

SaskPower is also claiming that the project will need at least a year of stable operation to prove the technical operation and the economics of the project, which would aid in determining commercial viability. SaskPower has announced it will not be able to make an informed decision about carbon capture sequestration until 2018. Yet the EPA here in the United States of America is demanding that all U.S. coal-fired generation industry implement this technology now. That is what I have said all along: If it is not obtainable, which it has not been—we have not spent the money trying to develop this technology, and it hasn't worked—shouldn't we at least make sure it works before we force a complete overhaul of the system or people to meet standards that are unobtainable.

These recent revelations prove that CCS is still technically unproven and still potentially damaging in a powerplant application. Therefore, it is foolish for this administration to require it now for new U.S. coal plants.

Last week I wrote a letter to Administrator McCarthy about these reports because forcing coal to meet standards when experts know that the required technology is not adequately demonstrated on a commercial scale makes absolutely no sense at all. Instead, I believe the EPA should scrap this impossible-to-meet rule or amend it to require advanced technology that has actually been implemented which would offer improved environmental performance and is commercially viable.

For the administration, this rule is more about desirability rather than feasibility, with little regard for rising consumer prices, the effects on jobs, and the impact on the reliability of our electric grid.

This administration thinks the country can do without coal. I will simply tell my colleagues this: They are in total denial. They might not like it, they might not want it, but it is built into the plan for the next 20 to 30 years. They have flat out ignored their own data that says that coal will produce more than 30 percent of our electricity through 2040.

It is completely contradictory that the EPA continues to impose unreasonable and unattainable rules in an attempt to regulate coal into extinction. The people who suffer are hard-working West Virginians and consumers across this great country. If these regulations go into effect, no new coal plants could begin new operations, more Americans would lose their jobs, and economic uncertainty would grow.

The Nation's coal-fired powerplants currently have an average age of 45 years, the average age of all coal plants in America today, which produce close to 40 percent of our power. Many will need to be replaced in the near future, and regulations that prohibit building new coal-fired powerplants can soon become a serious issue for the Nation's electricity grid and the reliability we all depend upon.

Although the Energy Information Administration—the EIA—within the Department of Energy still projects 37 percent of electricity generation will come from coal in 2040—I remind you, this administration that has put together rules that are unattainable and unreasonable is saying they are still going to need 37 percent of the electricity this country will need by 2040 from coal. The currently operating plants, without new additions, will average 65 years of age by that time. If nothing is done, these plants are averaging 65 years of age to produce the type of power this country needs. The history of coal plant operations already tells us coal plants at that age will not achieve the levels of hours of reliable operation required to meet the 2040 forecast.

The coal industry must be allowed to add the new coal-fired powerplant additions, such as the ultra-supercritical, which we know is technology that works. We know it works, but this is not the direction they are going. They are putting something that is unattainable in place. That is why we need to block this plan, the Clean Power Plan, that the President has brought before us because it cannot be attained and we are going to be in a deficit.

There is no doubt this President's agenda has already had a crushing impact on my State of West Virginia and other energy States around the country. We have to say enough is enough. In West Virginia we want clean air, we want clean water, and we are doing everything humanly possible. We have cleaned up the environment more in the last two decades than ever before.

If you look around the world, there is more coal being burned than has ever been burned before. The United States burns less than 1 billion tons of coal a year. Over 7 billion tons of coal are being burned elsewhere in the world, with 4 billion tons being burned just in China. I would venture to say nobody is meeting the standards that we are required to here for the technology that is going to be needed to be attained.

I will continue to explore all available options to prevent these unattainable regulations from impacting the State of West Virginia and the United States.

I would ask the President—this administration—to work with us to find and develop the technology that would allow us to use a product that we have in abundance in this country—which is coal—in the cleanest fashion. We can then export that technology around the world to clean up the overall environment and to help the environment around the globe.

Right now Congress needs to move forward to stop these rules that are crippling our energy production, jeopardizing the energy grid, and putting our workers out of good-paying jobs. I urge all my colleagues to support these resolutions that are put forward today when we vote.

Thank you.

## RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:17 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

## PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business and that I be allowed to speak without a time limit.

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

The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

## ISIL

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, it has been more than 1 year since President Obama spoke to the Nation about the threat posed by ISIL and escalated U.S. military operations against it. The goal at that time, the President said, was to degrade and destroy ISIL. One year ago, the goal was to degrade and destroy ISIL. It is impossible to look at where we are today and claim that the President's strategy is succeeding or that it is likely to succeed on anything approaching an acceptable timetable and level of risk.

No one should take this as a criticism of the men and women in uniform, as well as their civilian counterparts in the field, who are doing the best they can under the strategic and operational constraints they face, especially in the face of the White House's desire to revisit the Vietnam war tactics and to micromanage the military's campaign.

It is not that we have done nothing against ISIL; it is that there is no compelling reason to believe anything we are doing will be sufficient to destroy ISIL. Thousands of airstrikes against ISIL's targets have conjured the illusion of progress, but they have produced little in the way of decisive battlefield effects.

I noted with some interest that we provided some targeting for the French, who carried out airstrikes. I wonder why we hadn't done any of that in the last year.

ISIL continues to dominate Sunni Arab areas in the world, in both Iraq and Syria, and efforts to reclaim major population centers in those areas, such as Mosul, have stalled, to say the least. Meanwhile, ISIL continues to expand globally. It is now operating in Afghanistan, Yemen, Libya, Lebanon, and Egypt, and other radical Islamist groups, such as Boko Haram in Nigeria and al-Shabaab in Somalia, have pledged allegiance to ISIL. This appearance of success only enhances

ISIL's ability to radicalize, recruit, and grow.

In the past month, ISIL has commenced a new stage in its war on the civilized world by unleashing a wave of terrorist attacks around the globe. In Ankara, ISIL detonated two bombs outside a train station, killing 102 people and injuring over 400 more. In the skies over Egypt, ISIL destroyed a Russian civilian airliner with a bomb that killed all 224 passengers aboard. In Beirut, ISIL conducted 2 suicide bombings that killed 43 people and injured 239 more. In Baghdad, ISIL bombs killed 26 people and wounded more than 60 others. Finally, in the streets of Paris last week, as we all know, gunmen wearing suicide belts attacked innocent civilians at restaurants, bars, a soccer stadium, and a concert hall, killing at least 129 and wounding 352 other people.

The American people have experienced this kind of terror before, and we stand together with the people of Turkey, Russia, Lebanon, Iraq, France, and nearly 20 other nations whose citizens were murdered by these brutal atrocity committers. These attacks reveal nothing new about ISIL's character. ISIL is the face of evil in our world today. It has crucified its enemies, beheaded innocent journalists, burned a Muslim pilot alive in a cage, and it has condemned women and children and girls to slavery and torture and unspeakable sexual abuse. And when waging war on the living has failed to satisfy its savagery, ISIL has desecrated and destroyed many of the monuments to civilization that remain across the Middle East.

ISIL's latest attacks also reveal nothing new about its intentions. Everything that ISIL is doing is what their leaders have long said they would do. They have stated their aims explicitly and clearly. All we have to do is listen to their words. Indeed, as one author put it, ISIL has "toiled mightily to make their projects knowable."

What these attacks have demonstrated and what now should be clear is that ISIL is at war with us whether or not we admit we are at war with them. What should now be clear is that ISIL is determined to attack the heart of the civilized world—Europe and the United States—that it has the intent to attack us, the capabilities to attack us, and the sanctuary from which to plan those attacks. What should now be clear is that our people and our allies will not be safe until ISIL is destroyed—not just degraded but destroyed, and not eventually but as soon as possible.

Unfortunately—unfortunately—almost tragically, President Obama remains as ideologically committed as ever to staying the course he is on and impervious to new information that would suggest otherwise, as he made quite clear during his incredible press conference yesterday in Turkey. According to the President of the United States, anyone who disagrees with him is "popping off"—popping off.

I guess Michael Morell, former Deputy Secretary of the CIA, was just "popping off" when he said recently that "the downing of the Russian airliner, only the third such attack in 25 years, and the attacks in Paris, the largest in Europe since the Madrid bombings in 2004, make it crystal clear that our ISIS strategy is not working." That comes from Michael Morell, the former deputy head of the CIA under this President.

I guess Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN, vice chair of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, was just "popping off" when she said that "ISIL is not contained, ISIL is expanding" and that we need new military strategy and tactics.

I guess GEN Jack Keane, one of my heroes and architect of the successful surge strategy in Iraq, was just "popping off" when he said, "We are, in fact, losing this war. Moreover, I can say with certainty that this strategy will not defeat ISIS." This strategy will not defeat ISIS. That comes from the author of the surge which succeeded, which the President, by withdrawing all troops, allowed to go completely to waste, and the lives of brave young Americans were wasted.

I guess Hillary Clinton, the President's former Secretary of State and desired successor, was just "popping off" when she declared her support for a no-fly zone in Syria to "stop the carnage on the ground and from the air."

I guess GEN David Petraeus was just "popping off" when he testified to the Committee on Armed Services that the President's strategy has failed to create the military conditions to end the conflict in Syria and that ISIL will not be defeated until we do so.

I guess James Jeffrey, a career foreign officer and the President's Ambassador to Iraq, was just "popping off" when he wrote in the Washington Post today that the President needs to send thousands of ground troops to destroy ISIL.

What all of these national security leaders recognize is the reality that is staring us right in the face. It is the President who is once again failing to grasp it. He fails to understand even now that wars don't end just because he says they are over, that our terrorist enemies are not defeated just because he says they are, that the threat posed by ISIL is not contained because he desires it to be so, and that maybe, just maybe, the growing group of his bipartisan critics might just be right. And why won't he listen to them? Why won't he listen to these people of experience and knowledge and background? Whom does he listen to? Whom does the President listen to? He couldn't be listening to anybody knowledgeable and then make the comments he made at that press conference.

The President has had to go back on everything he said he would not do to combat the threats now emanating from Syria and Iraq. He said he would not arm moderate Syrian rebels be-

cause that would militarize the conflict. He was wrong. He said he would not intervene militarily in Iraq or Syria. He was wrong. He said he would not put boots on the ground in Syria. He was wrong. Now he says that his strategy is working, that all it needs is time, and that no further changes are required despite ISIL's campaign of terror. Now, get this straight. After the bombing in Paris, after the Russian airliner, after the other acts of terror, he needs time—he needs time—and no further changes are required. Does anybody believe him anymore?

What the President has failed to understand for nearly 5 years is that unless and until he leads an international effort to end the conflict in Syria and Iraq, the costs of this conflict will continue to mount. Those consequences have grown steadily, from mass atrocities and hundreds of thousands of dead in Syria, to the repeated use of weapons of mass destruction, to the rise of the world's largest terrorist army and its rampage across Syria and Iraq, to destabilizing refugee flows that have shaken the stability of Syria's neighbors and are now potentially changing the character of European society. Now we see the latest manifestation of this threat: global terrorist attacks directed and inspired by ISIL that killed hundreds around the world.

The Paris attacks, obviously, should be a wake-up call for all Americans, most of all for the President. If we stay the course, if we don't change our strategy now, we will be attacked. I don't know where, when, or how, but it will happen. Do we need to wait for more innocent people to die before we address the reality that is right before us? ISIL has said it intends to attack Washington, DC. Do we not take them at their word? Do we think they are not capable of it? Do we think time is on our side? It is not. Time is not on our side.

The lesson of the September 11 attack was that mass murderers cannot be permitted safe havens. They cannot be permitted safe havens from which to plot our destruction. Do we really have to pay that price again through the blood of our citizens?

For nearly 5 years, we have been told there is no military solution to the conflict in Syria and Iraq, as if anyone believes there is. In fact, one of the things that is most frustrating about the President's rhetoric is that he sets up straw men. He says we either should do nothing or the Republicans or critics—now Democrats as well—are wanting to send in 100,000 troops. We do not. We do not. We believe and I am convinced that we can send in a force composed of Sunni Arabs, of Egyptians, of Turks, and Americans—about 10,000—establish the no-fly zone, allow the refugees a sanctuary, and make sure that no barrel bombing will be allowed in those areas. We can succeed. ISIS is not invincible. The United States of America and our allies are far stronger. We are the strongest Nation on Earth.

To say we can't defeat ISIL—it is a matter of will, not a matter of whether or not it is a capability.

So I say to my colleagues and the American people, we can defeat ISIS and we can wipe them off the face of the Earth, but we have to have a strategy, and this President has never had a strategy.

For nearly 5 years we have been told that there is no military solution; that there are no good options; that our influence is limited, as if that is not always the case; that we won't succeed overnight, as if our problem is one of time, not policy; and that we can't solve every problem in the Middle East, as if that absolves us of our responsibility to make the situation better where we can. This isn't a question of our capacity, our capabilities, or our options. We have always had options to address this growing threat. But the longer we wait, the difficulty and risk and cost increase.

Four years ago, LINDSEY GRAHAM and I came to this floor and said: We need to have a no-fly zone and we need to arm and train the Free Syrian Army, once Bashar al-Assad crossed the redline. We could have done it then, and it would have been one heck of a lot easier. But this President didn't want to do it, and we are faced with a more complex situation. Tens of thousands or a couple hundred thousand Syrians dead and millions of refugees later, the President of the United States still won't act. He still believes, as he stated in his press conference yesterday, that, somehow, everything is going fine—what delusion.

After the attack on France, article 5 of NATO's founding treaty should be invoked, which states that an attack on one is an attack on all. That is what we did after 9/11. The United States should work with our NATO allies and our Arab partners to assemble a coalition that will take the fight to ISIL from the air and on the ground. My friends, air attacks only will not succeed. It will not succeed. I am sorry to tell you. I apologize ahead of time. We need boots on the ground—not 100,000 but about 10,000, with the capabilities that are unique to American service men and women. We can defeat ISIL.

We have to step up the air campaign by easing overly restrictive rules of engagement. At the same time, we have to recognize that ISIL will only be defeated by ground combat forces. Those don't exist today. We must recognize that our indirect efforts to support our partners on the ground—the Iraqi Security Forces, the moderate Syrian opposition force, the Kurdish Peshmerga, and the Sunni tribal forces—are insufficient to outpace the growing threat we face.

As I mentioned, the United States must therefore work to assemble a coalition and ground force with a commitment on the order of 10,000 U.S. troops.

In Syria, we must hasten the end of the civil war. We must accept that Russia and Iran are not interested in a

negotiated solution that favors U.S. interests. Russia and Iran have entirely different goals than the United States of America in Syria. Russia wants to keep Bashar Assad or his stooge in power, they want to keep their major influence in the region, and they want to protect their base there. The United States of America has none of those interests. They want to prop up the guy who has killed 240,000.

I appreciate the outpouring of concern of all my colleagues and all Americans about these refugees. The refugees are the result of a failure of Presidential and American leadership. They are not the cause of it. The cause of these hundreds of thousands or millions of refugees is because our policy failed. Bashar al-Assad slaughtered them with barrel bombs, and we are now faced with the threat, in some respects, of a possibility that one or more of these refugees, having gone through Greece, now are or possibly could be—as the Director of the CIA said yesterday—in ongoing operations to try to orchestrate attacks on America.

It is often said that America doesn't go abroad in search of monsters to destroy. But that doesn't mean there are no monsters in the world that seek to destroy us. The longer we wait to accept this reality, the greater is the cost we will pay.

One of my great heroes and role models, as is the case with many of our colleagues, is Winston Churchill. I would never compare myself to Winston Churchill in any possible way, except that I do sometimes have empathy with Winston Churchill, who, during the 1930s, came to the floor of the Parliament and made comments and speeches that were very, very moving, but no one paid any attention to him. In fact, he was ridiculed. In fact, LINDSEY GRAHAM and I have been ridiculed from time to time because of our assessment of the situation and what needed to be done.

