

people of other States and not his own State. Why would I, as a Senator from Michigan, push so hard for these tax credits in the Affordable Care Act that my own constituents wouldn't qualify for but people in other States would? That makes no sense whatsoever. The legislative intent here is crystal clear.

So we have this bizarre situation where colleagues across the aisle are asking the Court to strike down the tax cuts and raise taxes on millions of their own constituents.

My belief on this issue is the same as it was 5 years ago when I pushed the tax credits through the Finance Committee: The right to get those tax credits has nothing to do with where you live in the United States of America; it has to do with whether you need health care for yourself and your children. If you are an American, then you deserve the opportunity to receive these tax cuts that will make health care affordable for you and your family. Whether you get your plan through a State exchange or through the Federal Government, it doesn't matter. That was intent of the law when we wrote it; that is how the law has worked since the marketplace opened; and that is how it should continue into the future.

Finally, I want to make it absolutely clear that the bill authored by the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON, is not a repeal-and-replace plan; it is a Trojan horse that would completely destroy the health care law that is currently providing medical care for over 16 million Americans in our country. Experts tell us it would lead to a death spiral, where rates would go up so high that only sick people would be willing to pay the premiums, making insurance completely unaffordable for American families. It would let your State decide what health benefits are essential to your family, meaning a family in Iowa could have completely different protections from someone living a few miles away in Minnesota. It puts an expiration date on the tax credits that make health coverage affordable. Conveniently enough, though, it extends the tax cuts until after the 2016 election. And there is the real danger that when the guarantee of these tax cuts expires in September 2017, they will not be renewed. By putting that expiration date after the election, it is clear that this bill's first priority isn't finding a way to make health care affordable; its priority is delaying a massive tax increase until after the election. The priority is to win an election first and dismantle affordable health care coverage second.

My hope and, frankly, my prayer is that the Court recognizes what I know to be true: that the language of this law is consistent with the original intent, which is clear from the very first words of the law, title I, page 1. Here is what it says: "Quality, Affordable Health Care for All Americans"—not Americans in some States and not others, all Americans.

It is my deep hope that the Court ruling will allow us to lock in affordable

health care coverage for good. Then we can move on and spend our time more productively, focusing on how to make a good law even better for families, communities, businesses, and providers. I hope that will be the opportunity we will have.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Wyoming.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF DOUGLAS J. KRAMER TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 145, and that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that following the disposition of the nomination, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Douglas J. Kramer, of Kansas, to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Douglas J. Kramer, of Kansas, to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session. The Senator from Wyoming.

FEDERAL REGULATIONS

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I rise today to speak about the growing burden of Federal regulations and the need to rein in the creation of new rules and the expansion of existing rules. The regulatory burden in 2014 is reported to be nearly \$2 trillion, and the Federal Register last year came out to nearly 78,000 pages of new rules and regulations. This chart shows that 78,000 pages of regulations is all too common, especially for this administration,

where regulatory overreach has become normal, and the size of the Federal Register has topped 80,000 pages for 4 out of the 6 years of the President's time in office. With this administration, we are seeing a high-water mark of regulations that are drowning American families and businesses.

The flood of regulations has been getting bigger every year for the past 2½ decades under administrations from both parties. We can't afford to keep piling on these rules. The economic burden of Federal regulations is clear. One study estimated that the regulatory burden in the United States cost more than \$1.8 trillion in 2014 and was bigger than the GDP of India.

My second chart puts this in perspective: Only the 10 largest economies are bigger than the U.S. regulatory burden all by itself.

This burden is real. Some studies have estimated the regulatory drag on economic growth in the United States to be as high as 2 percent per year over the last 6½ decades. An annual report from the Competitive Enterprise Institute also noted that in 2014 regulations cost the average household nearly \$15,000. A study by the Small Business Administration found that regulations increase costs by more than \$10,000 per employee.

The fact that we cannot afford this burden is just as clear. Economic growth in the first quarter shrank by seven-tenths of 1 percent. If we get a growth of 1 percent, it increases the revenue, without raising taxes, to the United States by \$300 billion. That is according to the Congressional Budget Office. According to the President's budget person, it would increase it by \$400 billion. Imagine what a seventenths loss costs us.

