

vote yes on ending debate on cloture for the Child Care and Development Block Grant.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I have been on the floor now for a couple of hours urging some of our colleagues to take heed of one of the clear messages from this election. People all over the country voted and spoke, and spoke clearly and loudly to say let's get to work, let's work together, let's stop the gridlock and let's find common ground to move our country forward.

Two hours ago I came to the floor to see about one of the most important pieces of legislation, the Keystone Pipeline, as Chair of the Energy Committee in the Senate. I have had the great privilege of working in a bipartisan manner with the Members of the Republican Caucus on this bill led by Senator HOEVEN. I am the lead sponsor on the Democratic side and there is a large group of my colleagues trying to convince this body to have a vote, and a strong 60-vote margin, which is required for passage on the Keystone Pipeline. The Senator from West Virginia has come down and the Senator from North Dakota came down to speak and the Senator from Montana joined me, and I want to announce we have just gotten great word from the House of Representatives. Evidently they heard us speaking, and they have introduced our bill in the House.

They have introduced our bill in the House, and the information we have gotten is that they plan to pass it tomorrow. Let me just say hallelujah. I will say it again—hallelujah—because their bill would never have passed this body and their bill would not have any chance of getting the President's signature because it is Keystone Pipeline plus—or it was—but now the House has introduced the exact same bill as the Hoeven-Landrieu bill. We now have an even clearer path to victory. I started 2 hours ago saying that I could see the path. I am not sure everybody else could, but it is clear to me now that everybody is starting to see it, and I could not be happier.

I don't have the actual number of the House bill. I was just told they introduced an identical bill, including the private property language, which is absolutely essential to secure the 60 votes required. That is why I drafted it in the bill, that is why Senator HOEVEN insisted it be in the bill, and that is why we have it in the bill. I thank the House for keeping that language, which is important for its ultimate passage. To me, it looks as though just in the last 2 hours lots of people are paying attention, and this is wonderful because this is an important step.

I believe I am also a cosponsor of Senator ALEXANDER's bill. No Senator

has worked harder in either party, and that is saying a lot because Senator MURRAY and Senator MIKULSKI have worked hard on this issue. Senator ALEXANDER—a former Secretary of Education—has been ceaseless and tireless in his effort on behalf of early childhood education. He and I worked together when President Bush was President. I believe and I hope I am a cosponsor of his bill, and I look forward to helping him move that piece of legislation forward for a vote. There might be a few things in there other Members disagree with, but that is our process. This is a critical issue for education and job creation as well. We have the Keystone Pipeline on one end, which is as concrete as steel, and then we have the soft issues, which are also important issues, such as economic development, which begins with early childhood education. I am so proud to be an advocate of both bills, and I thank the Senator for his leadership.

I urge my Members, who I believe have been very supportive on this issue—as have the Republican Members—to give cloture on his bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Mr. INHOFE. I read with a lot of interest about the trip President Obama made to China and his meeting with President Xi over what they characterized as an agreement on greenhouse gas emissions. I didn't hear any kind of agreement or anything that was said by the President of China, and they have been talking about this as a historic breakthrough. That is exactly what they said in 2009, back when Copenhagen was center stage for the big annual party.

Just so people are aware of what goes on, the United Nations throws a big party to get countries to agree to reduce greenhouse gases by a certain amount. It is kind of interesting since at one of the first ones I went to, I saw a good friend of mine from Benin in West Africa, and I said: You guys are not sucked into this thing—I know that for a fact—in terms of any kind of reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. What would happen to the economy of West Africa if you did that?

He said: This is the biggest party of the year, so we are all going to be here.

The same thing was true in Copenhagen.

Before I go into that, let's take a look at what they called a major historic breakthrough between the United States and China where the President pledged to reduce the emissions in the United States between 26 and 28 percent by 2025. What did China agree to? First of all, even if they did agree to reduce emissions, we would not believe them because they don't end up doing what they say they are going to do in these agreements. But China says that what they are going to do is stop in-

creasing their CO₂ emissions by 2030. In other words, between now and 2030 they are going to continue to increase their levels of CO₂ emissions, which I agree they are going to do that.