Winston Churchill, after the crisis had been resolved to some degree and the people of Britain and the world had awakened, said—and there is a parallel between the situation 4 years ago and what Winston Churchill had to say:

When the situation was manageable, it was neglected, and now that it is thoroughly out of hand we apply too late the remedies which then might have effected a cure. There is nothing new in the story. It is as old as the Sibylline Books. It falls into that long, dismal catalogue of the fruitlessness of experience and the confirmed unteachability of mankind. Want of foresight, unwillingness to act when action would be simple and effective, lack of clear thinking, confusion of counsel until the emergency comes, until self-preservation strikes its jarring gong—these are the features which constitute the endless repetition of history.

I say to my colleagues, we are observing the endless repetition of history—what once upon a time was a manageable situation. When the President of the United States said that it is not a matter of when Bashar al-Assad

leaves but it is a matter of when, when the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and then-Secretary of Defense testified before our committee that it is inevitable that Bashar Assad will go, when the President of the United States continuously said time after time that we have a strategy and it is not anything to worry about, when we get out of Iraq and we draw redlines in Syria and don't do it, when we don't take any action after the redline is crossed, when his national security team, composed of Secretary of State Clinton, Secretary of Defense Panetta, and then-Director of CIA David Petraeus all recommended training and arming the Free Syrian Army, he rejected it.

So now we find ourselves with 240 thousand dead in Syria and more Syrian children in school in Lebanon than Lebanese children. Jordan, one of our best friends, has their very fabric threatened and unstable because of the huge number of refugees. We find a very unstable Middle East, and we find ISIL spread now to Libya, Lebanon, Yemen, and other nations. ISIL has now even established a foothold in Afghanistan, and the Iranians are doing the same.

It is not too late. It is not too late. We have to take up arms. We have to tell the American people what is at stake here. We have to inform the American people that what happened in Paris can happen here. Mr. Baghdadi, who was once in our prison camp at Camp Bucca for 4 years in Iraq, when he left said: "I'll see you guys in New York." He was not kidding. There is no doubt that what ISIL has just proved is that contrary to what this President believed, contrary even to what our intelligence told us, they have a reach. They have had a reach to make sure that a Russian airliner was destroyed. They have a reach to Paris. They have a reach to Beirut. They have a reach in northern Africa and other places in the world. There is no reason why we should not suspect that they have a reach to the United States of America. It is time we acted. It is time the United States of America, acting with our allies, takes out ISIL. We must go both to Iraq and to Syria and take them out. Their total defeat is the only thing that will eliminate this threat to the United States of America.

Yes, after they are destroyed there is a lot to do. Yes, there are things such as building economies and free societies and all of that. But there is only one thing that Mr. Baghdadi and his legions understand, and that is that we kill them and that we counter with everything we can this spread of this perverted form of an honorable religion called Islam. This is radical Islamic terrorism, whether the President ever wants to say it or not.

There is one additional point. The refugees are a huge problem. Obviously, we have to pause until we are sure that nobody is doing exactly

what—apparently, at least—one of the terrorists who attacked Paris did, and that is, to go through Greece and into France. But at the same time, we need to understand that the refugee problem is an effect of a failed policy, not the cause of it.

Finally, I would say the President should do two things: One, call together the smartest people that we know. I named some of them: General Petraeus, General Keane. There are a number of people. There is General Maddox, General Kelly, Bob Kagan. The names are familiar to many of us who follow national security. These people are the ones who made the surge succeed. Call them together over at the White House and say: Give me your advice. He must do that. What he has been listening to and what he is doing is failing.

I know that my friend and partner, LINDSEY GRAHAM, knows more about these issues than any other Member of this body—certainly anybody who is running for President of the United States. We will go over. We would be glad to go over and sit with the President. I want to cooperate with him. I want to work with him. We need to do that. I offer up my services and my advice and counsel, and anybody else on this side of the aisle.

This is a threat to the lives of the men and women who are living in this Nation. They deserve our protection, and they deserve a bipartisan approach and a bipartisan action in order to stop that.

So I stand ready. But right now, I have not been more concerned.

I leave my colleagues with two fundamental facts:

No. 1, there are now more refugees in the world than at any time since the end of World War II. No. 2, there are now more crises in the world than at any time since the end of World War II. We cannot sustain the failed policies that have led us to the situation that America and the world are in today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE  
AGAINST ISIL

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, over the weekend France suffered the worst attack that it has seen since World War II. The day before that, Beirut was rocked by two suicide bombs perpetrated by ISIL that killed more than 40 civilians. We just had confirmation that the Russian plane flying over Sinai was taken down by a terrorist bomb. Again, ISIL has claimed credit. These attacks have followed on the heels of an announcement 2 weeks earlier by the President that he has authorized deployment of up to 50 Special Forces in Syria. They will be there to support U.S.-backed Syrian rebels in the campaign against ISIL.

More than 1 year after the announcement of Operation Inherent Resolve, a mission to “degrade and ultimately defeat” ISIL, this conflict has escalated

dramatically. The facts on the ground in the Middle East have changed dramatically. Russia is intervening militarily on behalf of Bashar al-Assad in Syria. Hundreds of thousands of Syrians left their homes and their country to escape ISIL and Assad, precipitating a massive humanitarian crisis that has brought the European Union under great strain.

In addition to the deployment of U.S. Special Forces in Syria, news reports indicate that the United States will increase supplies and military weapons to U.S.-backed Syrian rebels fighting ISIL.

For all the changes that we have seen over the past year, one thing has not changed: The Congress of the United States has not voted to authorize the use of military force against ISIL. That needs to change. That is why I have come to the floor today. The Senator from Virginia, Mr. KAINE, who will speak in a moment, has come as well. We need an authorization for the use of military force.

The President maintains that the legal underpinnings of his authorization come from an AUMF provided to our previous President in the 107th Congress, back in 2001. The 2001 AUMF allowed the President the authority to use “all necessary and appropriate force” against those he determined “planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons.”

More than 10 years later, two provisions of the massive Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Act expanded the 2001 AUMF to include “associated forces” of Al Qaeda and the Taliban. This is the expansion from which the administration derives its authority for today’s actions to go after the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria.

I am not standing here today to debate the merits of the administration’s argument as to whether they have the legal authority. That is not what is at issue right here. What is at issue is the ease with which Congress happily defers to old statutes and abdicates its authority to weigh in on what history will record as a long, complex, brutal conflict. This conflict has been going on for more than a year with very mixed results, and the consequences will change the geopolitical landscape in that region for decades.

Ten American servicemembers have died supporting Operation Inherent Resolve—one of them recently killed in action. Five others have been wounded. With thousands of servicemembers in support of Operation Inherent Resolve and attacks happening all over the world, the notion that a 14-year-old statute aimed at another enemy is any kind of a substitute for congressional authorization is insufficient. Operation Inherent Resolve warrants its own authorization not just because of its size and duration, because Americans are dying in pursuit of it, or because it is

directed at an enemy that is a threat to our security; this mission warrants its own authorization because we want it to succeed. We want the world to know that the United States speaks with one voice.

Nearly a year ago, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee pressed the administration to come forward with a draft AUMF against ISIL. When it did not do so, the committee proceeded with its own AUMF, which spurred the administration to take action. Two months after that exercise, the administration sent up its own draft AUMF. That was more than 8 months ago. But efforts to produce an AUMF here in Congress have since stalled. In an effort to break the gridlock, as I mentioned, the Senator from Virginia, Mr. KAINE, and I introduced a resolution that we think represents a good compromise. It may not be perfect. It may represent only a starting point. But we need a starting point here, and we need to move forward. This issue is far too important not to try to get an agreement to move ahead.

I urge my colleagues to consider the importance of this operation against ISIL and the implications to foreign policies for many years ahead—specifically, the implications to this body, the Congress of the United States and the U.S. Senate. If we are not even willing to weigh in and authorize the use of force here, what does that say to our adversaries? What does that say to our allies? What does that say to the troops who are fighting on our behalf? How much longer can we go without an authorization for the use of force?

I wish to yield time to my colleague, the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Arizona for working so closely. This does not have to be a partisan issue. In fact, it should not be a partisan issue. My sense is that in this Congress, in both Houses, 80-plus percent of the Members believe strongly that the United States should be engaged in military action under some circumstances against this horrible threat of ISIL. Yet, despite that overwhelming consensus and despite the clear constitutional command in article I that we should not be at war without a vote of Congress, there has been a strange conspiracy of silence about this in the legislative branch for the last 16 months.

The Senator from Arizona and I introduced a resolution in January to authorize military force, building upon previous efforts in the Foreign Relations Committee, the President’s submitted authorization. We did it knowing that it is not perfect, knowing that not everyone would agree with every word, but we did it to show that we can be bipartisan and stand up against a threat such as ISIL.

As the Senator did, let’s review what has happened since August 8, 2014. The President on that day started airstrikes against ISIL and said he was

doing it for two reasons: first, to protect American personnel who were jeopardized at a consulate in Erbil, and second, to provide humanitarian support for members of a minority religious sect, the Yazidis, who were basically being hemmed in by ISIL in Sinjar in northern Iraq. Those were the two reasons.

At that point in August of 2014, ISIL and their activities were limited to Iraq and Syria. Sixteen months later, we have lost four American hostages who have been executed by ISIL. We have lost 10 American service men and women who were deployed to that theater. We have about 3,600 American troops who are deployed thousands of miles from home, risking their lives every day. We have spent \$5 billion—\$11 million a day—in the battle against ISIL. We have flown nearly 6,300 airstrikes with American aircraft against ISIL—ISIL, which was at first limited to Iraq and Syria and now has presence in Afghanistan, Libya, Yemen, and Somalia. They have undertaken attacks that they claim credit for in the Sinai in Egypt and in Lebanon.

This threat is mutating and growing. At the end of last week, on Friday the 13th, we saw the horror of ISIL with the grim assassination of innocents as they were enjoying dinner or going to music concerts or watching soccer games in Paris. ISIL put out a video a few days ago threatening similar attacks on Washington. ISIL is not going away. This is a threat.

The President started military action for a narrow and limited reason, but the threat has mutated. Like a cancer, it has grown, and it is now affecting nations all over the world. The question is, How long will Congress continue to be silent about this? I will say that I think this is a malady you can lay at the feet of both parties in both Houses. Congress has seemed to prefer a strategy of criticizing what the President is doing. And look, I am critical of some of the things the President is doing. In an earlier speech, the senior Senator from Arizona laid out some challenges with this strategy. But it is not enough for this body that has a constitutional authority in matters of war to just criticize the Commander in Chief. What we have done is sat on the sidelines and criticized, but we have not been willing either to vote to authorize what is going on, vote to stop what is going on, or vote to refine or revise what is going on. It is easy to be a critic. It is easy to sit in the stands and watch a play and say: Well, why didn't the coach call a different play? But we are not fans here, we are the owners of the team. We are the article I branch, and we are not supposed to be at war without a vote of Congress.

I will hand it back to my colleague from Arizona, and then perhaps I can say a few concluding words that would be more about the kind of emotional rather than the legal side of this as we are thinking about the challenges in Paris.

I think the events of last week—Egypt, Beirut, Paris—demonstrate that the voice of Congress is needed. The voice of Congress is needed to fulfill our article I responsibility. The voice of Congress is needed, as the Senator from Arizona mentioned, because we send a message by our voice to our allies, to the adversary, and to our troops. The voice of Congress is also needed because it has the effect of solving some of the problems Senator McCain mentioned earlier. To the extent that the administration's strategy is not what we would want it to be, they have to present a strategy to Congress. We ask tough questions of the witnesses, and we refine it and it gets better. We do that all in the view of the American public so they can be educated about what is at stake. When you don't have the debate, you don't put before the American public the reasons for the involvement, and that is desperately needed.

With that, I thank my colleague from Arizona. I would like to say a few words at the end about why this is a matter of emotional significance to me.

I now defer to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Virginia.

Let me say that we both mentioned the importance of the message that needs to be sent from the U.S. Congress, the article I branch, the message to our troops who are fighting on our behalf and the message to our adversaries. They need to know that we are resolved, that we speak with one voice.

Let me talk for a second about the message to our allies. An authorization for use of force will dictate and will set the parameters for that use of force. Our allies need to know if we are all in or whether there are certain limitations. If we decide—if the Congress decides there are certain limitations to that use of force, our allies need to know that. They need to know their role and what they are required to do. That will be useful. If there are limitations, we need to spell them out. If there aren't, we need to let our adversaries know that as well.

But whatever the case, we need to debate this. We need to authorize this use of force. We have waited long enough. Frankly, we have waited far too long. We have asked the President for language. The President sent up language. I think that it is lacking in a few areas. I like some parts of it. But it needs to be debated here. If we asked the President for that language, then we need to take it up and actually do something with it. It is our responsibility. We are the article I branch. We are the branch that is supposed to declare war. We need to do that here.

Again, I invite my colleague from Virginia to close. I thank the President and say that it is time—it is well past time that we move on this. Hopefully the events of the past couple of

weeks—the attacks that happened in Paris, the bombing of a plane, the other suicide bombings that have occurred—our commitment of new resources will convince us all that it is time to act here in Congress.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arizona for joining together in this important area.

I had a sad epiphany on Friday as I was thinking about this. I think Senator Flake and I have children who are about the same age. I was thinking about young people—looking at our pages here, thinking about young people. Like many, when the attacks happened Friday, my first thoughts were, whom do I know in Paris? A lot of folks have relatives or have family or coworkers or former coworkers who were in Paris.

Like a lot of people, I got on the phone and I got on text to try to track down my niece. I have a niece who is a student at law school, a third-year law student. She is in Paris for a semester studying at the Sciences PO. She was in the restaurant area where the shootings occurred so close that she could hear them. She was not immediately affected, but she and her friends had to barricade themselves in the restaurant for a while, wondering what was going on.

We were able to determine that Elizabeth was fine. She assured all the family and the people who wanted to send her a plane ticket to come home that, no, she was fine. But over the weekend I started to think about how fine she really is, how fine our young people really are. Elizabeth was a Peace Corps volunteer in Cameroon a few years ago. After she came home, the village she lived in was essentially wiped out by Boko Haram. The next door neighbor, who was her protector and the protector of all the Peace Corps volunteers who came before, was killed, along with a lot of her other friends. Boko Haram has now pledged allegiance to ISIL.

She had the experience of losing friends in a terrorist attack in Cameroon, and now she has had the experience of being near a terrorist attack in Paris. It started to work on my conscience a little bit that this for her is now a norm. For me, at age 57, these events are not the norm. They are the extreme. But for Elizabeth or for my children—I have three kids, one in the military, and they all came of age after 9/11—we are living in a world that for so many of our young people, the norm is not peace and safety and complacency; the norm is war or terrorist attacks all over the globe. If that can be said about America's young people, it is certainly the case for young people in France and young people in Syria and all over the region.

I hate that we are living in a world where young people are starting to think this is the norm rather than the exception. It seems to me as an adult, as somebody in a leadership position,

that a part of what we need to do is rather than just allow us to drift without taking a position into the world where this is more and more normal, while acknowledging that we are humble people and we can't completely control our destiny, we have to take charge of a situation and not stand by and lob in criticism but try to shape it to the best of our ability. I think that was the genius of the drafters of the Constitution.

