

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

stay on his parents' health insurance plan until he got a job at 27, with insurance.

Chandra in Summit County writes that she recently commented to some friends about the surprising benefits she was receiving under the Affordable Care Act, and one of her friends suggested she share her story with her elected officials. She says: Because of the ACA, we were able to switch to my husband's insurance without worrying that I would not be covered due to my pregnancy being a preexisting medical condition. The ACA had a very real financial impact on my family.

The question is, Why do some Members of this Congress, all of whom, I believe—almost all of whom—are receiving government-sponsored health insurance benefits from a good government insurance plan—why do they want to deny it to people such as Chandra and people such as Rachel and others.

Chandra says: I am not the type of individual who one would first think of when thinking of beneficiaries of the ACA. I have a master's degree, my husband and I both work full-time, and our employers also offer a full range of medical, prenatal, and optical benefits.

A few years ago, my husband and I decided to begin growing our family. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, there were no copays for my prenatal care, suggested immunizations or potential well visits. When our son was born, I immediately saw the true impact of the Affordable Care Act. Babies have many well visits and the cost of copays and immunizations have been a burden to some of my friends. Thanks to the ACA, we didn't have that financial burden. Thanks to a combination of good insurance and the Affordable Care Act, I was the recipient of a very nice, double electric breast pump. I also became the first employee at my job to utilize the provisions of the ACA for nursing mothers. A few years later, 2 months before our second child was due, I had the opportunity to take a better job.

She goes on.

The question again is, Why do they want—why do a bunch of politicians who have good insurance, paid for by taxpayers—why do they want to take these benefits away from the 25-year-old man who now has insurance on his parents' plan before he finishes school and goes out in the workplace? Why do they want to take away the preventive care families now have so when their daughter has an earache they can actually go to a family doctor because of the insurance rather than go to the emergency room? All of those things just beg the question, Why the politics of repealing ObamaCare and repealing the Affordable Care Act and taking these benefits away from so many Americans?

Five hundred thousand Ohioans have insurance, 100,000 more young people, a million Ohio seniors getting benefits with no copays and no deductibles, pre-

ventive care that helps them live longer, healthier lives. That is really the question.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

U.S.-CHINA CLIMATE AGREEMENT

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I rise to commend the historic agreement reached yesterday between the United States and China, the world's largest emitters of carbon pollution. This agreement is the latest and perhaps most consequential in a string of actions President Obama has taken to fight climate change.

Today, we have hope. We have hope because this agreement puts the world on a path towards solving climate change—hope because the world's two largest emitters have found common cause in protecting public health and economic opportunity for their citizens and for the world and hope because we are once again reminded what American leadership and political will can accomplish.

President Obama and President Xi of China recognize that climate change threatens our families, our jobs, our health, and our way of life. They deserve our thanks, as does Secretary Kerry, for their tireless work and dedication to this cause.

We can solve this. We know what we need to do, and we know how to do it. Today we see what political will can accomplish. I am now more hopeful than ever that we can keep warming below 2 degrees Celsius by the end of the century. This is the level scientists say is necessary to stay below in order to avoid catastrophic global consequences.

Together our two countries account for about 40 percent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions. We have a responsibility to act early and to act together, and this agreement puts us on that path.

The agreement recognizes that the United States and China must take short- and long-term measures to reduce emissions and encourage the development of clean energy. This represents a major shift for China, which had struggled to balance economic growth with growing pollution and has now agreed to cap carbon pollution for the first time ever. It is difficult to overstate what an important achievement this is, especially a full year before the next round of international negotiations in Paris.

As Secretary Kerry said today, this is a major signal to other countries that they should also put forth ambitious emissions reduction goals well before international negotiations start in 2015.

In addition, China has agreed to get a full 20 percent of its energy from zero emission sources by 2030. This means China will have to deploy close to 1,000 gigawatts of new zero emission powerplants. This is the amount of elec-

tricity the entire United States currently generates and shows just how serious China is about addressing this problem.

American leadership was crucial in forging these goals. It wouldn't have been possible without the President's Clean Power Plan, which will reduce emissions from the power sector by 30 percent relative to 2005 levels by the year 2030.

This agreement goes beyond even those ambitious targets, and in the coming months and years, it will be important for this President and the next to maintain and strengthen the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to protect Americans from harmful pollution.

Despite near universal consensus among climate scientists that the Clean Power Plan is part of the solution to fighting climate change, today that plan is under attack in Congress. Right after the President announced this historic agreement, climate deniers in Congress started rolling out every tired argument in the book. In fact, one of our colleagues here has already dubbed this plan "unrealistic" and called it an "ideological war."

These claims are the last bastion of a hopeless cause that ignores what we see all around us—from farmers to fishermen to small-town mayors. Theirs is an untenable position, because poll after poll shows that Americans do care about this issue. They care about it deeply. Americans care because they know fighting climate change is really about protecting their children's health, protecting economic opportunity, and leaving our children a world better than our own.

We are seeing the deniers' arguments collapse around them. One of their favorite tropes was to claim that U.S. actions are meaningless without action from China. Well, it looks as though that argument took a fairly big hit yesterday.

In fact, the U.S. did act first by developing the Clean Power Plan. The rules haven't even been finalized, but they are already giving us the leverage to reach major international agreements.

As excuse after excuse fails, we will see climate deniers retreat to tired claims that anything we do to reduce pollution will hurt the economy. But remember that we have heard these claims before. They were wrong then, and they are wrong now.

The list is long, so I will mention just a few. Taking the lead out of gasoline, putting catalytic converters in cars, reducing acid rain, all were met with panicky claims of economic devastation. But what we have learned is that keeping our air and our water clean actually helps our economy.

This agreement between the United States and China is historic. It is a real breakthrough, and it gives us hope that we will be able to confront and resolve one of the greatest challenges of our time. But it is still just an agreement.