits her specific competency to these areas, faith and morals.

This magisterial authority has always admitted to its limitations and to boundaries which may be obscure or at times touch up against certain matters outside of the Magisterium's immediate mission. This, of course, makes the task of properly interpreting these documents much more challenging and much more exciting.

The Church simply does not speak, nor does she claim to speak, with the same authority on matters of economics and science qua economics and science. In fact, the encyclical says, "on many concrete questions, the Church has no reason to offer a definitive opinion; she knows that honest debate must be encouraged among experts, while respecting divergent views."

A particularly fruitful part of the dialogue which *Laudato Si'* calls for, it seems to me, lies somewhere between its major title, *Laudato Si'*, Praised be God, and its subtitle, *On Care for our Common Home*. Here is what we know. We know that the riches of the earth which God created and have given to us are not simply placed at our disposal automatically. The reality of scarcity, which gives rise to the discipline of economics itself also tells us this. In paragraph 110 of *Laudato Si'*, the Holy Father makes an important observation on what he calls the

"fragmentation of knowledge." Put another way, no one can know everything.

One way that environmental degradation and even poverty might be described would be to say that it is evidence of a failure to know and to coordinate the things of value. After all, people don't generally degrade or discard what they see as having value. But they first need to know it. This, of course, is precisely why centralizing knowledge and planning is inadequate and, indeed, dangerous to yield a broad range of knowledge required to prevent the degradation of the economy or, for that matter, the environment.

Fortunately, the discipline of economics itself can enable us to confront what is called the "knowledge problem." The only way that knowledge can be obtained is through free signals called prices sent from across the economy by producers, consumers, buyers, and sellers.

Though reference to environmental issues has become common in many religious communities, environmentalism has come to mean more than getting rid of air pollution or cleaning up toxic waste dumps. Unfortunately, for many people of faith it has become their religion itself. It is one thing to recognize caring for nature as part of God's command, to honor what God has made; it is quite another to transfer that sentiment of worship to the creation itself.

I have submitted a much fuller examination of these questions and I look forward, as well, to your comments. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Father Sirico follows:]

Senator Inhofe. Thank you, Father Sirico. Thank you very much.

General Scales, it is nice to have you back.

STATEMENT OF MAJOR GENERAL (RET.) ROBERT SCALES, SENIOR MILITARY ANALYST

General Scales. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you very much for inviting me again to address this Committee.

During his graduation address to the Coast Guard Academy in 2015, President Obama shocked the defense community by declaring his new national defense priority: "So I'm here today to say that climate change constitutes a serious threat to global security, an immediate risk to our national security."

The Administration's newfound passion to connect climate change to war is an example of faulty theories that rely for relevance on politically correct imaginings, rather than established historical precedent. The theories linking climate change to war come from a larger body of political thought that ascribes human conflict to what we call the "Global Trends" school. Advocates of the Global Trends theory argue that environmental scourges such as diminishing water supplies, urbanization, and the AIDS/HIV epidemic shape the course of human conflict.

But climate change is not a global trend because 3,000 years of the historical record of human conflict argues conclusively against any causal relationship between war and temperature. Let me be more specific. Never in the written history of warfare, from Megiddo in 1,500 BC to the Syrian Civil

War today, is there any evidence that wars are caused by warmer air. At best, climate change might, over centuries, contribute minutely to the course of warfare. The key word is contribute. Climate change will never cause wars; thus, it can never be actually a threat to national security.

It is interesting to note the hypocrisy within the scientific communities that argue for a connection between climate change and national security. Scientists generally agree on the long-term consequences of global warming. Radical environmentalists delight in excoriating the so-called "junk science" espoused by climate change deniers, but they are less than enthusiastic in questioning the junk social science that environmentalists and their Beltway fellow travelers use to connect climate change to war.

Where does the Administration get their facts about climate change and war? Well, first they contend that a warming planet causes drought, which leads to mass migration away from areas of creeping desertification. To be sure, rising temperatures, combined with overgrazing in places like Central Africa, have caused displacement of peoples.

But the misery of these peoples leads to, well, misery, not war. Tribes striving to exist in these often horrific environmental conditions have little energy left to declare war against a neighbor. The nations of Central Africa are in the

grip of conflict started by Boko Haram in Nigeria and al Shabaab in Somalia. But these transnational terrorists are motivated to kill by the factors that have always caused nations, or entities masquerading as nations, to start wars, such as hatred induced by fear of alien cultures, religions, ideologies, economics, as well as social and ethnic differences.

But the myth of climate change as an inducement to war continues to curry favor among Washington elites. One source for connecting war to temperature comes from the political closeness between environmentalists and the anti-war movement. Their logic goes like this: Global warming is bad. Wars are bad. Therefore, they must be connected. Remember, prior to the 1991 Gulf War, environmentalists warned of a decade of global cooling that would come from burning Kuwaiti oil fields. More recently, environmental radicals argued against bombing ISIS oil trucks, fearing the environmental consequences.

Sadly, those in the Administration who lobbied against striking a legitimate military target because of imagined environmental damage caused by these strikes may in all likelihood have sustained ISIS by refusing to interdict their richest sources of income. The point is that in today's wars politically correct theories, when inserted into a battle plan, might well extend wars needlessly and get soldiers killed.

Our men and women in uniform are smart and perceptive. They can spot phoniness in a heartbeat. Think of a soldier in Afghanistan or Iraq, returning from a dangerous and exhausting mission, being obliged to listen to a senior defense official lecture them on the, well, revelation that fighting climate change is their most important mission. These men and women see the realities of battle all around them. The military threat of rising temperatures is not one of them.

Our young military leaders are already jaded and discouraged by an Administration that seems to be out of touch with their real-world, day-to-day life or death needs. Do we really think that they will become more confident about the wisdom of their leaders if they are obliged to turn away from ISIS and fight a war against rising temperatures? Somehow, I don't think so.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Scales follows:]

Senator Inhofe. Thank you very much, General Scales.

Mr. Epstein?

STATEMENT OF ALEX EPSTEIN, PRESIDENT, CENTER FOR INDUSTRIAL
PROGRESS

Mr. Epstein. The energy industry is the industry that powers every other industry. To the extent energy is cheap, plentiful, and reliable, human beings thrive. To the extent energy is unaffordable, scarce, or unreliable, human beings suffer.

And, yet, in this election year the candidates, especially the Republican candidates, have barely discussed energy. Thus, I am grateful for the opportunity to discuss the morality of energy policy.

When we evaluate energy policies, such as President Obama's efforts to restrict cheap, plentiful, reliable fossil fuels and mandate solar and wind, it is worth asking: Has this been tried before? The answer is much milder versions of the President's energy policy have been tried in Europe, and they have resulted in skyrocketing energy prices every time.

Take Germany. Over the last decade, Germany pursued the popular ideal of running on the unreliable energy from solar and wind. But since unreliable energy can't be relied upon, it has to be propped up by a reliable energy, mostly fossil fuels. The solar panels and wind turbines are an unnecessary and enormous cost to the system. The average German pays three to four times more for electricity than the average American. It is so bad

that Germans have had to add a new term to the language: energy poverty.

The United States should learn from the failed German experiment. Instead, our President is doubling down on it. And, just as ominously, he is calling for even the poorest countries to use unreliaables instead of reliables. This, in a world where 3 billion people have almost no access to energy.

How could this possibly be moral? The alleged justification is that fossil fuels cause climate change and should therefore be eliminated. But we need to clearly define what we mean by climate change, because while nearly everyone, the 97 percent, agrees that more CO₂ in the atmosphere causes some climate change, it makes all the difference in the world whether that change is a mild, manageable warming or a runaway, catastrophic warming.

Which is it? If we look at what has been scientifically demonstrated versus what has been speculated, the climate impact of CO₂ is mild and manageable. The warming of the last 80 years has been barely more than the natural warming that occurred in the 80 years before that, when there were virtually no CO₂ emissions. From a geological perspective, both CO₂ levels and temperatures are very low. There is no perfect amount of CO₂ or perfect average temperature, although higher CO₂ levels do

create more plant growth and higher temperatures do lower mortality rates.