James Madison, a Virginian who drafted many of these provisions, was trying to do something incredibly radical. At the time, war was for the King or the Monarch or the Emperor, and Madison and the others who drafted the American Constitution, said: We are going to take that power to initiate war away from the Executive. Nobody else has really done this, and we are going to put the power in the hands of the people's elected representatives so that they will debate and soberly analyze when you should take that step of authorizing military action where, even under the best of circumstances, horrible things can happen and people can lose their lives.

Well, we have allowed this war to go on long enough without putting a congressional fingerprint on it. For our young people, for our troops, for our allies, and for our adversaries, it is my prayer that we in Congress will now take up that leadership mantle and try to shape this mutating and growing threat to the greatest degree we can.

With that, I yield the floor and again thank my colleague from Arizona.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, the Obama administration's war on energy isn't just a war on coal, it is a war on American jobs, American families, and our national security. That is why it is no surprise that the President's anti-energy agenda is gaining opposition from both sides of the aisle. I am thankful for the bipartisan leadership demonstrated by leader MCCONNELL, Senator CAPITO, two Republicans, as well as Senator MANCHIN, Senator HEITKAMP, two Democrats, in standing up against the President's harmful regulations on our Nation's coal-fired plants. I am proud to have joined them as a cosponsor of the two bipartisan resolutions to stop the EPA from imposing its anti-coal regulations.

The Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval we are considering today will block the Obama administration's regulations on existing coal-fired plants. We are also seeing strong opposition from more than half of the States in the country, including my home State of Montana, which through three different lawsuits have requested an initial stay on the rule.

The Obama administration's reckless agenda is shutting down coal-fired powerplants across the United States. It is killing family waged jobs for union workers and for tribal members in

Montana, and it is stifling investments that could lead to innovations to make coal even cleaner here in the United States. President Obama calls it the Clean Power Plan. It is not named correctly. It should be called the unaffordable energy plan. President Obama's unaffordable energy plan will have a negligible impact on global coal demand and global emissions, but it will lead to devastating consequences for affordable energy and these good-paying union and tribal jobs.

Here are the facts: The United States mines just 11 percent of the world's coal and consumes about 10.5 percent of the world's coal. Said another way, approximately 90 percent of all the coal that is mined and consumed occurs outside of the United States. Global demand for coal-fired energy will not disappear even if the United States were to shut down every last coal mine and coal-fired plant.

Coal use around the world has grown four times faster than renewables. There are plans for 1,200 coal plants in 59 countries. Let me say that again: 1,200 coal plants are planned in 59 countries, about three-quarters of which will be in China and India.

China alone consumes 4 billion tons of coal each year. Compare that to the United States, which is at 1 billion tons. In other words, China's coal consumption is four times greater than that of the United States. In fact, China will be building a new coal plant every 10 days for the next 10 years.

Look at Japan, for example. After the great earthquake in Japan, they lost their nuclear power capability. Japan is currently building 43 coal-fired plants.

By 2020, India may have built 2½ times as much coal capacity as the United States is about to lose.

The Obama administration's reckless war on energy will have little impact on global emissions, but here is what it will do: It will devastate significant parts of our economy. It will cause energy bills to skyrocket. It will be a loss of tax revenues for our schools, roads, and teachers. And it is going to destroy family-wage union and tribal jobs.

If this rule moves forward, countless coal-fired plants like the Colstrip powerplant in Montana will likely be shuttered, thereby putting thousands of jobs at risk. It will also make new coal-fired plants incredibly difficult to build.

The bottom line is this: Coal keeps the lights on in this country, and it will continue to power the world for decades to come. In fact, in my home State of Montana, it provides more than half of our electricity.

I have told my kids—we have 4 children—when they plug in their phones, odds are it is coal that is powering that phone. Rather than dismissing this reality, the United States should be on the cutting edge of technological advances in energy development. We should be leading the way in powering the world, not disengaging. Unfortu-

nately, President Obama's out-of-touch regulations take us in the opposite direction, and the people who can afford it the least will be impacted the greatest.

I urge my Senate colleagues to join in this bipartisan effort to stop the President's job-killing regulations on affordable energy and join us in standing up for American energy independence. With what we have seen happen in the world in the last week, our national security and energy independence are tied together. Stand up for American jobs. Stand up for hard-working American families.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there is a desperate need for the Senate to address one of the greatest national security and public health risks we face as a country, something that has the ability to affect up to 3.4 percent, or \$260 billion, of U.S. economic output annually. What is this threat? It is climate change.

In its 2010 and 2014 Quadrennial Defense Reviews, the Department of Defense identified climate change as a risk that must be incorporated into the Nation's future defense planning. Last year, I held a hearing on this issue as chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Pentagon experts explained the far-ranging effects of this threat . . . putting the U.S. at risk around the world . . . changing the landscape and vegetation of training areas . . . accelerating regional tensions and conflict. This summer, the Department issued a new report outlining in even greater detail the threats we face. It states, "The Department of Defense sees climate change as a present security threat, not strictly a long-term risk." It goes on to say that climate change is introducing "shocks and stressors" in the Arctic, the Middle East, Africa, Asia, and South America.

The report argues that global warming has had "measurable impacts" on vulnerable areas and regional conflicts, like Syria. Due to these impacts, military leaders are now forced to include ways to respond to the risks and challenges of climate change in their planning.

So if our Nation's senior military leaders are doing their part to address climate change, isn't it about time that we did the same? Well, we can start by supporting the Environmental Protection Agency's efforts to limit carbon pollution from power plants—which account for over 40 percent of U.S. carbon pollution emissions. The rules would cut carbon pollution from power plants by over 30 percent and reduce emissions of the pollutants that cause soot and smog by 25 percent. That is equivalent to removing over 160 million cars from the road—or almost two-thirds of U.S. passenger vehicles.

The rules will also drive new investment in clean energy generation and energy efficiency technologies while growing the economy, shrinking household electricity bills, and putting the

U.S. on a pathway to lead the world in creating new clean energy jobs. In addition, EPA's rules would lead to climate and health benefits worth up to \$54 billion annually, including avoiding 3,600 premature deaths; 90,000 asthma attacks in children; and up to 3,400 heart attacks and hospital visits. This is a win-win for America.

The State of Illinois has already started taking steps to reduce its emissions by adopting laws that promote the use of renewable energy and energy efficiency.

Our "community choice aggregation" law allows Illinoisans to choose their energy providers. Since the program was started, more than 90 communities have chosen to use 100 percent renewable electricity sources for their residential power.

Illinois's Renewable Portfolio Standard requiring the State to use 25 percent renewable electricity resources by 2025 is one of the strongest in the country.

And State law also requires utilities to reduce Illinois's energy demand by 2 percent each year through efficiency improvements.

With the support of these laws, Illinois now employs approximately 100,000 people in the clean energy industry—and meeting EPA's new targets would put even more Illinoisans to work designing, manufacturing, and installing clean energy systems. Most importantly, EPA's rules will allow the U.S. to face the challenge of climate change head on instead of ignoring the problem until it is too late.

Leading scientists warn that the world is running out of time to make the cuts in carbon emissions that are needed to prevent irreversible damage to the Earth's climate. According to the United Nations's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, at least half the world's energy supply needs to come from low-carbon sources such as wind, solar, and nuclear by 2050 if we are going to avoid catastrophic climate changes. That gives us just 35 years to save the planet for future generations.

This may seem like a long time, but we have a lot to do. We need to start now, and EPA's rules are a great first step.

But I know some of my colleagues are opposed to the EPA's plan and anything this administration does to acknowledge the existence of climate change. So they have introduced two resolutions of disapproval to prevent EPA from listening to over 97 percent of climate scientists and acting to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. If the resolutions were to become law, they would prohibit EPA from proposing any new regulations that are "substantially the same" as their current rules for new and existing power plants.

But even supporters of these resolutions have to admit that we have a responsibility to be good stewards of our planet.

So I have to ask, if you don't like what the President is doing, what is

your plan to make sure we leave future generations with a brighter, cleaner future? How do you propose we address the threat of climate change? And what is your plan to make sure that America leads the world in creating the well-paying, green jobs of the future? Denying the harmful effects of greenhouse gas emissions, as these resolutions do, is shortsighted and declares war on science and on public health. So I hope my colleagues will vote "no" on the resolutions of disapproval from Senator MCCONNELL and Senator CAPITO.

The evidence is clear: we need to get serious about addressing the causes and effects of climate change. America has the resources and the inventiveness to create a new energy system that can protect our environment and economy and allow us to continue to choose our own destiny. But we can only do it by focusing on policies that address both the economic and environmental challenges facing the country by supporting critical, sustainable infrastructure. And we need to do it soon—our generation has a moral obligation to leave the world in as good of shape as what we inherited from our parents and grandparents.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, there is irrefutable evidence, with more accumulating all the time, that humans have altered not just the weather of a region, but the climate of our entire planet.

From flooding felt across the country to extreme temperatures from north to south and east to west, these severe events are happening more and more frequently. Droughts are proliferating, wildfires are bigger, and more expensive, tropical storms and hurricanes are more intense. You can look no further than the damage wrought in Vermont in the wake of Tropical Storm Irene—a storm that had greatly weakened since first making landfall, but still so powerful as to deliver hundreds of millions of dollars in damage to our small State. It was enough to convince many Vermonters of the reality of climate change as they watched roads washed away and iconic covered bridges yanked out of the footings that had supported them for generations.

The science and the data by now are clear that human activities are a factor in the climate change that is unfolding all around us and in every corner of the globe, but common sense alone should tell us, as we look about us and see all of the carbon and pollution that is being pumped into our thin and fragile atmosphere, that all of these human activities are contributing factors.

We must address the root causes of climate change, and that is what the administration's Clean Power Plan, bolstered by the rules for new and existing power plants, will do.

Today, we won't vote about how to support our roads and bridges. We won't vote to further advance edu-

cational opportunities for young children. We won't vote on ways to keep our government—of the people, for the people—open. Rather, we are summoned to heed the call of pressure groups, wealthy corporations, and moneyed interests and vote on a resolution of disapproval that denies the impact and the causes of climate change. These challenges under the Congressional Review Act fail to recognize the true cost of carbon pollution. The Clean Power Plan sets clear and flexible rules that signal to the marketplace that we cannot continue to spew harmful carbon pollution without limit. It finally puts an end to the free lunch for the fossil fuels industry.

These rules offer commonsense solutions that will not only address climate change, but will protect Americans' health with cleaner air. They will also unleash the creativity and inventiveness of American entrepreneurship and support investments in new technology. They will further set the stage for our vibrant and job-rich energy future. The flexibility in these rules means that States and companies will be able to decide the best ways to reduce their carbon emissions, whether through gains in efficiency and new technologies or through an increased use of natural gas or renewable fuels.

Vermonters are encouraged by these rules and about the Clean Power Plan—not only because together these proposals move the country forward to finally address climate change, but also because the plan and rules recognize the important work that Vermont and other Northeast States have been doing for the last decade through the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, RGGI, to cap carbon emissions and offer credits to cleaner producers. In Vermont, we can breathe easier knowing that under these rules, we will have less pollution blowing into the State from power plants in the Midwest.

The majority in the Senate would rather roll back some of the most meaningful environmental initiatives of our time, rather than help to improve the health of Americans across the country. The science is clear: Failing to address climate change will lead to more dangerous and costly extreme weather events and threaten the health and well-being of our families and our communities. We must stop putting the interests of polluters above public health. It is time to stop putting the future of our planet and of generations to come in danger and to act now to halt the devastating effects of climate change. Let us move beyond the energy policies of the last two centuries and move forward toward America's energy future.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, strong clean air protections remain very important for our health and environment. I have voted previously to protect the EPA's ability to take action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and I will oppose the two resolutions of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act which would permanently

block EPA from limiting carbon pollution from existing and new fossil fuel fired powerplants.

Finalized on August 3, 2015, the Clean Power Plan sets the first national limits on carbon pollution from existing fossil fuel fired powerplants, the Nation's single largest stationary source of greenhouse gas emissions. According to EPA estimates, the Clean Power Plan will reduce carbon dioxide emissions from the electric power sector by 32 percent, from 2005 levels, by 2030. The final plan includes additional flexibility and provides States with more time to submit plans and to achieve compliance with the requirements. The standards to limit carbon dioxide for new, modified, or reconstructed powerplants were also finalized on August 3. On November 4, 18 States, including Maine, and several cities asked a Federal court to allow them to defend the Clean Power Plan against legal challenge.

I am encouraged that the emissions targets under the Clean Power Plan for Maine are more realistic than were originally proposed in recognition of the fact that Maine already ranks first in the Nation in the percentage reduction in greenhouse gases due to the State's participation in the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, RGGI. Through RGGI, Maine has already made substantial progress in reducing carbon emissions, increasing energy efficiency, spurring the adoption of clean energy technologies, and improving air quality and public health. By contrast, the EPA's original proposal would have unfairly disadvantaged and asked more of States that took action early than it would have from States that had not yet acted to reduce their emissions. The final rule represents a considerable improvement in this regard.

I continue to have some concerns, however, with the Clean Power Plan's treatment of renewable biomass energy. Biomass energy is a sustainable, responsible, renewable, and economically significant energy source. Many States, including Maine, are relying on renewable biomass to meet their renewable energy goals. Because the final rule places the onus on States to demonstrate the eligibility of biomass for the Clean Power Plan, this approach will lead to more regulatory uncertainty. The EPA must appropriately recognize the carbon benefits of forest bioenergy in a way that helps States, mills, and the forest products industry and recognizes the carbon neutrality of wood. I will continue to seek regulatory certainty and clarity on this issue.

Climate change is a significant threat both here in the United States and around the world. It is a challenge that requires international cooperation, including from large emitters like China and India, to reduce greenhouse gas pollution worldwide. The upcoming climate summit in Paris provides a new opportunity for international efforts to curb greenhouse gas emissions in countries around the globe.

I have had the opportunity to meet in the field with some of the world's foremost climate scientists. I have traveled to Norway and to Alaska where I saw the dramatic loss of sea ice cover and the retreating Arctic glaciers. In Barrow, AK, on the shores of the Arctic Ocean, I saw telephone poles leaning over because the permafrost was melting, and I talked with native people who told me that they were seeing insects that had never before been this far north. I returned from this trip believing that U.S. leadership to slow climate change would be vitally important—in order to prevent the worst extreme weather events, shifts in agricultural production and disease patterns, and more air pollution.

For Maine, climate change poses a significant threat to our vast natural resources, from working forests, fishing, and agricultural industries, to tourism and recreation, as well as for public health. With heat waves, more extreme weather events, and sea level rise, the greenhouse gasses that drive climate change are a clear threat to our way of life. As a coastal State, Maine is particularly vulnerable to storm surges and flooding, and unpredictable changes in the Gulf of Maine threaten our iconic fisheries. Climate changes also raise significant public health concerns for Maine's citizens, from asthma to Lyme disease. Maine has one of the highest and fastest growing incident rates of Lyme disease, and its spread has been linked to higher temperatures that are ripe for deer ticks and their hosts. Sitting at the end of the air pollution tailpipe, Maine also has some of the highest rates of asthma in the country.

The Clean Air Act remains vital for protecting our health and the environment, and I will continue to support responsible and realistic efforts to reduce harmful pollution that affects us all.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to speak in favor of the Clean Power Plan. This plan shows real American leadership when it comes to climate change, proof that we are taking responsibility for the world we leave to our children.

The debate over the Clean Power Plan is a question of whether we should take any action at all on climate change, a shocking question considering how long we have known about the ways we are harming the planet.

A recent report by Inside Climate News shows that Exxon scientists were warning the company's leadership about climate change as early as 1977. The Exxon scientists wrote: "There is general scientific agreement that the most likely manner in which mankind is influencing the global climate is through carbon dioxide release from the burning of fossil fuels."