Complex regulations are costly and time-consuming, especially for small businesses. Small business owners and their employees have to take on dozens of different responsibilities to make their business work. They have to be compliance experts now, and that takes time and resources away that they need to put toward growing their business and succeeding. I have spoken to many businesses in Wyoming that have stopped measuring their permitting applications in pages because it is easier to measure them in feet.

Businesses are struggling in this regulatory environment because they can't make long-term plans for investments. They don't know what new regulation might come out next month that will change their entire business model. And the problem with complex permitting and regulatory requirements is not just the cost that existing businesses have to bear; it also comes as a cost in businesses that don't even get started because the Federal Government has placed a mountain of paperwork between their idea and success.

The rush of regulations by this administration is clear. President Obama's administration has issued

more than 80 regulations that have a price tag of more than \$100 million each. That is, at a minimum, \$80 billion in costs for this administration's rules.

But what is more disturbing is not just the willingness to churn out more redtape but to find new and creative ways to do it. Agencies are only supposed to create new rules when they have clear authority from Congress to do so and can demonstrate a real need for the regulations. However, we are seeing more and more examples of the administration finding new justifications and new interpretations of laws that Congress has passed in order to get around Congress.

President Obama said that because he is unable to rely on Congress to achieve his agenda, he intends to use Executive orders. We have seen that with the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Labor Relations Board, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which is collecting everybody's data as we speak, the National Security Agency, and so many other Federal agencies that are willing to read new authorities into existing laws and grant themselves new powers that Congress never intended.

One place that is willing to force through an agenda regardless of congressional intent, the will of the people, or the Constitution, is in the energy sector. Energy is one of the main drivers of our economy. Yet, this administration is doing everything it can to wage a regulatory war on coal by releasing rules and regulations designed to make coal harder to produce and making energy more expensive to use in our Nation. Anyone who uses electricity should be concerned about this—oh yeah, that is everybody, isn't it?

I recently talked to some sisters who were driving from Arizona to Wyoming. They were running low on gas, so they stopped in Colorado to fill up. The power was out at the gas station, so they couldn't pump gas or get a snack or use the restroom. All of these things—the gas pump, the cash register, the restroom lights—depend on electricity. Think of all the things around you that depend on electricity. Almost everything we do depends on electricity. Yet, this administration seems to want to do anything it can to drive up the cost of electricity.

A few years ago, Senators on both sides of the aisle realized that coal is one of our best sources of energy, the only stockpileable one, and rejected a cap-and-tax as an extremely expensive and bad idea—bipartisan. Now the administration is moving forward on a backdoor cap-and-tax proposal. They believe the best way to reach their goals of promoting alternative energy sources is to make the current sources more and more expensive to produce and to use. This hurts consumers, it hurts jobs, and it hurts our economy.

It is a simple fact: Make it more expensive to mine coal, and the coal in-

dustry will be less profitable. Make it more expensive to use coal to produce energy, and consumers will see a hit on their energy bills each and every month. Make it more difficult to turn a profit with coal, and coal workers will find themselves with fewer benefits, less job security, and a lot less employment, which costs the government more for unemployment.

This administration has made it clear that they do not care about these costs. The Small Business Advocate wrote EPA that their review panel on the Clean Power Plan was only checking the box and "is unlikely to succeed at identifying reasonable regulatory alternatives for small businesses." The incomplete information they provided "greatly limits [small entity representatives'] ability to propose potential regulatory flexibilities or discuss the costs and benefits of particular regulatory alternatives."

Rural electric cooperatives, transmission companies, and municipal utilities are going to bear the costs of these coal regulations. This is where our communities get their electricity, so those costs will likely be passed on to consumers. Businesses really have no other choice.

Several Members are pushing back on this regulatory overreach. For example, I am proud to cosponsor a bill Senator VITTER introduced earlier this week to protect small business from the onslaught of regulations. But the recent case of the Colowyo mine is a good example of how the administration does not care about a loss of jobs or costs to consumers and is a clear signal to Congress that we have to do more to oppose this.