To be sure, many prominent scientists and organizations predict catastrophe, but this is wild speculation, and it is nothing new. Indeed, many of today's thought leaders have been falsely predicting catastrophe for decades. Thirty years ago, NASA climate leader James Hansen predicted that temperatures would rise by 2 to 4 degrees between 2000 and 2010. Instead, depending on which temperature dataset you consult, they rose only slightly or not at all.

Thirty years ago, President Obama's top science advisor, John Holdren, predicted that by now we would be approaching a billion CO₂-related deaths from famine. Instead, famine has plummeted. More broadly, climate-related deaths, deaths from extreme heat, extreme cold, storms, drought, and floods, have decreased at a rate of 50 percent since the 1980s and 98 percent since major CO₂ emissions began 80 years ago.

How is it possible that we are safer than ever from the climate? Because while fossil fuel use has only a mild warming impact, it has an enormous protecting impact. Nature doesn't give us a stable, safe climate that we make dangerous; it gives us an ever-changing dangerous climate that we need to make safe. And the driver behind sturdy buildings, affordable heating and air conditioning, drought-relief, and everything else that keeps

us safe from climate is cheap, plentiful, and reliable energy, overwhelmingly from fossil fuels.

Thus, the President's anti-fossil fuel policies would harm billions of lives economically and make them more vulnerable to nature's ever-present climate danger. Using more fossil fuels, along with other cheap, plentiful, reliable sources, such as nuclear and hydro, also opposed by most of the environmentalist movement, is a moral imperative.

Now, I realize that many of you have fought to restrict fossil fuel use, and it can be politically difficult to change one's stand, but if you continue on your current path, you will cause billions of people to suffer unnecessarily. I hope you reconsider your position and, no matter how politically difficult it is, I hope you change your stand.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Epstein follows:]

Senator Inhofe. Thank you very much, Mr. Epstein.

I am going to try something different here. Judging from our experience yesterday and some of the previous Committee's hearings, our members seem to go over, so I am going to change our five minutes to six minutes and then really try to hold everyone to six minutes, if that is acceptable.

General Scales, you have heard the quote that I gave in my opening statement in terms of the President talking about the greatest threat facing us is not ISIS, but is global warming. One time he made that statement was April 18th, and it was on that same that that ISIL executed two groups of Christians, beheading 21 and shooting the other 9.

What do you believe is the greatest national threat and how do we respond to these statements?

General Scales. Thank you, Senator. I believe the greatest threat, in a word, is Russia. They are the largest existential threat, the most aggressive nation state that we face, and we are seeing a resurgence of aggression obviously in Ukraine and Syria and elsewhere led by Vladimir Putin.

But what makes this so difficult to deal with, Senator, is that the military today has a whole panoply of additional threats. You mentioned ISIS. How about the Chinese threat to the South China Sea? We haven't begun to speak about the

Iranian nuclear threat, which will be on us soon, and what that implies.

So soldiers and sailors today are bombarded by a series of global threats and diminishing resources, and to my mind, at least, the additional distraction of focusing on climate change in the midst of all this is simply counterproductive.

Senator Inhofe. Now, would you say that, to focus on climate change, does this impact our ability to execute operations with our allies around the globe against ISIL?

General Scales. It is too early to say. I think, inevitably, this has to be true because, remember, there is only so much energy and so much money, and so many men and women to confront our global challenges today. If you have lawyers that are telling you what to bomb, rules of engagement that keep you from bombing, a media looking over your shoulder as you try to prosecute wars, young soldiers today are just overwhelmed by distractions from their mission, which is to defeat the enemy. And adding another layer to this, making them focus first on climate change as a threat, is simply a distraction they shouldn't be obliged to endure.

Senator Inhofe. Thank you very much.

Father Sirico, let's talk a little bit about the impact of all these accusations on the impoverished communities, the poor communities. What impact would you say that the

Administration's climate change agenda would have on these communities, the impoverished communities?

Father Sirico. Well, I think it is fair to say that when you wage what is in effect a war on coal or fossil fuels, what you end up doing is increasing the cost of those resources. When you increase the cost of those resources, the poor are further impoverished.

Not only that, but it has an effect as well on the companies that are employing people and providing these resources. For instance, all the different bankruptcies or the layoffs on the part of the Powder River Basin, for example, laid off 243 workers at the Black Thunder Mine. Peabody Energy laid off 235 miners at the North Antelope Rochelle Mine. The Alpha Natural Resources filed for bankruptcy in Virginia last summer. And the list could go on.

So I think that the rhetorical attack, the moral attack, and the regulatory attack, not to mention the various kinds of taxation that go into this, impede the ability of these businesses both to employ people and to provide resources at affordable prices for people, thus impoverishing their communities.

Senator Inhofe. Thank you.

Mr. Epstein, a recent report from the U.S. Global Change Research Program claims that we will see a rise in extreme heat-

related deaths due to climate change. Yet, in your testimony, on page 2, you state that higher temperature actually lower mortality rates.

Mr. Epstein. As I indicated, it is very important to distinguish between what is demonstrated and what is speculated. So what is demonstrated is a steep decline in climate-related deaths as we more energy, including fossil fuels.

So what is going on with those predictions are they are based on climate prediction models that can't predict climate and they are based on a false understanding of climate safety. Nature doesn't give us a safe climate; the primary cause of climate safety is the state of climate protection, industrialization, and technology. So billions of people around the world who don't have that, who are vulnerable to climate, that is what they need; they don't need a 1 degree cooler temperature.

Senator Inhofe. Thank you.

Back to you, General Scales. The President's focus on climate change impacting our ability, now, a lot of us up here at this table spend time over there. We talk to people in the field; we talk to our commanders; we talk to the kids in the mess halls, and they have questions that we, quite often, are asked, and that is his focus, the President, the commander-

in-chief, on climate change impacting our ability to execute operations with our allies over there?

General Scales. Yes, I understand, Mr. Chairman, and one of the interesting things is I also talk to soldiers, as you know, and there is a growing sense, in many ways, of cynicism among our young men and women in uniform, particularly those who are deployed. They have so many conflicting stressors that keep them, as they would say, from doing their mission.

And when they are sitting in a mess hall in Kabul and they see the President saying, on television, that ISIS may not be our number one enemy, climate change may be, and they just came back from a patrol with their Afghan allies, these young men and women turn to each other and say have our leaders sort of lost touch with the reality all around us? And then you stack that up with all the other things that we have talked about recently, and I am afraid that level of cynicism is what interferes with our ability to defend our Country.

Senator Inhofe. I get that same thing.

Senator Boxer?

Senator Boxer. I would like to see if Sheldon Whitehouse would like to take my turn as first.

Senator Whitehouse. With the Chairman's permission.

Senator Inhofe. No objection.

Senator Whitehouse. I do have to get to a budget hearing at 10:30.

I guess I would say that I am just a little bit sad at what this Committee has become. EPW, Committee on Environment and Public Works, it is beginning to look increasingly like the committee on eccentricity and public works.

We have a United States military that in repeated Quadrennial Defense Reviews, which are done by the career military, and in the national security strategy have singled out climate change as a problem for the future that will create the types of stresses that will draw conflict and draw our young men and women into conflict. I believe every single military official who has spoken about climate change, civilian or military, has agreed with that proposition.

Admiral Locklear ran our Pacific Command for years and said that the effects of climate change are more likely than any of the other scenarios that they commonly talk about to lead to conflict in the Pacific. In the years that I sat on the Intelligence Committee and in the assessments that I have seen since, it has been a consistent theme of our national security personnel in the intelligence community that this is a concern that we need to address.

I would note that with respect to Retired General Scales' comments, the timeframe we are dealing is not at all the

timeframe of the history of warfare. The history of warfare goes back tens of thousands of years. We have had at least 800,000 years within a relatively safe, in our human experience, range of carbon in the atmosphere of 170 to 300 parts per million. Now we are at 400 and climbing. We are in unprecedented territory.