Even before that, scientific advisers first cautioned the President about climate change in 1965—50 years ago this month—explaining that carbon dioxide from fossil fuels would "almost certainly cause significant changes" and

"could be deleterious from the point of view of human beings."

And as far back as 1956, the New York Times reported early evidence connecting climate change with greenhouse gases from fossil fuel combustion. That prescient article concluded with a sad commentary: "Coal and oil are still plentiful and cheap in many parts of the world, and there is every reason to believe that both will be consumed by industry as long as it pays to do so."

Today, decades later, we not only have even more scientific evidence of climate change, we are actually seeing the real-world consequences of inaction.

This past September was the planet's warmest September in the 136-year history of weather records. The last 5 months in a row all set world records for hottest average temperatures.

Last year was the planet's hottest recorded year, and the last two decades include the 19 hottest years on record. Global sea levels rose 7 inches in the last century. And since the beginning of the industrial era, the acidity of the oceans has increased by 26 percent, which could destabilize the food chain.

My own home State of California is seeing firsthand the effects of higher temperatures and changing precipitation patterns. We are in the midst of an epic drought, which scientists say has been made 15 to 20 percent worse due to human-induced changes in the climate. This has made a drought into a disaster.

The Sierra snowpack, which accounts for a third of the State's drinking water, is down to 5 percent of its usual levels, the lowest in 500 years.

The wildfires in California are made even more terrifying by the hot, dry conditions. And the fire season now lasts 75 days longer than just 10 years ago, resulting in more and larger fires.

Southern California and the Central Valley have the worst air pollution in the country, home to six of the top seven regions of worst ozone smog pollution. This is made worse by hotter conditions.

But this is just the beginning. Unless we dramatically change course, children born today will witness calamitous changes to the world's climate systems in their lifetimes.

Sea levels will rise another 1 to 4 feet this century based on thermal expansion of the oceans and continued melting of land-based ice. This would inundate Miami Beach, the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, and 85 percent of New Orleans.

In addition, a portion of the west Antarctic ice sheet large enough to raise global sea levels by 4 feet has begun an irreversible collapse. We have to slow down this process as much as possible and make sure the same doesn't happen to the rest of Antarctica or Greenland.

By midcentury, ice-free summers in the Arctic Ocean could be routine. The global volume of glaciers is projected

to be reduced by up to 85 percent this century. And massive numbers of species will go extinct because many plant species cannot shift their geographical ranges quickly enough to keep up with the rate of climate change.

This future is unacceptable. We cannot leave future generations a planet in such terrible disrepair.

I will not see California become a desert State, with aquifers overrun by salt water and coastal cities overwhelmed by storm surges. My colleagues must understand that we will never relent in the fight to save the planet.

I understand some States are afraid of an economy without fossil fuel extraction. But I assure you that transitioning to a new economy will be easier than coping with the devastating effects of global warming.

That brings me to the issue we are debating today: the Clean Power Plan. Although the final rules were only recently completed by the EPA, the Supreme Court set us on this path 8 years ago when they found in effect that the Clean Air Act compelled the regulation of greenhouse gases.

It puts us on a path to cut national emissions from the electricity sector by 32 percent over the next 15 years, using tools that each State can tailor to its own unique situation. It is a remarkably flexible regulatory approach that will harness the ingenuity of the American people to confront and roll back the effects of climate change.

I know this approach can work because I have seen it work in California. In the last 10 years, the State has implemented a number of changes: an economywide cap-and-trade program to return statewide emissions back to their 1990 levels by 2020; a renewable portfolio standard requiring 50 percent renewable electricity by 2030; regulations to double energy efficiency by 2030; a low carbon fuel standard to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation fuels at least 10 percent by 2020; and a program to reach 1 million zero-emission vehicles by 2020.

Here is the thing: even though California is making these changes, the State continues to grow. The economy grew by 2.8 percent last year, with a 1.3 percentage point reduction in the unemployment rate. Both of those figures are better than the national average.

As a result, California is already on track to meet or exceed the Clean Power Plan's targets. And more importantly, California's leadership is showing others just how much we can accomplish.

Internationally, California's cap-and-trade program was used as a model for China's cities and provinces. Now, President Obama has leveraged the ambition of the Clean Power Plan to convince the Chinese to combine their regional cap-and-trade programs into a national carbon strategy.

This is how bold leadership achieves results. And this December in Paris, the Clean Power Plan will serve as the

keystone of America's national climate ambitions, helping convince the world that we will be the leaders we promise to be in combatting climate change.

The Senate shouldn't be considering a rejection of the Clean Power Plan. Our real responsibility is to find ways to be even more ambitious.

Today's vote changes nothing. If Congress were to pass this resolution to disapprove of the Clean Power Plan, the President's veto would not be overridden. The Clean Power Plan will be implemented.

I believe the Clean Power Plan will not only reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but that process won't be nearly as difficult as some now fear. The Clean Power Plan will be seen as one of the many important steps we took to stabilize global temperatures.

I truly think we are making headway in the fight against global warming. Environmentally conscious individuals are marking changes in their own lives, and those are driving changes in the economy and in State policies. Those changes spurred reform on the national level, and now, we are seeing real action on the global stage.

Today's "show vote" on the Clean Power Plan won't diminish those successes.

Thank you.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I join many of my colleagues in opposing S.J. Res. 23 and S.J. Res. 24.

These measures are an attack on the Clean Power Plan's carbon pollution protections for new and existing power plants.

Not only would these measures undo the health and economic benefits of the Clean Power Plan, they would also bar the EPA from issuing any standards in the future that are substantially similar.

The Clean Power Plan is an important step in reducing carbon pollution and taking action on climate change. It seeks to protect public health, cut energy costs for consumers, and create jobs in the clean energy economy. Additionally, these reductions—the first of its kind in our country for carbon pollution from power plants—are vital to meeting the commitments the United States has made to lowering emissions. Our country is not alone in making these commitments. China and other nations are also doing so—as will be discussed and hopefully furthered at the climate negotiations taking place next week in Paris. Because pollution crosses borders, protecting air quality is a globally shared responsibility.

Let me also emphasize that EPA has the legal authority to set standards on carbon pollution. In 2007, the Supreme Court ruled that the Clean Air Act authorizes the EPA to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from sources including power plants.

Despite criticism from the opposition, we have seen, since the enactment of the Clean Air Act 45 years ago, that economic growth and environmental protection are not mutually ex-

clusive. According to the Department of Commerce, environmental laws including the Clean Air Act have made the U.S. the largest producer of environmental technologies in the world, supporting close to 1.7 million jobs and \$44 billion in exports annually.

The Clean Power Plan will build on this progress and help accelerate the development of renewable energy, creating thousands of jobs in the clean energy sector.

The Energy Information Administration, EIA, finds that the Clean Power Plan will increase the use of renewable energy, leading to thousands of clean energy jobs across the country, including in my home State of Rhode Island.

The 2015 Rhode Island Clean Energy Jobs Report states that Rhode Island's clean energy economy currently supports nearly 10,000 jobs and suggests that the State is expected to add approximately 1,600 new clean energy jobs over the next year.

Renewables, like wind and solar, are already generating power reliably and cost-effectively across America. Wind power is already showing it can be integrated onto the grid at a large scale while ensuring reliability.

Wind power plays an important role in Clean Power Plan compliance, with wind electricity generation capacity more than tripling over 2013 levels by 2040, according to the EIA.

This is why in Rhode Island we are building the first offshore wind farm, which is projected to increase energy capacity for the residents of Block Island.

Our commitment to clean energy is not only cost-effective, but vital to supporting our Nation's health. Climate change is impacting air pollution, which can cause asthma attacks, cardiovascular disease, and premature death, and fostering extreme weather patterns such as heat and severe storms, droughts, wildfires, and flooding that can harm low-income communities disproportionately.

The Clean Power Plan makes America healthier by improving the well-being and productivity of our children, workforce, and seniors through such benefits as reducing asthma attacks in children, lowering the rate of hospital admissions, and reducing the number of missed school and work days.

Action is needed to protect not just our economy's growing renewable energy field, but also our public health. This is why I stand with my colleagues in supporting the Clean Power Plan.

We must make clean air a priority.

I urge my colleagues to support the Clean Air Act and vote "no" on both S.J. Res. 23 and S.J. Res. 24.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

#### SYRIAN REFUGEE CRISIS

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, on Friday, ISIS terrorists massacred 129 people in Paris. Just the day before, ISIS terrorists massacred 43 people in Beirut. While these are merely the latest

in a series of horrific attacks launched by ISIS over the last few years, these twin tragedies have riveted the attention of the world.

These events test us. It is easy to proclaim that we are tough and brave and good-hearted when threats feel far away, but when those threats loom large and close by, our actions will strip away our tough talk and reveal who we really are. We face a choice—a choice either to lead the world by example or to turn our backs to the threats and the suffering around us. Last month Senator SHAHEEN, Senator DURBIN, Senator KLOBUCHAR, and I traveled to Europe to see the Syrian refugee crisis up close. I come to the Senate floor today to speak about what I saw and to try to shed some light on the choice we face.

Over the past 4 years, millions of people have fled their homes in Syria, running for their lives, searching for a future for themselves and their families. Official estimates indicate that 2 million Syrians are now living in Turkey, more than 1 million in Lebanon, and more than one-half million in Jordan. The true numbers are probably much larger.

The crisis has put an enormous economic and political strain on those countries. In late 2014, I traveled to Jordan where I visited a U.N. refugee processing center. I also met with Jordan's Foreign Minister, U.N. representatives, and American military personnel stationed in Amman. Even a year ago, it was clear that the humanitarian crisis was straining these host countries and that there was no end in sight.

In recent months, the crisis has accelerated. The steady stream of refugees fleeing Syria has become a flood, and that flood has swept across Europe. Every day refugees set out on a journey of hundreds of miles from Syria to the Turkish coast. When they arrive, they are met by human smugglers who charge \$1,000 a head for a place on a shoddy, overloaded, plastic raft that is floated out to sea, hopefully in the direction of one of the Greek islands.

I visited one of those islands last month. Lesbos is only a few miles from the Turkish coast, but the risks of crossing are immense. The water is rough, the shoreline is rocky, and these overcrowded, paper-thin rafts are dangerously unsteady. Parents do their best to protect their children. Little ones are outfitted with blowup pool floaties as a substitute for lifejackets in the hope that if their rafts go down, a \$1.99 pool toy will be enough to save the life of a small child—and the rafts do go down. According to some estimates, more than 500 people have died crossing the sea from Turkey to Greece so far this year.

Despite the risks, thousands make the trip every day. Greek Coast Guard officials told us that when refugees see a Coast Guard ship, they may even slash holes in their own rafts just so they will not be turned back.

I met with the mayor of Lesbos, who described how his tiny Greek island of 80,000 people has struggled to cope with those refugees who wash ashore—more than 100,000 people in October alone. Refugees are processed in reception centers on the island before boarding ferries to Athens, but Greece plainly lacks the resources necessary to handle these enormous numbers. Refugees pile into the reception centers, overflowing the facilities and sleeping in parks or beside the road. Last month, a volunteer doctor in Lesbos was quoted as saying: “There are thousands of children here and their feet are literally rotting, they can't keep dry, they have high fevers, and they're standing in the pouring rain for days on end.” Recently, the mayor told a local radio program that the island had run out of room to bury the dead.

Greece's overwhelmed registration system is not only a humanitarian crisis but also a security risk. In meeting after meeting, I asked Greek officials about security screening for these migrants, and time after time I heard the same answer. It was all Greece could do simply to fingerprint these individuals and write down their names before sending them off to Athens, and from there, to somewhere else in Europe. Now Greece's Interior Minister says that fingerprints taken from one of the Paris attackers may match someone who registered as a refugee at a Greek island entry point in early October. Whether this ultimately proves to be true, there is no question that a screening system that can do no more than confirm after the fact that a terrorist entered Europe is obviously not a screening system that is working.

The burden of dealing with Syrian refugees cannot fall on Greece alone. Greece and the other border countries dealing with this crisis need money and expertise to screen out security threats. Europe needs to provide that assistance as quickly as possible, and if we are serious about preventing another tragedy like the one in Paris, the United States must help. We must build adequate procedures to make sure that refugees, especially those who have entered Europe through this slipshod screening process, can enter the United States only after they have been thoroughly vetted and we are fully confident that they do not pose a risk to our Nation or our people.

The security threat is real and it must be addressed, but on our visit to Lesbos, we also had the chance to meet with refugees processed at the Moria reception center to see who most of them really are. From the outside, with its barbed wire and guard towers, Moria looks like a prison. At the entrance, the words “Freedom For All” are etched into the concrete encircling the facility, but speaking with refugees inside feels more like a 21st-century Ellis Island. We met doctors, teachers, civil engineers, and college students. We met young, educated, middle-class Syrians seeking freedom and oppor-

tunity for themselves and their families. They were seeking a safe refuge from ISIS, just like the rest of us.

The most heartbreaking cases are the unaccompanied children. These boys and girls are separated from the other refugees in a fenced-in outdoor dormitory area. I met a young girl in that fenced-in area—younger than my own granddaughters, sent out on this perilous journey alone. When I asked how old she was, she shyly held up seven fingers. I wondered, What could possibly possess parents to hand a 7-year-old girl and a wad of cash to human smugglers? What could possibly possess them to send a beloved child across the treacherous seas with no more protection than a pool floatie? What could make them send a child on a journey knowing that crime rings of sex slavery and organ harvesting prey on these children? What could possess them to send a little girl out alone with only the wildest, vaguest hope that she might make it through alive and find something—anything—better on the other side?

Today, we all know why parents would send a child on a journey alone. The events of the last week in Paris and in Beirut drive it home. The terrorists of ISIS—enemies of Islam and of all modern civilization, butchers who rape, torture, and execute women and children, who blow themselves up in a lunatic effort to kill as many people as possible—these terrorists have spent years torturing the people of Syria.

And what about the Syrian Government? President Bashar al-Assad has spent years bombing his own people. Day after day, month after month, year after year, Syrian civilians have been caught in the middle, subjected to suicide attacks, car bombings, and hotel bombings at the hands of ISIS or Assad or this faction or that faction—each assault more senseless than the last. Day after day, month after month, year after year, mothers, fathers, children, and grandparents are slaughtered.

In the wake of the murders in Paris and in Beirut last week, people in America, in Europe, and throughout the world are fearful. Millions of Syrians are fearful as well, terrified by the reality of their daily lives, terrified that their last avenue of escape from the horrors of ISIS will be closed, and terrified that the world will turn its back on them and their children.

Some politicians have already moved in that direction, proposing to close our country for people fleeing the massacre in Syria, but with millions of Syrian refugees already in Europe, already carrying European passports, already able to travel to the United States—and with more moving across Europe every day—that is not a real plan to keep us safe, and that is not who we are. We are a country of immigrants and refugees, a country made strong by our diversity, a country founded by those crossing the sea, fleeing religious persecution and seeking

religious freedom. We are not a nation that delivers children back into the hands of ISIS murderers because some politician doesn't like their religion, and we are not a nation that backs down out of fear.

Our first responsibility is to protect this country. We must embrace that fundamental obligation, but we do not make ourselves safer by ignoring our common humanity and turning away from our moral obligation.