Coal produced by this mine is responsible for employing over 200 people. The Craig Power Station in Senator GARDNER's State of Colorado sends power to a tristate cooperative which provides service in the West. If the cooperative goes offline, electricity prices for electric customers will rise. Why would it go offline? Because of a little vacation on the mine planned from 2007.

Senator GARDNER, will this affect your State's mine? But it also sets a wider precedent against our most dependable fuel source.

So what does taking this one mine offline—I know they are picking on a small one. That is easier to do than pick on a big one. But what does it mean to your constituents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the Senator from Wyoming through the Chair for bringing that point to our colleagues about what is happening in western Colorado and the Colowyo mine.

The Senator from Wyoming mentioned in his comments that sometimes the regulations from this administration can and should be measured in a matter of feet and not just pages because that is how many new regulations are being piled upon businesses in this country.

In the case of the Colowyo Mine, though, a 2007 permit is being brought into question by a Federal court that has given this mine 120 days—the Office of Surface Mining—to rectify a decision that was made back in 2007. This is a court case that was brought 8 years after the 2007 permit was granted.

If the 120 days go by and the court decides that the review was not complete by the Office of Surface Mining, it could result in a shutdown of the Colowyo Mine. As you mentioned, this will result in 220 layoffs. Communities in western Colorado of Craig and Meeker will be devastated.

This mine is responsible for about \$200 million in economic impact to Western Colorado. It pays almost \$10 million to the Federal Government in terms of taxes. It pays about \$1 million to the State of Colorado in terms of severance taxes. Think about the impact that losing 220 people would have on the Main Street of Craig, CO, and on the people of Meeker, CO. Think about the impacts this would have on families and the kids of the 220 employees who are being pulled out of school systems. Maybe \$100,000 or more of impact to schools that can barely afford the loss already. That is just to mention the direct impacts to those communities of this court decision, and, by the way, we only have about 85 or 86 days left to rectify this permit decision if the Department of the Interior decides they are not going to appeal this decision. You have about 80-some days to make this decision that could affect the lives of 220 people, that could affect \$200 million worth of economic activity.

You mentioned that this power is from an electric co-op. The Senator from Wyoming mentioned that this power is from an electricity co-op, a cooperative. There are no shareholders. There are no stockholders. There is no guaranteed income to Tri-State.

This is an organization that is a cooperative. It is designed to be owned by its members, those people who receive power through the cooperative. When we increase the cost of electricity by closing down a mine that feeds the Craig Power Station, in this case, you are increasing the cost of that electricity. You are taking money out of the hands of members across the Tri-State region, whether that is in Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico or Nebraska. Those costs will get borne by the members of the cooperative.

One thing that we know as well is that Tri-State is one of those cooperatives that provide electricity to some of the poorest areas in Colorado. They are some of the areas that can least afford it. As a result of this decision, it will increase the cost of electricity, and those costs will be borne by those people who can least afford it—people on low income, people on fixed income, people in rural areas of our State who do not have as high an income as other areas in the State or country may have. This will have a significant economic impact.

In fact, the Senator from Wyoming may or may not know that a number of Members of Congress from the Colorado congressional delegation have written letters to the Department of the Interior urging them to appeal this decision as well as to put a stay on this decision, as we have 80-some days left and because 220 people, their lives, their livelihoods, their jobs are at stake, and these are small communities. They are communities that can be economically devastated with 220 job losses.

The Presiding Officer represents a State where there are many towns where five jobs are a really big deal, two jobs are a really big deal, one job is a really big deal. For a community that is the size of the town that I live in—3,000 people or so—to lose 220 jobs would be economic catastrophe.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Governor John Hickenlooper to the Honorable Sally Jewell, Secretary of the Interior, asking for an appeal of this decision. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Congressman ED PERLMUTTER to appeal this decision. In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter that I wrote, as well as Congressman SCOTT TIPTON wrote, asking and urging for an appeal of this decision.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF COLORADO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Denver, CO, May 22, 2015.