And when you look over that 800,000-year time over the association between temperature and CO₂, it is a very close association. And if temperature follows carbon dioxide, and there is a reasonable change that it will when it has done so for 800,000 years, then we are in for very substantial changes. Not just little changes, but big changes. Not just changes that would reflect the history of warfare, but changes that are really unprecedented.

And I kind of doubt that actually individual soldiers are being asked to address climate change. That is not their job; it is our job in Congress to set the terms for our economy so that we don't drive our soldiers into situations in which conflicts caused by climate change are putting them at risk.

Similarly, from the Catholic Church we have a pope who has written an entire encyclical about our responsibility to our climate, focusing on climate change. We have the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, which has repeatedly and constantly and unanimously continued to say with a very strong

voice that it is really important that we address climate change. Several Catholic bishops actually have come to Washington to meet with us and to urge this to happen. There was not very good turnout by our Republican colleagues for that, but they were here to speak to anyone who would come.

So we have these very, very strong signals coming from the vast majority of these great institutions, our military and our Catholic Church, and what we hear in this Committee are these extremely eccentric voices.

And we particularly, I think, have reason for concern about the presence here of the Acton Institute, which has something of an unfortunate record of fronting for industry groups. We are now dealing with climate change, but not long ago one of the health and safety issues that was predominant was tobacco, and people have used those wars, the tobacco wars. During those tobacco wars, the Acton Institute took money from the tobacco industry.

And if you look through the records that the attorney generals required to be made public in the settlement with the tobacco industry, you find a memo from the tobacco industry authored by Philip Morris that actually talks about its work with the Acton Institute to fight back against tobacco regulation. There is a list of organizations that they work

with; the lead one is the Acton Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty.

How something for the study of religion and liberty gets into tobacco policy is another question entirely, but I am quoting from the document. First they call the Acton Institute, and I quote Philip Morris, "an esoteric policy group that focuses on illuminating the free market perspective." Second, they vouch for Acton in that Acton "has on several occasions written articles and op-eds opposing the use of cigarette excises as a funding mechanism for health care."

And here is the really interesting part. The author says "Acton is presently preparing, with our assistance," with our assistance, with the assistance of the tobacco industry, "a monograph for the Detroit News detailing arguments against sin taxes. I will be contacting them," the Acton Institute, "this week to elicit their assistance in rebutting the just released University of Michigan report that attacks industry projections of economic dislocation caused by prohibitive excise taxes."

When you are taking industry money and working with industry and doing what industry tells you, I have an issue with that.

My time has expired.

Senator Inhofe. Thank you.

Senator Rounds?

Senator Rounds. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Father Sirico, you have pointed out that the Pope's encyclical and environmental stewardship reinforces the concern that society progress be balanced with a respect for nature and a concern about the most vulnerable populations. I come from a rural State where agriculture is the backbone of our economy.

I would like to know your opinion of how the free market can help support a wide variety of industries, particularly those like ag, in which those who tend to their land are the best environmental stewards we have. How can industries like agriculture help alleviate some of the concerns regarding vulnerable populations and what should we do to make certain these industries are able to not only survive, but to thrive in this Country?

Father Sirico. Of course, the question of vulnerability has to do with a lack of access to resources, so the best kind of policies is to allow these, whether it is agricultural businesses or other, businesses to be as productive as they can be within the rule of law, under the rule of law, in order to provide goods and services that are accessible to vulnerable populations, at the same time increasing the likelihood and the opportunities that they have for employment in order to support their families.

Draconian legislation, general animas toward free market activities, the hindrance of competition, the placing of one's thumb, as it were, on a scale in terms of that competition by the use of various kinds of regulation all impede that knowledge flow that I spoke about earlier, and speak about more extensively in my prepared remarks, that enables people to rise in their economic well-being. So I think that what the Government needs to do is ensure that law is fair and just and objective, rather than partisan.

Senator Rounds. Major General Scales, in your testimony you warn about the consequences of having senior defense officials lecture our soldiers on the idea that combatting climate change is their most important mission. How does this mindset impact the men and women serving in the U.S. military and how does this detract from our national security in the face of ISIS and other security threats to our Nation?

General Scales. That is a great question, and it goes to the points made by Senator Whitehouse. First of all, let me say up front that the impression that he gives that this is a universal thought held within the defense community is ridiculous. I was on the Quadrennial Defense Review; I spent six weeks arguing with my colleagues about this, and in our version of the QDR we did not mention climate change.

Mr. Breen mentioned a report by 17 generals and admirals that climbed on board to this mantra about climate change. Well, those are friends of mine, so I called them the other day, over the last week, and I asked them, what are you doing, what is this all about? He said, well, our consensus was we will sign up to the dangers of climate change, or the relationship between climate change and national security "as long as it doesn't cost us anything." I mean, why not?

And as far as Admiral Locklear is concerned, now retired commander of the Pacific Command, he made that as a sort of off-the-cuff comment about climate change in the Pacific and he never went back to it again. He is now retired.

This is just part of America, Senator. I mean, it is like Y2K or it is like prohibition. We, in our society, have a tendency to jump on bandwagons because that is just what America does; it makes us to feel like part of the organization.

But the idea that only young soldiers are concerned about losing faith in their leaders over their profession of climate change is not true. I will assure you that many senior military, both active and retired, are concerned about this today.

Why? Because they fear that, to your point, that it will deflect us away from our primary mission, which is defend this Country and kill the enemy; and, secondly, it will cost us tens,

if not hundreds, of billions of dollars. Go back to these generals and admirals and say, do you still ascribe with that thought if it is going to empty our national security budget of \$200 billion? You will get a different answer.

Senator Rounds. Thank you.

Mr. Epstein, in your testimony you mention that Germans have added the term energy poverty to their language. Can you explain what this means and is energy poverty something that threatens the United States?

Mr. Epstein. Sure. It varies from country to country, but basically it is the percentage of people for whom energy is almost a prohibitive percentage of their income. So with any kind of measure like this, where you are restricting a crucial life-enhancing product, the more expensive you make it, the more you hurt poorer people in particular.

So we see even in the wealthier countries that lots of people can't afford their electricity bills or can't afford many other things that stem from electricity bills. We see manufacturers that are on the margin that could work in this Country if natural gas is cheap.

But what happens if you ban fracking? Then those companies go out of business. And then, of course, internationally, and I think this is one of the greatest moral crimes, if you make energy more expensive or you prohibit or restrict people from

getting energy from sources like coal, that is literally death. I tell a story in my book, the Moral Case for Fossil Fuels, about a young child who could have been kept alive with an incubator, but in the Gambia there are no incubators because of no reliable electricity.

Senator Rounds. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Inhofe. Thank you very much.

Senator Boxer?

Senator Boxer. Thank you.

Mr. Epstein, are you a scientist?

Mr. Epstein. No, a philosopher.

Senator Boxer. You are a philosopher?

Mr. Epstein. Yes.

Senator Boxer. Okay. Well, this is the Environment and Public Works Committee. I think it is interesting we have a philosopher here talking about an issue --

Mr. Epstein. It is to teach you how to think more clearly.

Senator Boxer. Well, you don't have to teach me how to think more clearly.

[Laughter.]

Senator Boxer. You don't have to. Try running for the Senate on your platform.

Reverend Nelson, perhaps the most -- well, this is the place to have a philosopher, not a scientist; it is perfect for this Republican --

Mr. Epstein. You have to integrate the big picture data.

Senator Boxer. I am not asking you anything. I am telling you that all you have to know is you are a philosopher, not a scientist, and I don't appreciate getting lectured by a philosopher about science.

Now, I want to talk to Reverend Nelson, who never claimed to be a scientist or came up with all these figures and facts in his own mind. I just want to say to you you are the most eloquent person I have ever heard in all my years here, and I am so grateful to you for bringing your eloquence to this Committee. What you are trying to tell us in a very calm voice and not an argumentative, nasty voice is that we have a moral obligation to the least among us. Am I right on that point?