ISIS has shown itself to the world. We cannot and we will not abandon the people of France to this butchery, we cannot and we will not abandon the people of Lebanon to this butchery, and we cannot and we must not abandon the people of Syria to this butchery. The terrorists in Paris and in Beirut remind us that the hate of a few can alter the lives of many. Now we have a chance to affirm a different message—a message that we are a courageous people who will stand strong in the face of terrorism. We have the courage to affirm our commitment to a world of open minds and open hearts. This must be our choice—the same choice that has been made over and over again by every generation of Americans. This is always our choice. It is the reason the people of Syria and people all around this world look to us for hope. It is the reason ISIS despises us, and it is the reason we will defeat them.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, let me thank my colleague Senator WARREN for those very eloquent remarks. She and the Senators she traveled with have taught us a lot. We have heard her comments, and she is right. Our values in the United States of America are accepting and open to refugees who flee violence and persecution, and that is the country we are.

So I thank very much the Senator from Massachusetts for her remarks. As I have said, we all have learned very much from her and the trip she took and from what she shared with us.

#### TERRORIST ATTACKS AGAINST FRANCE

Mr. President, before I begin my remarks today, in addition to the comments I have just made, I wanted to first pause for just a moment and say a few words about the Paris attacks last Friday.

The people of New Mexico and the people the world over are grieving for those who were killed and injured in the horrific attacks that have just been spoken about by Senator WARREN and others who have come to the floor today. Earlier today, we had a moment of silence to recognize them. I just want to say that our thoughts are with the French people, and we are united in our resolve to fight the murderous thugs of terrorism who thrive on hate, intolerance, and fear.

I met today with the French Ambassador to give him New Mexicans' heartfelt condolences. All of us on the Sen-

ate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate leadership met today with the French Ambassador to say to him that we stand together with him against these murderous thugs.

Mr. President, today, because we are on this resolution of disapproval, we are discussing the issue of climate change and global warming. It is one of our greatest challenges and we have a choice. We can deny the reality. We can ignore the danger to our planet, to our economy, and to our security—that is one choice—or we can move forward. We can work together. We can find common ground with a diversified energy portfolio that includes clean energy, with an energy policy that makes sense, that creates jobs, that protects the environment, and that will keep our Nation strong. That is the choice we should make, that is the choice we must make and, once again, that is the choice we are failing to make.

This year is almost over. It will likely be the warmest year on record. The current record holder is last year—2014. The impact is clear. People are seeing it all over the world, with rising sea levels and increased droughts.

The Southwest is at the eye of the storm. In New Mexico, temperatures are rising 50 percent faster than the global average, not just this year or last year but for decades. This has strained my State with terrible droughts and wildfires. When the rain does come, it often brings floods as well. In 2011, we had the largest fire in our State's history—the Las Conchas fire. Then, in 2012—just a year later—we had an even larger wildfire. The Whitewater-Baldy fire burned 259,000 acres. We have seen massive droughts. Our crops and natural resources are at risk.

Through all of this, Congress has failed to act. There have been many attempts in the past. We have had many bipartisan bills introduced in the Senate, including the McCain-Lieberman cap-and-trade proposal, the Bingaman-Specter cap-and-trade proposal, the Cantwell-Collins cap-and-dividend proposal, the Lieberman-Warner bill, the Kerry-Graham bill, and others. In the House of Representatives, I had my own bipartisan bill with Representative Tom Petri. In 2005, over half the Senate voted on a resolution affirming the need to implement mandatory reductions of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States. Each and every time Congress failed to make it to the finish line—failed to pass comprehensive legislation in both Houses to curb our greenhouse gas emissions. Meanwhile, the clock is ticking. Time is growing short, and we are going from bad to worse.

So the President and the EPA have used their authority under the Clean Air Act to implement restrictions and to control the pollution. They have done what needs to be done with the support of many of us in Congress and, as we know, with the support of the American people. The proposals are

reasonable, they are critical, and they will make a difference to restricting emissions from new and existing powerplants. Some in the Senate have argued these proposals do too much and others argue they don't do enough, but instead of rolling up our sleeves and developing a comprehensive energy and climate strategy of our own, we are here today voting on a Republican resolution of disapproval of the Clean Power Plan rules. What a waste of our time, the American people's time, and the time we have left to seriously address this very important problem.

I started this speech talking about choices and again we are making the wrong one. We are wasting time when we should be working together and developing proposals that would address global warming and help push forward clean energy jobs. There are now more solar jobs in the United States than coal jobs. There are currently more than 98 solar companies in New Mexico, employing 1,600 people. Renewable energy jobs and solutions are in abundance in New Mexico, and this is true for many other States. A renewable electricity standard, which I have long fought for, would create 300,000 jobs. Most of these jobs are high-paying, local, and cannot be shipped overseas.

Congress could be using this time moving forward. Our country can lead the world in a clean energy economy. We have the technology, we have the resources, and we need the commitment. Instead, the Republican leadership in Congress is doubling down, trying to overturn the President and derailing the progress we are making. They do so knowing they will fail, knowing the President will veto it, and knowing the votes aren't there to override the veto. Once again, this is a lot of sound, a lot of fury, and a lot of wasted time. It makes a false claim that support for climate action does not exist in the United States, and it does so ahead of the Paris Climate Conference, where 153 countries, it is my understanding at this point, are going to gather and sign on to positive climate proposals.

Action on climate change is under attack in the U.S. Senate. That is true, make no mistake about it, but also make no mistake that all of these attacks will fail.

I have led the charge in our Appropriations Committee, on the subcommittee of which I am the ranking member, to fight against dangerous environmental riders. I will continue to fight them, and they will fail.

My colleagues and I are here today in opposition to this resolution of disapproval and we also are here to ask that we move on, to ask that we work together and face the very real threat of climate change.

We will go to Paris next month, and we will get a solid, strong agreement from the international community. The United States will continue to lead on this issue even if our Republican colleagues continue to fight it each step of the way.

With that, I yield the floor to my good friend from Massachusetts Senator ED MARKEY, who has been an incredible champion in terms of working legislation and who had a big part a Congress or two ago getting climate change legislation out of the House of Representatives.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his historic leadership on these issues.

The consequences of climate change are evidenced around the world. Temperatures are increasing, sea level is rising, glaciers are receding, rainfall is changing, and people's health is suffering. These impacts can worsen the tensions that are fueling terrorism and conflicts around the world. The Pentagon and the CIA have both issued reports that found that instability from changes in the climate can contribute to conditions that breed insurgencies.

As we look around the world, we can see how climate change is a threat multiplier and a catalyst for conflict today. That is why partnering with developing countries so they can grow their economies in a climate-smart way is a crucial part of our foreign policy. That is why we need to support the Green Climate Fund and other financing and aid programs that will help countries increase their resiliency in the face of climate change impacts, because those impacts are very real, and scientists agree that it is humans who are causing them.

The year 2014 was the hottest year in a global record that stretches back to 1880. The first half of this year is now the hottest January to June in that same record. As temperatures continue to soar upwards on land, our seas are getting hotter as well.

While we have to deal with the consequences of climate change that are already gripping our Nation and our planet, there is still time to prevent future catastrophes. That is why President Obama has been using the tool he has in the Clean Air Act to reduce carbon pollution. He has used it to further increase the fuel efficiency of America's cars and trucks.

He has released the historic Clean Power Plan, but Republicans want to undo that plan with the Congressional Review Act. Undoing the Clean Power Plan would be bad for our economy, for our national security, and for our health. The Clean Power Plan captures the scientific urgency and the economic opportunity needed to avoid the worst consequences of climate change. The Clean Power Plan provides flexibility to the States to find solutions to reducing carbon pollution that work best for their situations. The Clean Power Plan will be at the heart of a supercharged renewables renaissance in every single State in the Union. It will create jobs and save consumers billions on their electricity bills. It will avert almost 100,000 asthma attacks a year

and prevent thousands of premature deaths. The climate and health benefits of this rule are estimated to be \$34 to \$54 billion every year by the year 2030.

With the Clean Power Plan, we can create wealth and health for our country. In Massachusetts, we know firsthand that by cutting carbon pollution, we can grow our economy and save families money. It is a formula that works. We did it through the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, or RGGI, which is a model for the Clean Power Plan. Since the program went into effect in 2009, the program has added on the order of \$3 billion worth of economic value to participating States and it has saved consumers more than \$1.5 billion.

Massachusetts now has nearly 100,000 people working in the clean energy sector in our State. It is the fastest growing job-creation sector in our economy. All of this has happened just over the last 10 years.

As a nation, we have a choice: We can continue to pump harmful carbon pollution into our skies and foreign oil into our cars or we can pump new life into our economy, creating jobs and saving Americans money on their energy bills.

Climate deniers call this plan a war on coal, but it is really a war on carbon pollution. The Clean Power Plan is a signal to the marketplace to invest in clean energy, and it is a signal to the world that America will lead the global effort for climate action and be the global leader. You cannot preach temperance from a bar stool. If we want to be a leader, we have to stand up and say: Here is what we are going to do.

By reducing U.S. carbon pollution, the United States will be the leader and not the laggard in the international climate negotiations beginning at the end of this month in Paris. U.S. leadership has helped secure climate pledges for Paris from more than 150 countries. We now have the opportunity to forge an international climate agreement that includes all countries doing their fair share for a global solution to global warming.

We aren't tackling climate change alone. Efforts are underway in legislatures around the world to develop laws and develop national responses to climate change. But without the Clean Power Plan, America would not be able to have any credibility in Paris in 2½ weeks in saying: We are going to reduce our greenhouse gases. You must, as another sovereign country, reduce your greenhouse gases.

Coal companies, the Koch brothers, and other allies of the fossil fuel industry may oppose the United States and the world acting on climate, but scientific facts, economic opportunity, and history are not on their side.

Today we are debating a resolution to overturn the Clean Power Plan, and should it pass, the President will veto it and Republicans won't have the votes to overturn the veto. What the Republicans are doing today is nothing

more than a political Kabuki theater. Instead of wasting time tilting at legislative windmills, we should be passing tax extenders to help build more wind turbines and more solar panels in the United States of America. That is what we should be debating out here on the floor of the Senate today.

If the Republicans don't like the Clean Power Plan, then I ask them what is their plan to prevent climate change, expand energy, and create jobs. That is the real question we should be debating on the Senate floor today. The reality is that they have no plan. The reality is that as a party they are in denial that the planet is dangerously warming. The reality is that they want to keep the wind and solar tax breaks off of the books, giving incentives for Americans to innovate in this area. The reality is that the fossil fuel industry is still driving the agenda of the Republican Party here in Congress. That is the reality. That is why we are having this vote here on the floor of the Senate today, because the Republican Party is siding with Big Coal and Big Fossil Fuel in order to keep us on a pathway that does not allow us to unleash this renewable energy revolution.

The green generation—the young generation in our country—wants to be the leaders. They are innovators and they can find investors to help them with their new technology. They are professors and they are producers who want to work together in order to unleash this revolution.

The next generation already did this with telecommunications. They moved us from a black rotary dial phone to an iPhone in about 8 years. The technology was locked up. There was no innovation that was possible. The utility industry that was the telephone industry had a stake in everyone still renting a black rotary dial phone. The utility industry, which is the electrical generating industry, has a stake in slowing down the pace at which we move to wind and solar and to new technologies of the 21st century that are the match for the iPhone in the telecommunications sector. That is what we are debating on the floor—the path to the future. That is what we are debating on the floor—the 19th-century technologies versus the 21st-century technologies.

That is what we are debating on the floor—the status quo or an innovation economy where young people are able to move into these new sectors and invent these new technologies and exploit them around the planet. We did that in telecommunications. It is branded Google, eBay, Amazon and YouTube, around the planet. We did it in the blink of an eye once we unleashed the potential. We can do the same in the green energy sector, but defeating the Clean Power Plan vote the Republicans brought out on the floor is the key to unleashing this potential not only in our own country but across the planet.

I urge a "no" vote on this historic set of regulations that President Obama is

putting on the books. It is what will give us credibility when he goes to Paris in the beginning of December in order to negotiate this historic deal.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I rise today to oppose the Congressional Review Act to derail the Clean Power Plan.

It was Theodore Roosevelt who said, "Of all the questions that can come before this nation, short of the actual preservation of its existence in a great war, there is none which compares in importance with the great central task of leaving this land even a better land for our descendants than it is for us."

Theodore Roosevelt was at the core of the conservation movement in the Republican Party. It is a Republican Party far removed from the party it is today. Roosevelt's determination to "leave this land a little better" has been replaced by complete abdication of responsible leadership for the stewardship of our planet.

The Clean Power Plan that this resolution concerns is the single most significant step this country has taken now or in the past to combat climate change. Many citizens do not know that over the past few decades we have seen the carbon pollution rise in the atmosphere, and it is now in the upper level of 400 parts per million. As that carbon dioxide concentrates and comes to a higher level, it traps the heat, and that heat is producing profound consequences. We haven't had this level of carbon pollution for 3 million years—long before humans walked this planet and when sea levels were as much as 80 feet higher than they are today. So this is no ivory tower issue; it is very real, not only in the measurement of pollution in the air but in the facts on the ground.

In my home State of Oregon, we are seeing impacts on our forests. We see impacts of pine beetles spreading and creating a big red zone of dead trees. We see it in impacts in terms of fiercer forest fires and a longer forest fire season—a season that has grown 60 days in 40 years. We see it in terms of the diminishing snowpack in the Cascades, which not only makes our trout streams warmer and smaller, but it decreases the water we have for agriculture, and we have a massive drought year after year. The three worst ever droughts have been in the last 15 years in the Klamath Basin in the south. We see it in terms of our sea production—our oysters, which are struggling to create shells when they are small because the Pacific Ocean is 30 percent more acidic now than it was before the industrial revolution.

Carbon pollution is really a war on rural America. It is a war on forestry, our fishing, and our farming, and that cannot be allowed to stand.

There is no question that we have conclusive evidence of global warming.

Globally, 14 of the 15 warmest years on record have all occurred in the last 15 years. They have all occurred in this century, and 2014 was the warmest year ever on a global basis. This year, 2015, is on course to be even warmer yet. This translates into damage to our rural economy not only in terms of our forestry, our fishing, and our farming, but also in terms of the economic impact that occurs from the damage. The damage we see today is going to only get worse in the years ahead. These rural industries will suffer, and American livelihoods will suffer.

It is irresponsible to continue business as usual. We need to dramatically change course. We need to pivot from a fossil fuel energy economy to a renewable energy economy.

The Clean Power Plan sets achievable standards to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 32 percent of 2005 levels by the year 2030—strong but achievable standards. We have the technology today, but do we have the political will? Or is this body going to be ensnared by the powerful lobbying of the Koch brothers and the fossil fuel industry, which have announced they are going to spend \$1 billion in the next election to make sure their policies are the ones adopted in this room and that their policies will guide our future.

Well, how about this? How about we have policies that are the policies related to the welfare of American citizens, related to the welfare of our farmers, our fishing industry, and our forest industry? How about we fight for rural America instead of being led astray by the Koch brothers and the fossil fuel industry?

We know the Clean Power Plan will have a powerful, positive impact that will provide significant public health benefits, reducing premature deaths from powerplant emissions by nearly 90 percent, and that will avoid 3,600 premature deaths, will lead to 90,000 fewer asthma attacks for children, and will prevent 300,000 missed work and school days. We know this plan will create tens of thousands of jobs while driving new investments in cleaner, more modern, and more efficient technologies. We know it will save the American family nearly \$85 on their annual energy bill.

Fewer deaths are a good thing. More jobs are a good thing. Saving families money is a good thing. So let's fight for good things. Let's not follow the path my Republican colleagues are proposing, in which they are saying no to reducing bills for families, they are saying no to creating good-paying jobs, they are saying no to improving public health, and they are saying no to saving lives. Well, let's say yes.