Next year—that is, a year from December—there is going to be another big party that will be in Paris, and it will be the one where President Obama says he and President Xi from China have an agreement. But, of course, that is going to be kind of like it was in Copenhagen back in 2009.

I remember 2009 so well. At that time I was—and I still am—on the Environment and Public Works Committee. We had a wonderful lady who was President Obama's appointee to be the Director of the EPA, and at that time in Copenhagen they already had Congresswoman PELOSI, Senator BOXER, President Obama, and then-Senator John Kerry. All of them were over there promising the 191 countries that were in Copenhagen that we were going to pass some kind of cap and trade.

After that was over, I went on a quick roundtrip to Copenhagen. I always remember that trip because I was on the ground, after all that travel, all of 3 hours, but I think it was the most enjoyable 3 hours I ever had because I was able to be over there as a one-man truth squad and to say to the people attending that great meeting there that the United States was not going to pass any kind of cap and trade. In fact, the most votes they could have gotten in the Senate at that time—and the Senate is changing, as we all know—was 30 votes. Obviously it took a lot more than that to do that.

I went over as the one-man truth squad to tell them that they were not telling the truth and that there is no way in the world we are going to pass it, and the same is true this time.

I will tell you what that meeting reminds me of. It reminds me of the meeting that took place in China a couple of days ago with our President. It reminded me of the meeting that took place in Rio de Janeiro. This would have been in 1998, which was during the Clinton White House. They went over there and agreed and signed the Kyoto Treaty. They signed the treaty knowing for a fact that it would not be ratified on this end. We know it takes a supermajority to ratify a treaty in the Senate.

We had a resolution that was passed at that time called the Byrd-Hagel resolution. It said that we would not ratify any agreement, such as Kyoto or anything like that, that didn't do two things—that were either harmful to the economy or didn't treat all countries the same. In other words, we have to treat the reductions in China the same as they would be in the United States. Of course the Kyoto Treaty didn't do that. They knew at the time it was not going to be ratified. In fact, they were not even going to submit it for ratification to this body, and that is exactly what did happen.

Let's look at what is happening in China right now. China is doing pretty

well. Between 2005 and 2011, China added roughly two 600-megawatt coal-fired powerplants per week. That is two powerplants a week. In 7 years, China added more coal capacity to its fleet than existed in the entire United States. This is not going to be slowing down in the years to come. By their own admission, they will be increasing between now and 2030. China is expected to bring a new coal-fired powerplant online every 10 days to give its economy the electricity it demands. So China is now the largest consumer and importer of coal in the world.

It is kind of interesting. We are going through the shale revolution in this country. Wonderful things are happening here. If we did not have the resistance from the White House, we could be totally independent from any other nation for the production of energy. China, on the other hand, doesn't have the shale or the oil or the gas. They don't have the coal, but they can import the coal, and that is exact what they are doing, and they will continue to do that. Stop and think. If you don't like the arguments, just use logic. Why would China ever agree unilaterally to reduce its emissions when that is the only way it can produce electricity?

I have talked to them before. I talk to people who smile and laugh at us and say: Wait a minute. You say you believe us when we say we are going to reduce our emissions? We applaud the United States. We want the United States to reduce its emissions. If they do that, the manufacturing base has to leave the United States and come to China.

So it is to their advantage to increase their emissions, and that is exactly what will happen.

We will talking about this a lot. I will chair the Environment and Public Works Committee. I chaired that several years ago when the Republicans were in the majority, and the Republicans are a majority again. We will look at these things logically, and we will conduct ourselves in a way that will not give the United States of America the largest single tax increase in history.

Way back in the beginning, in 2001 and that timeframe, a lot of us thought there was actually some truth to the global warming issue, and a lot of people are trying to resurrect that now. However, at that time people didn't know what the cost was going to be. Shortly after that, it was the MIT, Charles River Associates, and the Wharton School that came out with an approximation of what it would cost in the way of a tax increase for the American people if we were to adopt the global warming provisions they wanted to adopt, which was between \$300 and \$400 billion a year.

If you follow that statement with a statement not from me and not from anyone else on the floor of the Senate but from Lisa Jackson, who was the Director of the EPA and was appointed by President Obama—I asked her this

question on the record: Let's say that we go ahead and pass one of these resolutions.