Rev. Nelson. We do, Senator. And I challenge the notion that somehow or another the Bible does not speak to this. I have with me, actually, a Green Bible, which the pages are marked and the passages are marked in green throughout this Bible that actually speak to the issues of the care of creation.

Senator Boxer. Well, I would appreciate it if I could have some copies of those passages.

Rev. Nelson. Certainly.

Senator Boxer. Because I think it is so important to people who claim to be religious to turn their back on this threat. It is shocking. When we know the co-benefits of going after carbon pollution, we are going to save 1,500 to 3,600 lives, 1,700 heart attacks won't happen, 90,000 asthma attacks in children won't happen, and we will restore 300,000 missed work days and school days.

It is a moral issue, and I just wanted to thank you because from the angry voices, and we have had them here, it is a beautiful thing, and obviously within you you have the security and the peace, and you have said it here, and it is very important and I so appreciate it.

And I appreciate the fact that Senator Inhofe allows us to pick a couple of witnesses.

Now, Major General, you disagree with the DOD and you kind of made fun of them and said they are just saying it because they are getting on a bandwagon. So I am not asking you a question, but what I am hoping you would do, because you spoke for others and you demeaned them and said they are just saying they are doing it to get along, it doesn't cost anything, give me the names of those people so I can contact them, because this is a very important testimony here.

So you can't just get up. I can tell you anything. I could tell you I was visited by the greatest leader in all the

world and said this. You know, you can say anything. I want specifics; that is why you are here.

Now, Mr. Epstein talked about the President mandating solar and wind. I would like you to send me those mandates. That would be important, because I don't know of them.

And, Father, I appreciate your being here.

Father Sirico. Thank you.

Senator Boxer. I looked up the Acton Institute because I didn't know much, and I know that my colleague said you have ties to the tobacco industry. Is it true that you received \$315,000 from ExxonMobil since 1998?

Father Sirico. Let me give you a broader --

Senator Boxer. No, I am asking. I don't have a lot of time. Is it true?

Father Sirico. Okay, I am going to be very brief.

Senator Boxer. No, no, yes or no.

Father Sirico. The Acton Institute has existed for 26 years. I brought the numbers with me. From that time we have received under 5 percent of our funding from all corporations --

Senator Boxer. Father, that is fine.

Father Sirico. -- and 1 percent from Koch, .05 percent from Exxon --

Senator Boxer. Father? Father?

Father Sirico. -- and the numbers you have on tobacco is correct.

Senator Boxer. I am losing my time. You received \$315,000 from ExxonMobil; you received funding from the Koch brothers --

Father Sirico. Actually, it was \$410,000. Your number is wrong.

Senator Boxer. Thank you for correcting the record, and we will show it.

Father Sirico. Thank you.

Senator Boxer. The Koch Foundation, David H. Koch, \$313,000 since 2003.

Father Sirico. No, \$895,000 --

Senator Boxer. The Claude Lambe Foundation is another part of the Koch Brothers, \$60,000

Father Sirico. Which was that?

Senator Boxer. The Claude Lambe Foundation, \$60,000.

Father Sirico. Yes.

Senator Boxer. That is connected with the Koch brothers.

Father Sirico. An educational subsidy.

Senator Boxer. And I would ask unanimous consent to place into the record all the other donations from those who are fighting us on climate change, if I might.

Senator Inhofe. Without objection.

Senator Boxer. Thank you.

[The referenced information follows:]

Senator Boxer. Father, this was kind of interesting. The Acton Institute's strong support for Catholicism and free market economics has come under strain as Pope Francis has actively criticized global inequality and unfettered capitalism. In May 2014, the Pope's Twitter account posted a tweet, the Pope's, saying, "Inequality is the root of all evil." Joe Carter, a senior editor at Acton, tweeted in reply, this is to the Pope saying inequality is the root of all evil: "Seriously, though, what was up with that tweet by the Pontiff? Has he traded the writings of Peter and Paul for Economist Piketty?"

So do you disagree with the Pope when he says that climate change is one of the biggest issues and we have to face it?

Father Sirico. Senator, I am very grateful for your defense of the Pope. Perhaps not in all of his magisterial authority and the cherry-picking of this or that --

Senator Boxer. I can ask you what I want. Do you disagree with the Pope on climate change? It is a simple yes or no.

Father Sirico. When the Pope says things that have to do with science, he does not speak from the magisterial authority of the Church.

Senator Boxer. So you don't agree with him. Okay, fine.

Father Sirico. When he speaks on moral issues, such as abortion and contraception and the like, then he speaks on that

--

Senator Boxer. So who is cherry-picking? You're saying that when the planet is facing all these problems, it is not a moral issue. I don't agree with you.

Father Sirico. I never said that. Where did I say that? Could you give me that quotation, Senator?

Senator Boxer. You just said it, sir.

Father Sirico. I did not. I certainly did not.

Senator Boxer. Sir, you receive money from the Koch brothers, from Exxon, you disagree with the Pope,

Father Sirico. I never said I didn't --

Senator Boxer. -- and you tend to wear the cloth you are in front of us?

Senator Inhofe. Okay, okay.

Senator Boxer. I think you ought to have a talk with Reverend Nelson.

Father Sirico. Who is, by the way, not a scientist.

Senator Inhofe. Okay, Senator Barrasso.

Senator Barrasso. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I think I ought to just not ask any questions and just let ask, anything else you want to say on my time, Father?

Father Sirico. What I was trying to do is put into perspective the notion of how an institute is funded. And, by the way, it is not just an educational institute like ours; it is political campaigns like the Senator's.

Senator Barrasso. So when Democrats make a pilgrimage to Tom Steyer's house in California, who promises \$100 million to their funds, including members of this Committee, that might be something that --

Father Sirico. That might be something. I would have to look into that. I don't know what Soros gives and things like that. The point is that we exist for the purpose of helping people understand the moral foundations of the free economy, and it is a shame that one has to come to the United States Senate to make that case and to be opposed on it.

We go to donors and ask them to support that, and then because of political motivations this is distorted into insinuating that we are somehow being purchased by industry. We get less than 5 percent of our money from industry, and we are defending capitalism. I think we should get more money from industry because we are defending enterprise. So to distort it and make it sound like somehow we are going out like moral prostitutes to gain this support I think is disingenuous, at the least.

Senator Barrasso. And the Pope is infallible on matters of faith and religion, but not on the matters of science and philosophy.

Father Sirico. And does not claim, and does not claim to be infallible on science or economics.

Senator Barrasso. Thank you.

Mr. Epstein, I would like to read to you something that came out from the Energy and Environment Climate Wire. It has to do with Wyoming. It is called Powder River Basin: Coal's Western Stronghold Faces Precarious Future. In the article, it says, "Overall, Wyoming coal production has decreased 14 percent since 2011. The economic consequences have been extreme." It goes through the fact that we continue to lose jobs, hundreds have been laid off again last week.

It says, "Even before these recent layoffs, the Wyoming Department of Workforce Services reported that Campbell County had experienced one of the largest jumps in unemployment across the State last year." Now, these, as you know, are real people, real jobs, good-paying jobs providing for their families.

The jobs are being crushed because of political decisions made by this Administration that decided that coal was politically incorrect. People do not know where to go, how to get a similar job, the same pay, the same benefits, how to provide for their families.

So rather than making coal cleaner or burning it cleaner, or recognizing the benefits that coal provides not only to communities like Gillette that depend on it, but also to low-income communities across the Country in terms of the cost of electricity, the Administration has basically towed the line

from their big green activist groups and the elite special interests who pay millions and millions of dollars to candidates who support that viewpoint, my question is this: Is there a moral argument to be made that communities, coal communities shouldn't be crushed by their own Government to appease special interests?

Mr. Epstein. Well, I disagree with the way people talk about jobs. It is perfectly legitimate for an individual or a community to lose jobs if it is out-competed by a superior product. What is happening here, though, they are being forced out of business despite creating a superior product, a life-enhancing product, fossil fuel energy, that in its modern incarnation even coal today is some of the cleanest energy people have ever had access to. In North Dakota you have some of the cleanest air in the Country and an enormous amount of coal-fired power.