It has been said that we are the first generation to feel the impacts of global warming and the last generation that can do something about it. This is a moral challenge to our generation of humans on this planet—on our beautiful blue-green planet. This responsibility rests not with some future gen-

eration or some past generation but with all of us right now. This resolution to try to torpedo the most effective measure America has ever adopted in the past or in the present is, in fact, deeply, deeply misguided.

Let's turn back to the test President Theodore Roosevelt put before us when he said that there is no more important mission than leaving this land even a better land for our descendants than it is for us. Our children and our children's children are counting on us to act. They are counting on us to save jobs, to save lives, and to save our planet. We must not fail this test.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the administration's Clean Power Plan. I think the first thing that must be said—and said over and over, especially this week, with so many critical issues facing our country, with appropriations bills pending, with the transportation bill pending, with perhaps a motion to go to conference on the education reauthorization—is that we are wasting floor time, that this piece of legislation has no chance. The threshold under the Congressional Review Act is 51 votes, and while it is very likely the threshold will be met, let's take this through the legislative process.

This will eventually, if it passes the House—when it passes the House—reach the President's desk. Can you imagine that President Obama is going to enact legislation that overturns his signature and environmental achievement? Whether you agree or not with the Clean Power Plan, the idea that he is going to sign this into law is preposterous. So it faces a veto. So then the only question is this: Can you get 67 votes in the Senate? And the answer is a resounding no.

So let's put this in context. This is an important debate, but this is not likely to result in any kind of legislation one way or the other. But here is what this is about. The Clean Air Act requires the EPA—it doesn't authorize the EPA; it requires the EPA—to regulate airborne pollutants. So it doesn't allow the EPA to pick among airborne pollutants and place limits; it requires that any airborne pollutant have limits.

In 2007 the Supreme Court of the United States determined that CO<sub>2</sub>—carbon—was in fact an airborne pollutant, which is kind of intuitive and consistent with what every expert in the field understands. So the only question is this: Do you believe in the Clean Air Act? Do you believe there should be an exception in the Clean Air Act for carbon pollution? Do you disagree with the consensus among scientists that carbon is a pollutant? That is what we are voting on today. So carbon is a pollutant, and this is a pretty straightforward policy issue, and it is a pretty straightforward scientific issue. The EPA must regulate emissions.

Let's also understand how CRA works. This vehicle is to overturn the Clean Power Plan. The way the statute runs is that it doesn't give the administration—or any future administration—any flexibility to do a different version of the same thing. It prohibits the administration from doing anything that is “substantially similar.”

So the difficulty, of course, is that hasn't actually been tested too many times in court. But the assumption most attorneys on both sides of this question are operating under is that it would not just invalidate this Clean Power Plan but prohibit the EPA from regulating carbon on a going-forward basis.

So if you have a specific concern, if you have a specific objection to the way this thing is administered, that is fair enough, but you don't have the ability to tell EPA to go and do this again and submit it again. It will actually be illegal under a CRA. So CRA is an extremely blunt instrument. It is an extremely radical thing to do, and that is what we are contending with.

So why, if all of that is true, is there a CRA vote this week? My instinct is that it is designed to create confusion, to kick up dust, and to raise the possibility that the American government does not stand behind the Clean Power Plan as we go into the final throes of the Paris climate talks.

Now, we have an opportunity here. We have 160 countries for the first time in history committing to different versions—all executed from within their own governmental systems, but they are all committing to different versions—of emissions reductions. Some of them have cap and trade, some have incentives, some of them have regulations, some have financing programs, but all of them are committing to various programs to reduce carbon emissions. This is a significant international achievement.

In previous climate negotiations, folks who opposed international climate action would actually go to these negotiations to create confusion, to imply the American government was somehow not going to stand by its commitments. That is why I wanted to go through how the CRA works and what the inevitable outcome of this piece of legislation will be, which is that it will be vetoed and that veto will be sustained.

The hope, I think, among people who oppose international climate action is that there is enough confusion going into Paris that someone can point to America's national legislature and say: Well, there is no consensus. That is true. There is no political consensus. But there is no practical way to overturn the Clean Power Plan, and there is no going back. I mean that is the most important aspect of this. This year, 2015, of all the new power generation in the United States, the majority of it was clean energy. The majority of new power generation in the United States was clean energy—how exciting.

I am not exactly sure why people fear the clean energy future so much. I understand we need to make a transition. The State of Hawaii depends on low-sulfur fuel oil for the vast majority of its electricity. I understand we can't make that transition overnight, and I understand there is going to be disruption and there is going to be difficulty as we make a transformation of this magnitude, but we are going to have to make this transformation. It doesn't have to be a bad thing. It can create innovation jobs, it can attract investment capital, and it can be a new American economy.

This is already happening. This is not pie in the sky any more. This is already underway. The majority of new power generation in the United States is clean energy. Let's keep the momentum up. Let's support the Clean Power Plan.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes.

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

The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I first want to thank very much the Senator from Delaware for his courtesy in this regard.

(The remarks of Mr. VITTER pertaining to the introduction of S. 2284 are printed in today's RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

Mr. VITTER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

#### SYRIAN REFUGEES

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I come to the floor to address the issue of climate change, but I am inclined to follow up on comments by our friend from Louisiana who has just spoken.

As the Presiding Officer knows, I am no longer the chairman of the homeland security committee, but I am the senior Democrat. I have served on the committee for about 15 years. The issue of the security of our homeland, whether from cyber attacks or terrorists or any other of number of threats, is something I care a whole lot about.

I am sure all of us recall when we had a special visitor who addressed a joint session of the Congress on the other side of the Capitol. His name is Francis, and he is the Pope. It was a Papal visit. He addressed a joint session of Congress. I am not Catholic, but I was moved, and I know a lot of our colleagues were moved, especially when he invoked the Golden Rule in front of a national television audience, when he called on all of us to treat other people the way we would want to be treated, and also when he invoked the words of Matthew 25: When I was hungry did you feed me, when I was naked did you clothe me, when I was thirsty did you give me to drink, when

I was a stranger in your land did you take me in?

When I hear of the prospect of a thousand or so Syrian refugees coming to this country this year—and more next year—I think of the desperate plight of people who are trying to escape the hellacious situation in Syria and who have been living, in some cases months or years, in refugee camps. What kind of moral imperative do we have with respect to them? What kind of moral imperative? What kind of moral imperative do we have at the same time to ensure that the folks we allow to come in as refugees to this country—that we are going to protect those of us who live here from possible threats that might be caused by that immigration?

This week I learned a few things I didn't know before. There is a lot more I have to learn. Among the things I have learned this week is that when refugees—whether in Turkey or someplace else in that or the other side of the world, in Pakistan or any other place—seek to come to this country, they don't get to just come. It is not like they say: I am applying under refugee status to come to the United States, and I would like to come this week or this month or even this year. The average wait for folks in refugee status trying to get someplace out of a refugee camp—and it could be here, but especially here, the average wait for refugees is not a week, it is not a month, it is not a year. It is 1.5 years. For those of Syrian descent, the wait could be even longer.

I am not going to go through all the hurdles folks have to go through, but it is a screening process that begins not with the Department of Homeland Security in this country. It is a screening process that begins way before that with the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees. They first register refugees, they gather biometric data, and they gather other background information. Only those who pass the U.N. assessment are ever referred to the United States for possible resettlement. Where they are looking to accept maybe 1,000 Syrian refugees this year, the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees may interview 3,000, 4,000, 5,000 refugees, or more, to come up with a list of 1,000 that we would even consider. Those refugees are interviewed not when they get off a plane here, but overseas, before they ever get on a plane. Before they ever get on a plane, they go through multiple background checks and vetting and use biographical checks conducted by the State Department, security advisory opinions from intelligence and other agencies for certain cases, National Counterterrorism Center checks with intelligence agencies for support, the Department of Homeland Security and the FBI biometrics checks, and the Department of Defense biometric screening.

Then, after going through all of that, if they get here, they have the opportunity to be interviewed again face-to-

face by the Department of Homeland Security folks who are trained to interview people alleging to be refugees. They could be something else. Then, if they get approved to stay here as a refugee, we continue to monitor them for an extended period of time.

A year or so ago there was great concern with Ebola. We had a lot of people coming across the border from Mexico, and they were going to have Ebola and infect us all and a lot of people were going to die. Not one American died from Ebola contracted here.

So I would have us take a deep breath, try to gather the facts, and really understand what somebody has to go through as a refugee to get here. It is not overnight; it is not a 1-week or a 1-month deal. If I were a bad guy wanting to come here and create mischief, I sure wouldn't go as a refugee. I wouldn't cool my jets for a year and a half, trying to get through that process. I would find another way.

Mr. President, that is not what I wanted to talk about. I want to talk a bit about one of our favorite subjects, climate change and global warming.

I will start off with a map here of New Jersey, Maryland, Philadelphia. In between Philadelphia and the Delmarva Peninsula is my State, the State of Delaware. This is probably hard to see from up there or on television, but the outline of this map is Delaware today. A couple hundred years from now, if we don't continue to make progress in reducing carbon dioxide, Delaware will not look like the outline of that map. It is not going to look like the green. It will be somewhere between the outline of that map and the green that we see here that depicts Delaware. For us, this is real. These are our homes, these are our farms, the places we live and raise our families. So for us, this is something that is serious.

Long before I ever moved to Delaware, I served as a naval flight officer in the Navy during the Vietnam war and served in Southeast Asia and other places. Long before I ever did that, long before I went to Ohio State to study economics, long before I moved to Virginia, I was born in West Virginia. I was born in a coal mining town. My dad, coming out of Shady Spring High School in Beaver, WV, was for a short while a coal miner. Even after my sister and I had grown up and left West Virginia—she after being in the third grade and I in the second grade—we would come back and visit my mom's parents, my grandparents, in Beaver, WV, right outside of Beckley. A coal miner named Mr. Meaders lived next door to my grandparents. He had a big field of about 2 to 4 acres right next to my grandparents' house. He would come home from work at about 4 or 5 in the afternoon. He always had his coal mining clothes on. He had mined coal for decades. He also owned a cow, and he kept his cow in a shed on that 3-, 4-, 5-acre field. When he would come home, he would clean up,

and then he would milk his cow and he would let us milk his cow. Mr. Meaders didn't make his living off the milk from that cow. He made his living as a coal miner. And he wasn't the only person in West Virginia who made their living mining coal. There are still a number of people in West Virginia whose income is derived from mining coal.

West Virginia is one of the top five coal-producing States in the country, among Wyoming, Kentucky, Illinois, and Pennsylvania. The number of people employed in the coal mining business in each of those States today—as opposed to when I my sister and I were little kids running out with Mr. Meaders to milk his cow—has come down a whole lot. But for these people, these are good-paying, life-sustaining jobs for their families.

So we try to figure out—not just in Delaware, not just in America, but around the world—how do we reduce the threat from high levels of carbon in our atmosphere? Is there a way to do that? Is there a way to do that that is also respectful of the needs of people in Wyoming, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Kentucky, who are trying to make a living and all they want to do is mine coal? That is what they have done maybe all their lives and want to be able to continue to do that. The Golden Rule—again, is there a way we can somehow adopt a policy or policies that are mindful of their needs to be able to sustain and support their own families, and at the same time to make sure in doing that, they don't endanger the rest of us? That is the dilemma we are in. We have a moral imperative to look out for the coal miners and their families in those States I mentioned, and we have a moral imperative to look out for everybody else, including the folks here and up and down the east coast and west coast, and others whose lives are going to be changed if we don't continue to make progress. We want to continue to make progress with respect to reducing the amount of carbon in our air.

I think we can try to at least address both moral imperatives—to try to make sure the folks who for generations have mined coal can continue to do that in a way that is not just economically sustainable but environmentally sustainable, and do so in a way that actually looks out for the legitimate interests of a whole lot of us who come from States where we don't mine coal.

One of the biggest sources of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere continues to be coal-fired plants. We generate electricity. It used to be that about 40 percent of the electricity in the United States came from coal-fired plants, maybe another 20 percent or so from nuclear powered plants, another 20 percent or so from natural gas-fired plants, and the rest from hydroelectric, solar, wind, and so forth. That mix has changed a little bit. Today, coal is down to about 30 percent. Natural gas,

in terms of generating capacity, is up to about 30 percent. Nuclear is still in there at about 20, adding a couple nuclear plants in the next few years, maybe building some smaller, modular plants. We are generating ever more electricity from wind, a bit more from solar and from geothermal and hydro. But coal is down from 40 to maybe 30 percent, and the projection is that maybe by 2030 it will be down from 30 percent to as low as 20 or 25 percent. That is going to create some hardship for the folks in those States, including my native State. Is there some way that we can actually help them while at the same time helping those of us who aren't from those five States?

For as long as I can remember, I have heard people, including from this floor, for many years talking about Robert Byrd, who was the former majority leader, dean of the Senate, and maybe the longest-serving person in the House and Senate in the history of our country. He was a big champion of clean coal technology. Since approximately 1997, we have pursued clean coal, carbon capture, and sequestration. I am told that just in this last decade we have spent about \$20 billion, since maybe 2005—something like that, in the last decade—and we have a success story. We have had a lot of disappointments, but we have a success story. I want to share that with our colleagues today.

The success story on U.S. clean coal is a project in Southwest Texas, in Houston, where there is NRG, a big utility company. That project is a clean-coal project generating electricity. It is going to come online sometime next year. There are other projects under way, and we are continuing to invest a lot of money in clean-coal technology. We need to continue to do more.

The last thing I want to say is this. We face many threats to our Nation these days. ISIS is certainly one of those. There are also other terrorist threats. Cyber security is certainly a threat we face. We have an obligation to our grandchildren and their grandchildren to be able to make sure we address those threats.

This is not a battle that the United States can win alone on those fronts—nor with respect to our climate change concerns. It is going to take a coalition of many nations, and we are one of those nations. We are one of the nations that put as much CO<sub>2</sub> in the air as anybody else. We have an obligation to try to figure out how to reduce that amount and how to reduce the threat. We need to be a leader and not just say to other nations that they should do this but also that they follow our example. What we are trying to do is to lead by our example.

At our church, our pastor sometimes will say: I am preaching to the choir, but even choirs need to be preached to. The other thing he will say from time to time is this: I would rather see a sermon than hear a sermon. For the rest

of the world, they don't want to hear a sermon from us on climate change. They want to see the sermon.

What we are trying to do over the next 15, 20 years is to reduce our CO<sub>2</sub> emissions since 2005 by about 30 percent and leave it up to the States—not EPA calling shots and not micromanaging—to figure out what works best in their States and to help them help us meet that national target. Thirty percent reduction from 2005 to 2030—that is the deal. That is the goal. My hope is that we will do our part. We will provide the leadership that is needed, not by what we say but by what we do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5:30 p.m. today, all time on S.J. Res. 24 be considered expired and the Senate vote on passage of S.J. Res. 24; further, that following the disposition of S.J. Res. 24, the majority leader be recognized to make a motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 23; that if the motion to proceed is agreed to, then all time under the Congressional Review Act be considered expired and that the Senate vote on passage of S.J. Res. 23.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for such time as I shall consume.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, at 5:30 p.m. today, two votes are going to take place on the two CRAs—one by Senator CAPITO and one by Senator McCONNELL, as he just referred to.

The Congressional Review Act is something really good that has come along for a reason. A lot of people don't understand that the bureaucracy gets out of hand sometimes. I was listening very attentively to my friend from Delaware. When I see some of the regulations that come through, I am wondering: How in the world could this happen? These are things that we have voted on over and over, as with the case of cap and trade, which is what we are talking about now. Our first one was the McCain-Lieberman act of 2003, then again in 2005, and then the Warner-Lieberman act of 2008. And Waxman-Markey didn't even come to the Senate floor because they knew they didn't have the votes for it. Each one of these was rejected by the elected Members of the Senate and by a larger margin each year.