The resolutions have been offered since 2002. The first one was offered by MCCAIN and Lieberman and the last one by my friend Senator MARKEY, who was then in the House.

I said: If we pass any of these—the largest increase in history—would this have the effect of reducing greenhouse gases?

Her answer—Lisa Jackson, Director of the EPA, said: No, it would not. She said the problem is in China, India, and Mexico, and that would not affect the overall world emissions of CO₂.

So for those who really believe there is going to be something that comes before us in the form of a treaty—as our President has said will happen in Paris 13 months from now—keep in mind that it is something that will not happen, the same as it was not going to happen in Copenhagen. The American people are not ready. They have studied this issue. They know the science is not there, and what they want to do is to avoid any kind of a negative effect on our economy, and that is exactly what I think will happen.

I see my good friend is here, and I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

MR. BROWN. I thank the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

MR. BROWN. Mr. President, in the days after the election this year, I heard a number of my colleagues—many from my State—in the House of Representatives and in the Senate talk with great exuberance about repealing the Affordable Care Act. They call it ObamaCare; others call it the Affordable Care Act. I am not sure where they were over the last month or so, but I remember hearing Pope Francis I exhort his parish priests to go out and smell like the flock. Abraham Lincoln used to talk about it. He would say he needs to go outside of the White House and get his public opinion baths.

I cite Pope Francis and President Lincoln because I think if my colleagues had been out talking to real people and not going to fundraisers, not meeting with rich people at country clubs, and not going to the political rallies, but out talking to real people, they would have seen what the Affordable Care Act has done.

In a moment, I wish to talk about a couple of numbers, but more importantly, I want to share some stories. More than 500,000 people in Ohio—and I think New Mexico, the Presiding Officer's State, is proportionately no different—have health insurance today who did not have it 14 months—did not have it 1 year ago. An additional 97,000 young Ohioans—people who are just a bit older than the pages sitting here; 18, 20, 25—are on their parents' health plans. Thousands of Ohioans have been

protected as patients, as people who are insured. When they would get sick and their coverage was expensive, they would be dropped by insurance companies because they were too costly. Now they have the consumer protections and they can't be dropped from coverage. One million Ohio seniors now have gotten—with no copay and no deductible—free preventive care for osteoporosis and physician screenings. One million Ohio seniors were able to get their screenings at no cost.

I have to tell a quick story. Every Thursday anybody from Ohio can come to a coffee we have in our office at 8:30 a.m. when the Senate is in session. A family came by on one of those Thursdays. They were pretty conservative. I assume they were not really voters for me, but it didn't matter. We were talking about a bunch of different issues.

The mother said: Thank you for the Affordable Care Act. See my son over there? He is 15 years old.

I said: Yes.

He was across the room. She said that when he was 7, he was diagnosed with diabetes.

She said: I have counted, since he was diagnosed, 34 times that he was turned down for insurance.

My family was turned down for insurance. Last week she told me I got insurance because of the Affordable Care Act, because we don't allow under Federal law now that that be done.

Let me share for a moment, if I could, a handful of letters I have received from people who have written me because of the Affordable Care Act.

Rachel from Hamilton County writes that since 2008 she and her husband insured themselves through individual insurance. It had been difficult, and at times, we had to go without insurance because of the incredibly high cost. I had also been denied insurance due to a preexisting condition. All of that changed since we were able to sign up via the healthcare.gov site. But imagine my surprise when I heard the D.C. Circuit Court struck down subsidies people like myself receive. I receive a subsidy because health insurance has become so expensive that it is unaffordable for so many of us. I fear we will not be able to afford insurance if we lose our subsidy.

Linda from Madison County, west of Columbus, writes: My husband and I have personally benefited from the portion of the bill that did away with lifetime maximum payments. I suspect it may have saved our retirement and kept us off welfare rolls. My colleague benefited from the portion of the bill that allowed her son, who suffers from a potentially fatal illness, to stay on her insurance through age 26, at which time he graduated with a master's degree and got a job.

So this is exactly what this was written for—a 23-24-year-old graduating from college, going on to get more school, getting a master's degree, preparing himself or herself for something better in life. That young man could