I want to comment on the nature of the industry because it seems to be an easy way to score points to talk about somebody's affiliation with the industry. Now, I do not happen to be funded by anybody, since I am an independent speaker and writer, but I am very proud that I sell books to and give speeches to fossil fuel companies. These are companies that everyday have individuals who are taking action to make all of us alive.

And without being too rude about it, most of the people on this Committee are quite into their years. Very few of you would be alive without cheap, plentiful, reliable energy. Everything you are wearing, whatever made it possible for you to get here is made possible by energy. And it is not just energy in general; you have to produce it cheaply, reliably, scaleably, efficiently.

And you can talk about, oh, I think that can be done via solar. The way to figure that out is to compete on the free market. But as long as your life is being made possible by the people of the fossil fuel industry, I think you should be grateful and I think it is a crime, a moral crime that you are damning anyone by association.

And I wish Senator Whitehouse were here, because what he is doing to the free speech of those companies and anyone associated with them is unconstitutional, and I think he should apologize or resign.

Senator Barrasso. Thank you very much for the comments. I appreciate your being here. I appreciate your writings and appreciate you taking the time to be here.

Mr. Epstein. Thank you. And I am serious. You violate the Constitution, you resign. I thought that was a policy in the United States.

Senator Barrasso. General Scales, the Department of Defense, under this Administration, has spent millions of Department of Defense funds on alternative fuels, and they have done it in the name of climate change. Now, this is despite millions in funding for alternative fuel research and other departments of Government.

I think there is a thing that comes out each year called the Pig Book. It is about citizens against Government waste and it talks about how the Navy, earlier in this Administration, spent in excess of \$400 per gallon for about 20,000 gallons of algae-based fuel. Senator McCain frequently references this when he speaks.

How is this improving readiness, safety of troops, sailors, airmen, by paying \$400 per gallon for biofuels and other similar climate-related Department of Defense --

General Scales. Well, thank you, Senator. First of all, let me say that our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines understand intuitively, because they are of that generation, that they need to be good stewards of the environment, like all the rest of our citizens; and the military has an obligation not to pollute the atmosphere or to spill oil in motor pools.

And I think, because the military is a disciplined organization, they do a remarkable job of -- if you have ever

been to a military installation like Fort Sill, you will see that they are very careful about protecting the environment.

But to your point, when it gets to the point where the efficiency of our weapons, the ability of aircraft to fly and ships to sail are impeded by this obsession of going to alternative means of propulsion, or when the cost gets so high that things like readiness and modernization and manning levels are affected by the diversion of attention and funds, then it becomes a problem; and most of the military people I talk to about this issue tend to agree with that. They agree, protect the environment as a priority; but as a national security not so much.

Senator Barrasso. Well, and to your point, I would just say that I spent Thanksgiving with our Wyoming National Guard at Bagram Air Force in Northern Afghanistan, you know, north of Kabul, and the same things that you described that are occurring on the bases in the United States, our soldiers are doing the same job of protecting environment around the world.

General Scales. Right.

Senator Barrasso. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Inhofe. Thank you, Senator Barrasso.

And for those who came in a little bit late, we extended our questioning time by a minute, to six minutes, in the hopes that everyone will stay within their six minutes. All right?

Senator Markey?

Senator Markey. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, very much.

I have in my hand here the encyclical from Pope Francis, *Laudato Si'*, on the care of our common home. This is the Pope's encyclical on the environment. He decided, in order to reinforce the message, to come to Capitol Hill. On Capitol Hill the Pope delivered a sermon on the Hill to the members of the House and the Senate, and to the American people.

As we all know, the Pope taught chemistry. The Pope taught chemistry. And here is what he said to us. He said, number one, the planet is dangerously warming, and the science is clear. Number two, human beings are the most significant new contributor to the dangerous warming of the planet, and the science is clear. Number three, since human beings are making this significant contribution to this problem, we have a moral responsibility to do something about it. The United States, as the historically largest contributor to greenhouse gases, red, white and blue CO2 up in the atmosphere, that we have a responsibility to be the leader to reduce the risk to this planet.

Now, following on what Senator Whitehouse said, by the way, with whom I agree 100 percent, the issue then comes to why haven't we dealt with this issue? What has been the problem? Well, the problem is that there are groups out there in the fossil fuel industry whose business model, whose profit-making model aligns totally with adding more CO2 up into the atmosphere and denying the relationship between CO2 and the dangerous warming of the planet. They make money the more they contribute to the problem. The Koch brothers are the tip of that huge iceberg, but it is massive.

Now, what is the evidence of that? Well, the evidence is that they have been the leaders in stopping the free market from working. They are the single greatest force fighting the free market in our Country. Subsidies for the oil industry, 100 years old. Subsidies for the coal industry, 100 years old. Subsidies for the nuclear industry, 70 years old.

But try to get same level of subsidies for the wind and the solar industry, and these industries write letters to members of Congress saying, please do not allow for the perversion of subsidies to infect the free market, even though their entire business premises are tax breaks from the Government.

So they are acting at a hypocrisy level that is historic in size. And the Pope came here to talk about that, to talk about this power which these industries have. Even as recently as

2005 the United States was only producing 70 total megawatts new added to the grid from solar. Seventy total.

And then we began to win, our side began to win; the tax breaks going on the books, the States having laws saying there had to be a portfolio, an amount of solar and wind that came to generate electricity. This year there is going to be 14,000 new megawatts of solar in one year. Only 70 total in 2005. For wind, 7,000 megawatts new. Almost nothing in 2005.

So we have finally begun to break out. We are finally beginning to win. And what happens out on the free market when the same subsidies are given to the new technologies? Peabody Coal Company today declared bankruptcy. That is a free market, ladies and gentlemen. Finally, the new sources of energy can in fact compete. Let the free market work.

Let the science also inform the decisions made with regard to what the effects are of using fossil fuels as a way of generating this electricity.

Same thing is true with the fuel economy standards of the vehicles which we drive. Ford, General Motors, Chrysler, they all said, oh, we cannot increase the efficiency of our vehicles, even though we know that those tailpipes are sending greenhouse gases up into the atmosphere. Finally, finally the Congress acted and passed the law that said, no, you must increase the fuel economy standards.

Guess what happened? This year they are going to have the largest single sales of vehicles because the American people are finally realizing that they can have good cars with fuel efficiency and reduce the amount of greenhouse gases going up into the atmosphere. The free market, in other words, working.

And when Waxman-Markey, this bill that the Koch brothers and others spent upwards of \$300 million to defeat in the Congress, even in that bill Henry Waxman and I added \$200 million for the coal industry, for the coal industry, \$200 billion for carbon capture and sequestration. Peabody Coal said no. Peabody Coal said no. They said no. Okay? So even as you tried to help the workers, even as you tried to create a bridge, they said no.

So, ladies and gentlemen, from a national security perspective, this is dangerous. General Gordon Sullivan was my first witness on the Select Committee on Energy Conservation and Global Warming. Here is what he said. He was the Chief of Staff for the Army at Blackhawk Down Mogadishu. He said this in his testimony: one, he realized in retrospect that it was a drought that led to a famine that led to aid that had gone in, and now the gangs were now fighting in Somalia, and he had to order sending in Americans who got killed because of the impact of climate change in Somalia. This does have a national security impact.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Inhofe. Thank you, Senator Markey.

Senator Capito?

Senator Capito. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank the panelists for being here today.

Obviously, I come at this from a very different perspective, living in and being a native West Virginian, which has a lot of fossil fuels, a lot of coal, a lot of families. And when I hear my colleague cheering that a major corporation in this Country has gone bankrupt, you know what I think about? The thousands of families who now don't know if they are going to be working, if they are going to have a paycheck. There is no off-ramp for them. Those employees have to come home today and wonder if they are going to be able to support their families.