It is interesting what this President has done. He has taken the things that people don't want and has said: Well, if we can't do it through legislation, we will do it through regulation.

We have seen time and again that he has followed this. It is really going to come to a screeching halt this time because there are some things that are

going on that people are not aware of. There are a lot of legal problems with Obama's carbon rules—especially his power plan.

Right now we have 27 States, 24 national trade associations, 37 rural electric co-ops, 10 major companies, and 3 labor unions representing just under 1 million workers. They are now challenging the final rule in court. This chart shows you the States that are challenging the rule in court. A lot of these entities have requested a judicial stay, which would likely put these rules on hold until early next year. While the courts work through the numerous other challenges, time is going to go by and time is certainly not their friend.

I was listening carefully to what my friend from Delaware was saying. One observation I have is that the people have caught on. In 2002 it was very lonely standing here at this podium in this Chamber, and no one else wanted to be a part of that discussion. Yet, at that time, the ranking of people, insofar as what they thought about the legitimacy of the argument that the world was coming to an end because of global warming, was either No. 1 or No. 2. I am talking about the polls that were across the nation at that time.

Now that same poll last March that said that global warming was the No. 1 concern back in 2002 is now No. 15. People have caught on. They realize that the cost is going to be exorbitant, and they realize it is not going to accomplish anything. I don't have any doubt that once the courts assess the merits of these challenges, the Obama administration's power plan will not survive judicial scrutiny.

President Obama and Administrator McCarthy are equally aware of their legal vulnerabilities, which is why Obama's Agency deliberately slow-walked the implementation process to try to prevent any CRAs or negative court rulings prior to the International Climate Conference in December. It has already been done over there. It is going to get very active here in a matter of just a few days.

POLITICO had an article a week ago that reported that the administration has asked the DC Circuit to postpone decisions until after December 23. What does that tell you? It tells you that they don't want to go over to the International Climate Conference for the big show and then walk in and find out that nothing is going to happen over here in this country and where the people are in terms of this issue.

The Agency's lack of legal authority is not the only reason for bipartisan opposition to the administration's carbon regulations. The President's power plan alone would cost \$292 billion, resulting in double-digit electricity price increases in 46 States. That is conservative. We have documentation from MIT and from many of the organizations saying that the cost of this type of cap and trade is somewhere in the range of between \$300 billion and \$400 billion a year.

The Presiding Officer and I are very concerned about the State of Oklahoma. In the State of Oklahoma, every time I hear a figure that talks about trillions or billions of dollars, I find out how many families in my State of Oklahoma paid Federal income tax, and I do the math. This would cost somewhere around \$3,000 a family—an average family in Oklahoma. You couple that with the fact that nothing is happening only here. If you believed in all the dangers that you hear about with CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, if you really believe that to be true, that would not be true in terms of what we are talking about now. The first Administrator of the EPA who was supported by President Obama when asked the question if we were to pass this regulation or pass the legislation on cap and trade, would this have the effect of reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions worldwide, said no, it wouldn't because it would only affect the United States of America. If that is the case, then it is not going to affect the other countries.

In fact, you can carry it one step further. If we have very tight restrictions in this country where our manufacturing base is forced to go to other countries, and then there are countries that don't have any emission requirements at all, it has the effect of increasing, not decreasing, the emissions.

We had a hearing in the Environment and Public Works Committee, which I chair, and we had as one of the witnesses Harry Alford. Harry Alford is the President of the National Black Chamber of Commerce. He talked about how any type of a cap-and-trade scheme is unfair to very poor people. He estimated that the Obama power plan would result in an estimated job loss of nearly 200,000 jobs for Black Americans and more than 300,000 jobs for Hispanics. The increased energy cost undermines global competitiveness for American small business and energy-intensive industries. These companies will ultimately shut down here at home where the electricity bill becomes unaffordable and create jobs instead for our competitors, such as China.

I can remember talking to China at the various meetings such as the International Climate Conference meeting that is coming up at the end of next month. They are hoping that something will happen where we are going to restrict our manufacturing base because they are the beneficiaries of that.

The EPA has consistently acknowledged this. The former Administrator, Lisa Jackson, says that U.S. action alone is not going to have any reduction. Her job didn't last too long after she made that statement.

The current Administrator, Gina McCarthy, testified that the President's power plan is not about pollution control but rather about sending a signal to the rest of the world that the United States is serious about addressing global warming. The minuscule

benefits that might come would be hardly measurable to this country.

Lastly, I would like to mention something that people don't talk about very often, and that is, there is something good about the process that we have available to us, the CRA—the Congressional Review Act. There are a lot of people who are of liberal nature, and they like overregulation. They don't mind it a bit. I am talking about Senators and House Members now. They go back to their States, and they get hit by all the business communities that say: We can't compete because of the overregulation of EPA. The response is always this: Well, I have nothing to do with that; the unelected bureaucrats are doing that.

That is not true. You need to carry this message back with you. The CRA is there so that a person cannot tell the people at home that he is opposed to regulations that he is really supporting, because what is going to happen tonight—I can tell you right now—is that both of them are going to pass. But they are not going to pass them by a two-thirds margin. That means that they will go to the House, and they will pass them. They will go to the President's desk, and he will veto them. Therefore, it is going to take two-thirds to override a veto. They will come back for a vote. Those individuals who always rejoice in not having to vote and getting on record are going to have to vote on them. That is a neat deal. It is going to happen. You are here in on it right now.

That reminds me a little bit about Copenhagen, back in 2009. I remember so well that they were all going over there. That was back when the Democrats controlled the House, the Senate, and the White House. They made it a real issue. They put on quite a show over there. President Obama went over. PELOSI went over. John Kerry went over. They all talked about the 192 nations that were there and how we were going to pass cap and trade as legislation. This is 2009. I went over at the very last conference and told them they were telling the truth. We are not going to pass it. In fact, there weren't 30 votes in the Senate that would pass it at that time. Of course, that is what ended up being the case.

There is a real setback that happened 6 days ago. You may have noticed that Secretary of State Kerry made the public statement that nothing would be binding on the United States that came out of the International Climate Conference. Immediately, the President of France and all the others were outraged, saying that he must have been confused. They used the word “confused.”

Right now the big fight that is going on is not Republican or conservatives and liberals. It is between those participants who are all for restrictions on emissions. That is what is going on now. I think the vote this afternoon is going to be a very important one. I can assure you that anyone who wants to

vote against this can go ahead and do it. But keep in mind that this is going to pass. It is going to be vetoed by the President. It is going to come back for a veto override. Everyone is going to be on record. Here it is. These are the States that are currently anticipating the process of putting together legal action to stop this outcome. It is a very important vote this afternoon.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TERRORIST ATTACKS AGAINST FRANCE AND SYRIAN REFUGEES

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I wish to begin by echoing the condolences shared by millions around the world regarding last week's attacks in Paris. Our thoughts and prayers go out to the families and loved ones of those who died. As a nation, we remain committed to supporting and defending the people of France in whatever way we can.

The attacks in Paris last week remind us again of the dangerous world in which we live. Although Paris has become the focus of attention, the day before the attacks in France, two ISIS suicide bombers in Beirut blew themselves up, killing 40 people in a bustling urban area. Our thoughts and prayers go out to the people in Beirut and to all those who have suffered loss at the hands of this horrific terrorist organization.

ISIS remains one of the most brutal and indiscriminate terrorist organizations in recent history. Its campaign of violence is not limited to a specific region, nationality or religion. As the events in Paris have shown us, the threat posed by ISIS reaches well beyond the borders of Iraq and Syria. If it can, ISIS will spread its campaign of violence to innocent people all over the world.

The United States, as a champion of freedom and democracy, has a duty to stand up against ISIS's brand of radical Islam and stomp it out wherever it exists. ISIS represents a clear and present danger to the American people and our allies and it must be stopped.

President Obama, when asked about ISIS the day before the Paris attacks, made the following statement. He said:

I don't think they're gaining strength. . . . From the start our goal has been first to contain, and we have contained them.

“We have contained them.” Those were his words. Unfortunately, ISIS does not appear to be contained. My colleague from California, the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, responded this week by saying:

I've never been more concerned. I read the intelligence faithfully. ISIL is not contained. ISIL is expanding.

Yet yesterday President Obama, unbelievably, doubled down on this failing strategy by stating: “We have the right strategy and we're going to see it through. . . .” And when referring to the Paris attacks, he called them a “setback.” Based on the number of casualties and population of France, this attack was the equivalent of a 9/11. I would hardly call such an attack a mere “setback.” When it comes to the U.S. strategy against ISIS, one thing is clear: ISIS cannot simply be contained. ISIS must be defeated.

From what we have learned so far, most of the terrorists involved in last week's Paris attack were individuals who already resided in France and Belgium. That means these are individuals who became radicalized at home, received training or support from ISIS, and in some cases traveled to Iraq or Syria for training and then returned to France to carry out these attacks. Since ISIS first occupied territory in Iraq and Syria and began recruiting foreign fighters, the possibility of these combatants returning home has been a concern to the United States and to our allies, and this attack in Paris demonstrates the validity of that concern. As a nation we must remain vigilant in defending our homeland against this type of attack by radicalized individuals holding U.S. or European passports.

I also wish to speak for a moment about the Syrian refugee crisis because it ties into everything that has happened in that region of the world. As we are all aware, the regime of Bashar al-Assad is responsible for the civil war in Syria that allowed ISIS to gain a foothold and to expand. Assad used chemical weapons on his own people and hundreds of thousands of lives have been lost as a result of the conflict he created. It is completely understandable that the peace-loving people of that country want out.

Just this week, several of my colleagues sent a letter to President Obama expressing concerns about the possibility of ISIS infiltrating the Syrian refugee population and asking what is being done to thoroughly vet these refugees. Over half the Governors in this Nation have stated they don't want Syrian refugees resettled in their States. I share their concerns. The United States should not accept Syrian refugees as long as there is a threat posed by ISIS. If we cannot be 100 percent certain that additional refugees from Syria do not put Americans at risk, the President's plan to accept up to 10,000 additional refugees this year should be rejected. If the President tries to act unilaterally, Congress should cut off funding to prevent the President from taking any action that would put the American people at risk.

If we are going to be serious about solving the Syrian refugee crisis, the answer is not deciding which countries are accepting how many refugees, the answer is to defeat ISIS and remove Basher al-Assad from power so the

peace-loving people of Syria can return home.

On that point, I want to speak about a realistic strategy for defeating ISIS. So far the United States has relied almost entirely on airstrikes. Prior to the attacks in Paris, France was already the coalition partner conducting the second greatest number of airstrikes against ISIS. Those airstrikes have been ramped up in recent days, but this is not a fundamental shift in our strategy. Airstrikes are important, but ultimately they cannot be a solution in and of themselves.

It was President Obama's politically motivated decision to withdraw troops from Iraq that ultimately led to ISIS expanding into Iraq to begin with. President Obama stated yesterday that boots on the ground would be a mistake, but it was his decision to withdraw U.S. troops that is partially responsible for creating this problem, and now we are at a point where retaking territory from ISIS will require ground forces. There is no way around it. If President Obama is going to be realistic about defeating ISIS, he needs to form a coalition capable of taking the war to ISIS on the ground. That does not require the United States committing ground troops, but it does require the United States leading by example and forming a coalition capable of fighting both in the air and on the ground. The President needs to stop talking about containment and start acting on a strategy that will root out and defeat ISIS wherever it can be found.

I thank the Presiding Officer and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask to speak as in morning business.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I have the honor of being the ranking Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and earlier today I had a chance to be with the other Members of the Senate and the Ambassador from France to express our solidarity, our condolences about those who lost their lives in the attack last Friday night, and to express America's resolve to work with our French partners to root out ISIL.

Let it be clear, our policy is to degrade, defeat, and destroy ISIL wherever it may be, any place in the world. We will retake the properties and lands they currently control, and we will destroy their operation. That is our commitment, and that is what we must do. We will protect U.S. citizens, our homeland. That is one of our most solemn responsibilities. We will do that

by having the strongest possible security screening measures for those who enter our country. We will do that by enhancing our intelligence-gathering capacity not only here in the United States because we have taken major steps since the attack on our country on September 11, but we need a seamless system with our allies in Europe and our global partners to share timely information so we can track those who want to do harm to us and so we can apprehend foreign-trained fighters who have joined the terrorists and then go back to Europe or try to enter the United States. We need to know where they are, apprehend them, and get them out of our community.

Let me mention a couple of issues that have come to light just recently; that is, our policies with regard to refugees. I want to make it clear that we have to have the most stringent security screening, so that when we are settling refugees, we don't allow anyone with any association to terrorist organizations to be able to enter the United States.

I also think it is important that we understand the current procedures and processes that are in place and how it differs dramatically from Europe. In Europe, they literally have millions of refugees who are fleeing Syria and who get into Europe. They usually get in at a border country to the Middle East, over water, and then of course enter Europe and can travel throughout that continent. There is virtually no screening.

In the United States, before we will resettle a refugee under the auspices of the United Nations, there is a requirement for an in-person interview, biographic checks, interagency checks, biometric screening, including fingerprinting, initial case review by the Department of Homeland Security before an in-person interview, and it goes on and on and on.

My constituents and the Presiding Officer's constituents want to make sure that those security screenings are strong enough to make sure terrorists can't get into the United States, and we have a responsibility to make sure that in fact is the case, but I also point out that millions travel to the United States freely through our borders because it is a small world and people travel. They travel here for vacation, and they travel here for family. We have relationships with many countries, a program known as the Visa Waiver Program, where individuals can travel to the United States without obtaining a visa. It is interesting that if a person has a French passport, they can enter the United States without a visa. So we need to make sure that anyone who attempts to come to America, we know that; that if they are dangerous, we have that information, and as a result we can prevent them from entering our country.

I say all of this because I hope that what happened in France will energize us in unity to carry out our most im-

portant responsibility, which is to keep America safe and keep Americans safe. We need to do everything we can, whether it is going after terrorists or protecting our homeland, to make sure Americans are kept safe.

Madam President, shortly we will be voting on the Congressional Review Act, the regulatory review act which will allow us to vote on two regulations on the Clean Power Plan rules that have been promulgated by the administration. I urge my colleagues to reject these resolutions that would prevent these regulations from going forward. In other words, I urge my colleagues to allow these regulations to go forward that deal with the Clean Power Plan rules.

There are four reasons I say that. First and foremost is the public health reason. We have a responsibility for the public health of the people of this Nation, and clean air is critically important. The number of children who suffer from asthma will go up dramatically if we don't clean up our air. Premature deaths will go up. There is a direct cost to our public health as a result of ignoring what we can do for cleaner air in America.

Clean air has an effect on our economy. When a parent can't go to work because they have a child suffering from asthma because the air is not clean to breathe, that is a day lost from work. It affects our economy. We also know that if we rely more on clean energy and renewable energy sources, that is stronger for economic growth. It creates more jobs. So for the sake not just of our health but for the sake of our economy, it is important that we take the appropriate steps to make sure we have clean air.

Yes, there is also the issue of our environment. Climate change is real. We should follow the recommendations of the experts, not necessarily the politicians. The experts tell us that our activities on Earth are affecting the rate of change in climate, that they affect the stability of the world in which we live, and that we can do something about it for a more positive outcome.

The extreme weather conditions that we have seen all too often—I could talk about what has happened in my own State of Maryland and the impact it has had on the Chesapeake Bay. We know that. Scientists are telling us that. It is because the carbon emissions are accelerating as a result of our activities on Earth. Scientists say we can do something about it. Scientists have told us we can do better in the way we generate power in reducing carbon emissions. That is not a heavy lift; it is something we can do.