This isn't something to cheer about. This is a human tragedy that I am living in my State of West Virginia. And they may get tired of hearing about the 10,000 jobs that we have lost in West Virginia, the county school systems that are now cutting 30 and 40 and 50 teachers because of the loss of population, the pessimistic, downtrodden pockets of poverty that have been created in certain areas of our Country, Wyoming being one, four States in recession because of the policies.

You can say free market all you want. This is the policies that have been promulgated by this Administration that is maybe not the only cause, but one of the major causes of poverty creation in our own Country. And I can't even talk about it, hardly, without expressing the disdain for the glee that I hear when poverty is being created, people are losing their jobs, families are being devastated. There is a better way to do this. There is a better way to do this.

So my questions are, Mr. Epstein, you talk about the moral case for fossil fuels and you talk about I think a lot of the conversation goes around what this does in the international community, but I am concentrating, obviously, on what is going on in our own Country. So how do you see this impacting a low-income, particularly Appalachia? I am sure you have done study on that and looked at that area of the Country. We are deeply affected by this.

Mr. Epstein. And, again, the reason to have sympathy for the situation is that they are not being punished for doing something bad by the market. They are being punished for doing something good by people who believe that fossil fuels are evil. And I tried to give the big picture case why the exact opposite is true.

As I mentioned at the beginning, energy is the industry that powers every other industry. So when the price of energy

goes up, the price of everything else goes up. When the price of energy goes down, the price of everything else goes down.

So every aspect of your life, you can't even isolate one because it is the cost of your food, the cost of your clothing, the cost of your shelter, the success of your business, your ability to take a vacation, the cost of all the different modern miracles, the cost of your healthcare. They are all tied to energy. Even things like scientific inquiry. If we don't have a machine-based civilization powered by cheap, plentiful, reliable energy, there are no universities. That is a modern development that came out of industrial fossil-fueled civilization.

So whenever anyone talks about something that even increases the price of energy a little bit, yet alone Germany three to four times, yet alone the Obama policies, which would do much worse, you have to think about that is killing people, that is making them suffer, that is preventing them from being able to afford medical care, that is making their food more expensive. Every aspect of life is made worse.

But let's look at the positive. If we can liberate energy in this next election, we have an unbelievable opportunity to improve every area of life in this Country.

Senator Capito. Thank you. I sat in the audience and listened to the Pope speak, and I was very appreciative of many

of his words and I thought he gave a very moving address to Congress and really to the Nation, and very appreciative of that.

And certainly I was paying close attention to what he was saying about clean energy and climate change because that has big impacts on where I live. But what I heard him say after he talked about his concerns, he adds on his concern for poverty and what the cost of high energy and the changes that we are making drastically can do and what the cost of poverty is at the same time. So I was very appreciative of what he had to say and I saw it through a different lens, I think, because of where I live.

So very briefly, General, I know that the military has made a great emphasis with Secretary Panetta to move to green energy, and I think, as you know, we all know we can conserve and do better, and certainly the military is in that category.

But where I think we could make a better impact is to have longer timelines to develop more research, to use fossil fuels for jet engine. You can convert and there is all kinds of research that could be occurring. Do you find that that is occurring within the DOD or is it more of a drive to green energy and that is it?

General Scales. I do think, I know in Fort Sill and places in the Southwest they are using both wind energy and solar on

post to reduce the cost of energy. I know that the services are experimenting with alternative fuels. But the bottom line is simply this: so far, at least, a fighter plane or a ship or a tank simply can't be made efficient in close combat without the density of energy that is in liquid fossil fuels. You simply can't do it.

Now, I will also say that many of my colleagues are saying that in the long-term perhaps this will change. My concern is that if the commander-in-chief says to his soldiers, who obey orders, it is time to start thinking of other ways to propel a tank or an aircraft, it may cause something to happen before its time and it may very well impede our ability to fight future wars.

Senator Capito. Thank you very much.

Senator Inhofe. Thank you.

Senator Gillibrand has very generously agreed to swap turns with Senator Sullivan. Then we will go back and take care of the rest.

Thank you so much.

Senator Sullivan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank my colleague from New York. I am going to go preside here in a minute, so thanks for the flop. I want to thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member for holding this hearing, and the witnesses.

I think this is a really great topic, and it is also great to have a little bit of a heated debate here. So I appreciate you doing this. I know sometimes it is not easy; you have members of the Committee on both sides trying to go after the incentives for you to be up here testifying, and I am just going to say I assume you are all here on good faith, on what you believe, so I really appreciate that.

I also want to just echo what my colleague from West Virginia mentioned. I have the utmost respect for my friend from Massachusetts, but, holy cow, if he is celebrating the bankruptcy and job loss of hundreds of Americans, we have something wrong going on here, in my view. We shouldn't ever be doing that.

I think she was very passionate about what she said and very persuasive, so I certainly hope nobody would, particularly on this Committee, be celebrating the job losses and hard times that a lot of Americans, because of the policies of this Administration, certainly my State has seen that, are experiencing right now.

I just want to touch very quickly and, Father, maybe you can touch on this. We talk a lot about moral imperative. I have been someone who thinks that one of the biggest issues that we don't talk about here in this Congress, Democrats or

Republicans, and it relates to these policies we are talking to, is that we can't grow our economy.

There is a debate on fossil fuels, Obamacare. We debate everything. There is one issue that is not debatable: the last eight years, by any historical measure, have had some of the weakest economic growth in U.S. history. Never broken 3 percent GDP growth in the entire Obama Administration era. Last quarter I think we grew .1 percent, and nobody even says anything.

Is there a moral imperative to grow the economy and allow for free enterprise and free markets? That is what has made this Country strong; strong traditional levels of American growth, 3, 4 percent GDP growth, Democrats, Republicans. We can't even come close to it.

So you know what they do in Washington now? They dumb it down. They don't say, hey, we need to get back to 3 percent GDP growth, or 4, which will create opportunities for families, particularly those on the lower ladders of the economic ladder. We just dumb it down and say this is the new normal. The new normal. We are going to now tell Americans that we can only grow 1 percent. Don't worry, you should be satisfied with that.

The secretary of the Treasury never comes out and says, don't worry, America, we grew it .1 percent GDP growth last quarter; I have a plan. No. They dumb it down and say we should just accept that, it is the new normal.

Father, what do you think of that?

I would also like Mr. Epstein to maybe weigh in on that one as well.

Father Sirico. Well, I have no doubt that one of the green passages that are underlined in Dr. Nelson's Bible is the command of God to the newly created human family to multiply and have dominion over the world.

But the normative way in which we rise out of poverty is through human action; it is through human beings using their intellect, using their freedom, engaging their talents and their risk to produce from the fruits of the earth, because we do not become better off by having natural resources in nature. We become better off by having those resources drawn from nature and placed at human service.

And the fossil fuel industry, it seems to me, has been one of those great resources of human betterment on this planet, and the wealth of the United States, historically, and, indeed, the world has been predicated on that.

I find it a dangerously mistaken notion to think, and this may come as a shock to the Committee, that the Government is the source of wealth in this Country, or the source of jobs. And I saw that mistaken notion of thinking when the Senator from Massachusetts assumed that tax exemptions or credits were tax subsidies.

If you want to resolve that whole problem and have a nice bipartisan approach, remove all of the subsidies and all of the credits from all of the industries and let them compete on the free market that Senator Markey, I think inadvertently, was endorsing.

Senator Sullivan. Mr. Epstein, do you have a view on the issue of how we can't grow the economy, what that does for hope, what that does for poverty, what that does for the outlook of the American family?

Mr. Epstein. I think one of the tensions on the Committee on this issue is how do you weigh economic growth and then how do you weigh these kinds of environmental considerations. And this is exactly the kind of consideration that is the subject of philosophy, which Senator Boxer has said is unnecessary, although she thinks religion is necessary to evaluate science, which I don't get.

But what philosophy teaches us is how to look at the big picture, and with these issues the crucial concept, which is in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, is individual rights. We want the policies that protect the rights of individual to pursue their own flourishing without interference by others. So if you do it right, what you do is you set scientific, not speculative, but scientific thresholds

for things like CO2, where there is no relevant threshold right now for different kinds of air pollution, for other things.

So what you do is you liberate individuals to be as productive as possible while protecting each other's rights; and that is absolutely possible. And if that were done, we would have a thriving economy because fracking really slipped by Obama. He didn't really know about it. If he had known about it, he would have probably tried to get it banned.

So our prosperity right now depends on the ignorance of our politicians, which is pretty scary. But imagine if we had been free to frac, if we are free to produce energy, we are free in every other sector of the economy while having rational rights protecting environmental laws, we will grow 5 or 10 percent.

Senator Sullivan. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I want to thank again my colleague from New York.

Senator Inhofe. Yes. Thank you, Senator Sullivan. Go preside.

Senator Gillibrand, again, thank you very much for accommodating his schedule.

Senator Gillibrand. Thank you. This is quite a hearing.

I have a copy of Pope Francis' beautiful encyclical on climate change. Pope Francis reminds us the impacts of climate

change are often most acutely felt by those who are most vulnerable and who do not have the resources to adapt.

So, Reverend Nelson, can you talk a little bit about the effects that environmental degradation and resource scarcity has on communities like the one you serve in Memphis? Why do so many religious leaders believe that we have a moral imperative to address climate change?

And just in response to the last area of debate, on page 9 it says, "My predecessor, Benedict, likewise proposed eliminating the structural causes of the dysfunctions of the world economy and correcting models of growth which have proved incapable of ensuring respect for the environment." So just as a commentary on the last discussion.

Reverend Nelson, I would like your thoughts.

Rev. Nelson. Thank you. One of the great challenges in low-income communities is that many of them have had to bear the brunt of toxic waste, have had to deal with a number of issues regarding being located next to power plants that set off great emissions in the life of a community.

We have seen children who have developed all types of illnesses. And one of the greatest pieces in the community that I was in was the issue of asthma, which causes children to miss many days of school. That is never recorded in any kind of educational record; it is basically at the end of their tenure

in school, they miss too many days or they haven't been able to catch up with their work. So low-income children end up being further and further behind in the educational process due to a lot of these kinds of toxic problems that they are having with the environment.

And we are able to attribute, I think there is documentation across the board that has attributed that in most of these communities where there are heavy carbon emissions this is symptomatic of it, children not being able to make it to school and to be able to respond.

Senator Gillibrand. Yes, Reverend. I have the same problem in many places in my State. In the Bronx we have one of the highest asthma rates, and it is because of the density of transportation networks that don't rely on mass transit, as well as a lot of historic environmental degradation, along with a lot of poor air quality.

We also see it not just in our cities and our Country, but we also see it around the world. I would like to submit for the record a New York Times article specifically about Africa. And this is about what is happening in Zambia because most of their electricity is generated from a dam, from the Kariba, and it says, "But today, as a severe drought magnified by climate change has cut water levels to record low, the Kariba is generating so little juice that blackouts have crippled the

nation's already hurting businesses. After a decade of being heralded as the vanguard of African growth, Zambia, in a quick, mortifying let down, is now struggling to pay its own civil servants and has reached out to the International Monetary Fund for help." So this is a world problem.

And I would like to submit that for the record, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Inhofe. Without objection.

Senator Gillibrand. Thank you.

[The referenced information follows:]

Senator Gillibrand. Mr. Breen, I would like to talk a little bit about the Quadrennial Defense review. It classified global climate change as a threat multiplier. Could you please discuss the impacts of resource competition, particularly those in the developing world, on political instability? Also talk about the impact of our own national security.

And I know, because I serve on the Armed Services Committee, we have hardened a lot of our bases so that we are energy independent, so we don't have to rely on Middle Eastern oil. We don't even have to rely on fossil fuels. So we have Fort Drum, for example, that is entirely able to be off the grid at any moment and be entirely self-sustaining.

So I see this military as understanding where the threats actually lie and responding to them through energy independence, through renewables. And if you talk to anybody on the battlefield, if they don't have equipment that can recharge remotely, and not have to have large trucks of gasoline and oil delivering to bases, it is such a risk for them that they are dependent on these supply chains. So if they can have portable supplies, portable batteries, portable solar energy, it is so much more effective for our military and our fighting forces worldwide.

So could you please comment on those thoughts?

Mr. Breen. Sure. Thank you, Senator.

The military is, without a doubt, doing a lot of things to make itself more agile and more lethal on the battlefield with respect to energy. There is nothing abstract about this; I lived this firsthand as a 23-year-old lieutenant in Iraq fighting every night to get the fuel convoy into my perimeter I needed to run an inefficient gas generator. Today my colleagues have solar panels and tactical solar systems that run the same. They don't have to take the same kind of risks; they have taken action to reduce their logistical tail.

The fuel purchase, the fuel tests that the Senator alluded to earlier, that is intended to make sure that the Navy's fighter aircraft have combat capability with a broader range of fuel, so if something happens to the traditional petroleum fuel supply, they can operate on other fuels. That is about combat impact; that is about strategic flexibility.

But to your point about the Quadrennial Defense Review, I really do want to make this point. It is not just official policy of the Department of Defense that national security is a risk; it is not just the consensus of these 16 retired admirals and generals and many others who have no skin in the game, commandants in the Marine Corps, chiefs of staff of the Army who sign their names to this. I represent an organization with over 1,500 people who served on the front lines, soldiers and civilians.

What we have seen with our own eyes tells us these dynamics are real. When I was serving in Afghanistan, the going rate to fire 107 millimeter Chinese rocket at me and my paratroopers was \$10. The people taking that money were farmers whose crops wouldn't grow. Now, the guy giving them the money, that was the guy who we were in the country to capture or kill. He is not doing it because he is poor; he is a sworn enemy of the United States. But why are we making his job easier by failing to address the underlying conditions that allow him to recruit? And making my job harder by giving me more people to fight?

If you have walked those hills and lived those dynamics, there is nothing abstract or theoretical about the impact of flooding and drought and famine. Of course, people who can't feed their kids are going to turn to violence. And when they get organized in groups and start killing each other, that is called war.

Senator Gillibrand. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to say one thing. I am disturbed by a lot of the testimony I have heard today. If we are talking about religious values and Judeo-Christian values, we are talking about the Golden Rule, which is love one another as you would love to be loved; treat one another as you would like to be treated; love one another with all our hearts and souls. Individualism, as you talk about, has nothing to do with that

basic Judeo-Christian value. That is why we care about what policies we pass as a Nation and how they affect one another. We cannot live isolated lives and not care about effects.

So when someone is talking about moving this Country towards a renewable future, where we aren't polluting our neighbors' territories, our neighbors' states, anything burned in the Midwest, it dumps all the toxins on New York State. There are communities that have cancer in the numbers for children and women because of toxins, because of what we do somewhere else in the Country.

So please, as we debate these issues, and we are going to talk about values, let's talk about our founding principles of this Country. We have always believed that our democracy is strongest when we care about the least among us.

Senator Inhofe. Thank you, Senator Gillibrand.

Senator Booker?

Senator Booker. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for this hearing. I was a mayor for eight years of an inner city, and I had no time for philosophy besides reading, and I had the practicality of having to balance budgets and deliver services. I often talked to my Republican friends, who I worked in partnership with during my time, and said there was no government leader that cut government more than I did. I cut 25 percent of my workforce while I was there; no government in New

Jersey. The State, 21 counties, 565 municipalities. I partnered with big banks like Goldman Sachs, and unions to bring about Newark, New Jersey's biggest economic development boom in 60 years, bringing in billions and billions of dollars in development; new hotels, jobs, and the like.

I am a pragmatist, a fierce pragmatist. And what is outrageous to me is people who want to preach the free market. But what they are really defending is a perversion of the free market like at colossal costs. We know there are things called negative externalities when it comes to business, and the challenge we have right now is we are allowing businesses and corporations to pass on costs to society. This Government spends billions and billions of dollars, this Committee, brownfields cleanup, Superfund cleanup. Billions of dollars. I applied for these grants from government to clean up the costs of businesses who did not assume their costs.