Shortly, the world will meet in Paris to come together, I hope, on a way that we can join, as an international global community, in a strategy to reduce our carbon emissions. The United States must exercise leadership. President Obama has done part of that leadership by the promulgation of these power plan rules.

Lastly, this is a matter of national security. We know that we have a limited amount of fossil fuels. We know that. We also know that renewable energy sources are becoming more energy independent, and that is smart for our national security concerns.

So for all of those reasons, I urge my colleagues to reject the resolution that would prevent these regulations from going forward.

I just want to give by way of example what is happening in my own State of Maryland. Maryland is well underway in complying with these rules. We are there. We will be there. We have shown that we can make these types of investments, and by the way, we would create more jobs in doing this. Creating clean power generation will help our economy. As I said earlier, it helped Maryland's economy. So we have been able to move forward in aggressive steps for clean energy production. But Marylanders breathe air that is polluted by the generation of power in other States. We need a national policy. It can't be done just by a State. We need a national policy, and that is what these clean power rules do.

I urge my colleagues to follow the best science. Allow America to continue to be the world leader. Do what is right for the public health, for our economy, for our environment, for our future, and reject these efforts that would block these rules.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I rise to speak in opposition to the Environmental Protection Agency's new rules on carbon dioxide, which I believe need to be rescinded.

On August 3, 2015, the EPA released its so-called Clean Power Plan. This final plan will impose a 32-percent reduction nationwide in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the existing electric power sector compared with 2005 levels. This is an increase from a 30-percent reduction outlined in last year's proposed rule.

North Dakota's mandated reductions, however, far exceed those levels. The EPA originally proposed an 11-percent reduction, but then in the final rule that went from 11 percent to a 45-percent reduction. Let me repeat that. For our State, the EPA put out a proposed rule and said North Dakota has to reduce by 11 percent. Then, without reissuing a new proposed rule or anything else, EPA said in the final rule, no, it is not an 11-percent reduction in the State of North Dakota, it is a 45-percent reduction. Not only does that create real problems in real terms as far as our industry addressing that level of reduction, but I think it raises real questions as to whether EPA followed the law and regulation in promulgating the rule.

It is critical to communicate the impacts this rule will have on our State and across the country, especially in our electricity generation and mining sectors. People need to know that

thousands of workers' families and communities across the country will be negatively impacted by this rule.

On September 30, 2015, I hosted a meeting with North Dakota's coal industry and regulators to meet with Janet McCabe, the EPA Assistant Administrator in charge of issuing the new carbon dioxide rule. We directly communicated our State's opposition to the rule. We also called on the EPA to provide greater flexibility by recognizing the investments and advances made by industry in reducing CO<sub>2</sub> levels and North Dakota's unique coal and geographic resources.

As a result of the meeting, EPA officials agreed to provide flexibility for the State to submit its State implementation plan, its SIP. Essentially, instead of requiring a plan in 1 year, we will be able to provide a draft plan in 1 year, with 3 years to submit the final SIP. We also received a commitment from the EPA to send technical staff to North Dakota so that the Agency can hear firsthand from North Dakota regulators and officials about the challenges in complying with the Agency's mandate.

Also, here in the Senate, I am working with colleagues on several legislative efforts to halt and repeal this rule. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I worked to include language in the fiscal year 2016 interior and environmental funding bill to block the EPA from implementing this rule. We are working to include this priority in the fiscal year 2016 Omnibus appropriations bill that Congress will take up in the coming weeks.

I have also joined with Senator CAPITO of West Virginia to introduce a bipartisan bill, the Affordable Reliable Energy Now Act, or the ARENA Act. This legislation would empower State Governors to protect ratepayers from increases and ensure the reliability of the electric grid. At the same time, it would prevent the EPA from mandating unproven technology or withholding highway funds from States not in compliance with the rule.

Further, I am cosponsoring the resolutions of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act to repeal the new EPA regulation which we are considering on the Senate floor right now and which we will be voting on in a little more than half an hour. The Congressional Review Act, or CRA, authorizes Congress, by a majority vote, to repeal actions by a Federal agency after they are formally published and submitted to Congress.

In North Dakota, we have successfully adopted an "all of the above" approach to energy development, and we have demonstrated that we can utilize our natural resources to do it with better environmental stewardship. EPA's new rules on carbon dioxide neither reflect our State-led approach nor accounts for the significant investment our industry and workers have already made to improve the way electricity is generated in our State, and that is true across the country.

I encourage my colleagues to vote for Senator CAPITO's CRA which disapproves the EPA's carbon rule for existing electric utility sources, as well as Leader MCCONNELL's CRA to disapprove the EPA's rule for new sources.

We can produce more energy with better environmental stewardship, but the way to do it is not by shutting down powerplants and destroying jobs as well as raising costs on hard-working families and small businesses. Instead, we need to create a business environment that will attract more investments so that the industry can develop and deploy new technologies that help us produce more energy more dependably and more cost-effectively while at the same time promote better environmental stewardship. That is the right way to do it. That is the way we are doing it in North Dakota.

Thank you, Madam President.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I rise today to speak about this battle and regulatory war being waged by the Environmental Protection Agency.

Just 2 weeks ago, the Senate considered two measures aimed at rolling back ill-thought-out rules by the EPA—the waters of the United States rule. The body did the right thing in stating our bipartisan resolve against the rule.

Unfortunately, here we are again, another week, another proposed rule to massively expand the EPA's power, and another attempt by this administration to stomp out America's coal industry. That is exactly what the Clean Power Plan is—a miscalculated regulation aimed at keeping coal in the ground at any cost.

This latest travesty of a rule, known as the Clean Power Plan, requires States to develop and implement plans to reduce carbon emissions between 2022 and 2030 in order to accomplish interim and final emission goals established by the EPA. Let me clarify that. This is actually not one rule but three separate rules which, taken together, would be more aptly named the "No Power Plan." The Clean Power Plan includes a final rule to revise carbon pollution standards for new, modified, and reconstructed power plants; a final rule to revise carbon pollution standards for existing power plants; and thirdly, a Federal plan for enactment and enforcement of the other two rules. Simple, right? No.

Under the guise of flexibility and cooperation, the CPP requires States to choose between two types of plans, described by the EPA as an "emission standards" approach or a "state measures" approach. Some States, such as my home State of Wyoming, will have some terrible choices to make under the CPP. Under the final rule, by the year 2030, Wyoming's carbon emissions will have to be 44 percent lower than in 2005, which is the baseline year the

EPA uses for the plan. That is more than double the 19-percent reduction the EPA imposed upon Wyoming in the proposed rule, which was released about 18 months ago, in June of 2014.

As Wyoming's Governor Matt Mead said recently when my home State joined 23 others in suing the EPA to strike down the rule, "The fact that the agency more than doubled the damage to Wyoming in the final rule shows arbitrary and capricious action."

Not only that, this plan puts the onus on the States to figure out how they are going to do it, and that is so the EPA can avoid a cost-benefit analysis that they are required to do. But not if they force the States to do it! But, of course, if the States don't do it, then the EPA will have to do it, which means the agency should have done a cost-benefit analysis to begin with. But the EPA doesn't have a very good track record on cost-benefit analyses.

One of the regulations, the mercury air toxins rule, is going to provide about \$500 million in benefits over a 10-year period. It is hard to determine what those benefits are or how the EPA did the calculations. None of it is transparent. But the compliance cost for that \$500 million in benefits is up to \$43 billion a year. Couldn't we incentivize somebody to come up with a better system for a whole lot less than \$43 billion a year, to save \$500 million over 10 years? That is another example of an arbitrary and capricious action.

So how does Wyoming wind up with such a huge burden under the Clean Power Plan? Because the Clean Power Plan supposes it will achieve carbon emission reductions from electricity generating units that burn fossil fuels—coal, oil, and natural gas. States that produce these fuels are the hardest hit. Wyoming is the largest coal-producing State in the Nation. Wyoming produces 40 percent of the Nation's coal, and coal represents almost 40 percent of the electricity generated in this country. It is abundant, affordable, clean and, most important, it is stockpiled. If the power plants that produce energy from fossil fuels like coal are forced to shutter their doors to make dramatic structural changes, it will have tangible negative impacts on fossil fuel consumers. If that doesn't alarm you, it should, because according to the National Mining Association, every person in America uses 20 pounds of coal a day.

Of course, when we are talking about CO<sub>2</sub>, we are also breathing CO<sub>2</sub>, and plants need CO<sub>2</sub>. There is an interesting invention in Wyoming. A guy figured out how to grow plants vertically, and Whole Foods has some of his mechanisms to be able to do that, and you can actually cut your own vegetables while you are in the store. I asked him why he isn't doing greenhouses with this. He said: Not enough CO<sub>2</sub>. Yes, plants rely on CO<sub>2</sub> to live. I suggested that he locate near a power plant, where they can absorb the

CO<sub>2</sub> and use the waste heat from any power plants and help feed America at the same time. We need to be more innovative in what we are doing instead of just trying to put businesses out of business because we don't like the business.

As I said, under the Clean Power Plan, Wyoming will have to reduce its carbon emissions by 44 percent. That isn't just a problem for Wyoming or the 27,000 people employed in the coal industry and the ripple effect it has on people who work with the things that people in the coal industry use. If you represent Illinois or Missouri, you should be worried about CPP, too, because in 2013 each of those States received more than 10 percent of Wyoming's coal. Wisconsin, Kansas, Arkansas, and Michigan each got 5 percent of Wyoming's coal. Wyoming's coal was distributed to Georgia, Alabama, Colorado, Louisiana, Minnesota, and Arizona. If I didn't list your State, don't think this issue doesn't affect you. More than a dozen other States and foreign entities got smaller amounts of Wyoming coal in 2013.

According to the National Mining Association, which commissioned the report on the Clean Power Plan after it was released, the plan would cost \$366 billion and bring double-digit electric rate increases to 43 States. That is more than a 10-percent increase to 43 States. All this because of the administration's vendetta against coal and power plants that burn it and provide energy.

Just this week the EPA held a hearing in Denver and received public comments on the proposed Federal plan to implement the Clean Power Plan. That is right. Even though 26 States are suing the EPA to block the plan's implementation, the Agency is going ahead with a rule to implement it. At that hearing, Mickey Shober, a county commissioner from Campbell County, WY, also known as the energy capital of the Nation, had a chance to speak. Campbell County has 11 surface mines that produce over 340 million tons of coal every year, the majority of which is delivered by train to about 30 States across the country for electricity generation. All in all, Campbell County coal provides about one-quarter of the Nation's electricity every year. That is one county. So when a Campbell County commissioner gets up to talk about power generation, everyone should pay attention.

As Commissioner Shober pointed out, the coal industry has historically stepped up and dealt with every new regulation and challenge the Federal Government has thrown at it, but the new technology and innovation—the type that will have to be utilized, if there is any way for new and existing power plants to comply with this rule—takes time and takes money. As the commissioner said, America's energy industry always rises to the challenge, but the EPA isn't fighting fair this time. This rule needs to be scrapped in

its current form, and that is exactly what these joint resolutions of disapproval will do.

Congress has provided billions of dollars in incentives for solar and wind energy. Wyoming produces a lot of solar and wind—primarily solar, because Denver is the Mile High City and you have to go uphill to get to Wyoming. There are high plateaus across the southern part of the State. The first wind turbines that went in Wyoming had to be redesigned because the wind blew so hard that it blew the rotors off. At 80 miles an hour, the rotors on wind turbines will not stand up. They will generate a tremendous amount of power. Most of that power goes out of State, and other States use it but claim offsets from their wind power because it doesn't carry any of these bad connotations from the EPA. Wyoming has to claim all of carbon emissions from the coal and the coal-fired power plants, though most of the electricity produced is sent out of State. So Wyoming gets no credit for the energy it provides, but we get all the disadvantages associated with providing energy.

General Electric wanted to build a test facility in Wyoming to figure out better ways to burn coal. They went through all the permitting process to the point of building it. Then they said: Wait a minute. Under this President, who is trying to get rid of coal, who would we sell our product to? So they postponed the project.

I have spoken of why this rule is bad for my home State of Wyoming and why it is bad for any State that consumes fossil fuels, but I would be remiss if I didn't address the reasons the Clean Power Plan is bad for the United States. At the end of this month, the President is going to send his team of environmental experts and negotiators to the U.N. Climate Summit in Paris. That summit aims to map out a global accord to limit greenhouse gas emissions. The emissions goals described in CPP, which have been rejected by industry and rejected by almost half the States, are at the heart of this administration's plan to contribute to the overall global emissions reduction. To make commitments to our allies based on the plan which doesn't have the support of the American public is nothing short of irresponsible and disingenuous. We are living in a dangerous, complicated, frightening world—a world that forces our Nation to rely daily on its friends for priceless assets, such as shared intelligence and safe havens at which to strategically position our military troops around the globe. The very least America can give our allied partners in return is our candor.

Incidentally, I heard the comments about the growing cases of asthma. There has been a reduction in the amount of CO<sub>2</sub>, so why would these coal-fired power plants be elevating that health problem? One problem that we have out West is called regional haze here, but we call it smoke from forest fires. This summer we had tremendous smoke from forest fires and it

wasn't just smoke, it was ash as well. There hasn't been a power plant putting out ash in decades, but when we don't do the proper stewardship of our forests, we let them burn. If we allowed some of that to be cut into boards for houses, it could reduce the cost of housing, and the CO<sub>2</sub> would be trapped forever, not burned up and released into the air and blamed on coal.

I am hoping my colleagues will come together today to show our constituents where we and the world stand on the Clean Power Plan.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield back our remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 306 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Sasse
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Sessions
Corker	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	Manchin	Toomey
Daines	McCain	Vitter
Donnelly	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	
Ernst	Murkowski	

NAYS—46

Ayotte	Boxer	Casey
Baldwin	Brown	Collins
Bennet	Cantwell	Coons
Blumenthal	Cardin	Durbin
Booker	Carper	Feinstein

Franken	Menendez	Schumer
Gillibrand	Merkley	Shaheen
Heinrich	Mikulski	Stabenow
Hirono	Murphy	Tester
Kaine	Murray	Udall
King	Nelson	Warner
Kirk	Peters	Warren
Klobuchar	Reed	Whitehouse
Leahy	Reid	Wyden
Markey	Sanders	
McCaskill	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—2

Graham	Rubio
--------	-------

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 24) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 24

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units" (published at 80 Fed. Reg. 64662 (October 23, 2015)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S.J. Res. 23.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 293, S.J. Res. 23, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 23) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all time is yielded back.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 307 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Sasse
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Sessions
Corker	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	Manchin	Toomey
Daines	McCain	Vitter
Donnelly	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	
Ernst	Murkowski	

NAYS—46

Ayotte	Gillibrand	Peters
Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Reid
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	King	Schatz
Boxer	Kirk	Schumer
Brown	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Leahy	Stabenow
Cardin	Markey	Tester
Carper	McCaskill	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Warner
Collins	Merkley	Warren
Coons	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Feinstein	Murray	
Franken	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—2

Graham	Rubio
--------	-------

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 23) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 23

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units" (published at 80 Fed. Reg. 64510 (October 23, 2015)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

MORNING BUSINESS

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE J. KATIS

● Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and honor George J. Katis, an exceptional community leader and businessman in New Hampshire.

George Katis cares deeply about the well-being of children in New Hampshire, and he has an exemplary record of advocacy on their behalf, especially through his leadership with the Nashua Goes Back to School program. This initiative helps provide free backpacks stocked with school supplies to Nashua's neediest schoolchildren. Since