I have one of the most polluted rivers in America in the Passaic River that we just approved billions of dollars to clean up the negative externalities of corporations that have, in a sense, going to philosophy, are poisoning the commons. The get all you can, pursue what you want philosophy is clearly destroying the commons in our Country.

And this, Pastor, which you so eloquently write about in your testimony, is the agony that I see every single day, that

in a global, knowledge-based economy, the most valuable natural resource any Country has is not gas or oil or coal; it is the genius of our children. We are squandering that natural resource in ways that are greater than the oil spill in the Gulf Coast or any spill off the coast of California.

The number one reason my kids miss school, the number one reason my children in Newark, Camden, Passaic, Patterson miss school is because of the environmental toxins that cause them illnesses and ailments which our corporations outsourcing onto them, ranging from asthma to lead paint poisoning. I now have a city where nature has been so corrupted where I live, and I tell you right now, 100 Senators, I don't know anyone that goes back to their home in a census track that is in poverty.

So my community can't dig in their soil because it is poisoned with lead. We have to use planters above because of negative externalities from corporations. We can't fish in our water. All the clams, all the fish taken away. Can't breathe the air because of toxins in the air are causing epidemic asthma rates.

What happens to a people that have been divorced from nature because of these negative externalities? The costs are clear. We can measure this data in terms of what it means to have lost productivity of children. Millions and millions of lost school days and work days because of these environmental

toxins. So I believe in the free market, but what we have right now is a perversion of that market. And what you are doing, what we can't measure is the lost genius of our children.

Now, I know Memphis. My brother lives in Memphis. Ain't that much different than Newark. And what is tragic to me is that the children of your city and my city, there is just as much genius there as in our wealthiest communities. That lost potential, that lost productivity, that lost artistry because of this philosophy that is a perversion of the free market.

It is insulting to me that we are letting these costs consistently be passed on. We are not a Nation of individual rugged individualism. Rugged individualism didn't get us to the moon, it didn't map the human genome. It is our genius cooperation and partnership one to another. I know in our Declaration of Independence we recognize this interdependency, this need for each other when we talk about pledging to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor. Sacred honor.

So, Pastor, in the 10 seconds I have left, God bless you for advocating true free market capitalism, because the value of the children in your city, the environmental impact, what is it doing to the most precious resource God has ever created? Not coal in the ground, not gas released by fracking. The most valuable natural resource, what has it done?

Rev. Nelson. It is damaging whole communities of people. And I believe that as we read our holy books, the reality is that community is the beginning of formation, and how we are formed not only in the home, but how we are formed in the extended community itself. And when we find individuals who are dying of cancer too early, when we are looking at matriarchs and patriarchs of families who are struggling with what it means to work and come home and develop all kinds of sicknesses and illnesses, it deals with not only the psyche of parents of children and how they raise them, but it also deals with the fabric of whole families.

We are struggling with what that means. It is not just the issue of the physical illnesses, but also what it does to a person mentally, who cannot work, who cannot provide for their families, who are finding themselves struggling with energy and having sustaining energy in their own lives to be able to go to work every day and come home.

This has a devastating effect upon whole populations of people but, more importantly, it has a devastating effect upon families. And when we talk about building family life and the life of the United States of America, one of the realities is when parents come home sick, when they come home struggling, when they can't work, and then when their children can't go to school, and they are poor and don't have the levels of

assistance to either take care of those family members or those children, it puts a whole cycle of people in poverty and they remain there.

Senator Booker. Thank you, sir.

Senator Inhofe. I thank the panel.

Against my better judgment, my Ranking Member has asked for three minutes to close, and I will grant that as the Chairman of this Committee, but it will be only three minutes, and I will be following with three minutes. Then we will be adjourning.

Senator Boxer?

Senator Boxer. Thanks.

I will never forget this hearing. First, we have a philosopher who wants Senator Whitehouse to resign, Senator Whitehouse who is working every day to stop carbon pollution and save lives. We have a philosopher telling us that Senator Whitehouse should resign.

Then we have Father Sirico, who is proud to ask for more money from polluting corporations right here at the Environment Committee. He asked for more money from polluting corporations. Then we have a retired general who turns on the DOD. We have a Republican Senator who compares taking political money from polluters to taking political money from environmental advocates.

And we have another Republican Senator, this is unbelievable, blaming President Obama for slow economic growth, when the average yearly job growth under President Obama is 1.3 million, okay, average yearly growth of jobs, compared to 160,000 year under George W. Bush, who actually didn't create one new private sector job.

Now, look, to many people's delight and some people's sadness, I won't be here that much longer, but I have to tell you this hearing, I thank my Chairman for it because we have a job to do. This is the Environment Committee. We need to get back to what our mission is. I was here when Republicans and Democrats worked together. I mean, Senator Booker is trying so hard to do it today, and he is making progress and all of us are.

But that was the norm. The days of John Warner, the days of John Chaffee, the days when we could look across the aisle and realize maybe we didn't have every Democrat, but we sure picked up a few Republicans, it is gone. It is gone. The very people who testified and said climate change is real, we have to do something about it, when I took the gavel, which was so lovely, in 2008, those people have all changed; they are gone. They either quit or they are not around. Why? The insidious role of dirty money in politics, sometimes it is secret, sometimes it is not so secret.

Father, I respect you. You are right there. Give me more corporate money. Oh, yeah, I take money from the Koch brothers, just a little. Oh, I take money from Exxon, but it is just a little. How can you not have a compass inside that tells you it is not right, that there is a conflict there, when you testify on the environment in front of the Environment Committee and don't realize that you have a conflict.

So let's get back, Mr. Chairman, to the days when we had cooperation on this.

Senator Inhofe. Thank you, Senator Boxer.

Now I want to take my three minutes.

First of all, if you are talking about why is it you never hear from this side about Tom Steyer, who said he is going to put \$100 million to try to resurrect the issue of global warming? Why is it we keep hearing the same thing from the individuals over here that the science is settled, the science is settled, when in fact it is not settled?

Why is it we hear from people over here that when you have an increase in the emissions it produces warmer weather, when in fact, starting in 1895, that was the first time that they came along and declared and used the word another ice age is coming? Then that changed in 1918, then in 1945. It happens that we went into a cooling period in 1995. Now, 1995 was the year of the greatest increase in the release, this was right after the

war, of greenhouse gases, and it precipitated not a warm period, but a cold period.

Lastly, I would say I was kind of going for memory, so I haven't looked it up, but I do know, and it seems to be truer today when I read I think it is Romans 1:25, when they said we will come to the point when we will be worshipping not the creator, but the creation. I think we have come to that point.

Now, I have a minute and a half left over, and I think perhaps, Father, you were attacked a little bit more than the rest. You take about 45 seconds.

Then the same with you, Mr. Epstein. And if there is anything left over, General, you got it.

Father Sirico. Thank you, Senator. I am from Brooklyn, so I can take an attack. I can also give one, too. And let me just point out how, again, I want to be polite, the word is disingenuous to have people quote to me parts of a papal encyclical or a papal elocution like the sermon that was delivered here, and only choose the parts that are not magisterial parts, certainly things that he said as a man who is reflecting on these things, but not those very parts that are key to his pontificate, namely the things having to do not just with life vis-a-vis the environment, but life in the womb, which you have opposed. And the disingenuity of all of this is of great concern to me.

The question that Senator Booker raises about externalities is an exactly precise and good question, and is better resolved by a clearer definition of the right of private property; not by obscuring the right of private property or controlling it or taxing it, but precisely to define it more clearly so that people are responsible for those externalities and the vulnerable don't suffer from it.

I respect the time.

Senator Inhofe. Thank you. The time has expired. We are adjourned, and I thank very much our witnesses for coming and exposing themselves to this type of treatment.

[Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m. the committee was adjourned.]