Hon. SALLY JEWELL,
Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY JEWELL: On May 8, 2015, a federal District Court judge in Denver issued a decision that could have significant impacts to communities in Moffat and Rio Blanco Counties, in northwest Colorado. That ruling found that the Interior Department's Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSMRE) failed to perform adequate public notice and environmental analysis when approving a mining plan for the Colowyo Coal Mine pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act. Colowyo employs 220 people, contributes over \$200 million to the regional economy, generates royalties and taxes estimated at \$12.0 million annually, and provides affordable and reliable electricity to Colorado and the Intermountain West.

The final judgment in the Colowyo case stated that the court will void OSMRE's approval of the mining plan if the agency does not, within 120 days, supplement the environmental analysis, provide public notice and an opportunity to comment, and render a new decision. Such a result would effectively shut down the Colowyo Coal Mine, result in layoffs for all 220 individuals, impact hundreds of other families and businesses in the region, and eliminate the principle source of coal for the Craig Station Power Plant.

We have expressed our concerns to OSMRE about these impacts and pledged to play whatever role we can to minimize them, including participation as a cooperating agency in OSMRE's supplemental environmental

review. Given the importance of this mine to the economies of the region, we ask that you do everything possible to respond to the judge's order and remedy the situation as expeditiously as possible. If needed, we encourage OSMRE to petition the court for an extension of the time granted to complete the supplemental environmental review. In addition, we encourage you and OSMRE to appeal the decision if appropriate, given potential adverse impacts on mines in Colorado and other federal permitting decisions.

Thank you for your consideration. If we can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. HICKENLOOPER,
Governor.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

June 2, 2015.

Hon. SALLY JEWELL,
Secretary, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY JEWELL: I write regarding the recent federal District Court ruling affecting the Colowyo mine in Colorado. The ruling found the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSMRE) failed to fulfill the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act when approving the amended mining plan in 2007. The ruling gave OSMRE 120 days to re-examine the application and comply with the deficiencies identified by the Court.

I am concerned this ruling could have a damaging impact on communities in Moffat and Rio Blanco Counties. The mine supports more than 200 employees, over \$200 million in annual economic impact to the region, and is important to the steady supply of coal for Craig Station Power Plant which provides electricity to thousands of Coloradans. Quick resolution to this case is important so these workers and communities have the certainty they need.

I understand OSMRE is working with the State of Colorado pursuant to the Court's 120-day timeline to conduct additional public outreach and considerations in the environmental assessment. The Colowyo Coal Company also filed an appeal of the decision last week. While OSMRE must continue working to follow the Court's orders, I believe the Interior Department should also direct the Justice Department to appeal the Court's decision.

Thank you for your consideration and your attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,

ED PERLMUTTER,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2015.

Hon. SALLY JEWELL,
Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

SECRETARY JEWELL: On May 8, 2015, the Federal District Court for the District of Colorado issued an order determining that the Office of Surface Mining ("OSM") failed to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") in 2007, when it issued a mine plan approval for the Colowyo Coal Mine. The Court gave OSM 120 days to prepare a new analysis and issue a new decision. If OSM does not complete the process in 120 days, the Court stated that it would vacate the mine plan, effectively shutting down the Mine.

We write to urge you to take all necessary and appropriate action to ensure the continued operation of the Colowyo Coal Mine, which is a critical component of northwest Colorado's regional economy and has responsibly operated in the eight years since the

mine plan approval was issued by your office. Coal produced by this mine, located in Moffat and Rio Blanco counties, is then used to generate power at the Craig station and is responsible for employing over 200 people with a payroll of around \$20 million dollars. Requested actions include urgently deploying sufficient personnel with the resources and expertise to complete the supplemental NEPA work within the 120 day window provided by the District Court.

Colowyo Coal Mine is a significant contributor to both of the counties' economies. The adverse effects of shutting down this mine go beyond the jobs at the mine that would be lost. We surely do not need to impress upon your office the potentially devastating impact of reducing operations at two of the counties' largest employers as well as one of the largest electricity providers in the western half of the state.

In addition, we strongly urge OSM to evaluate the propriety of an appeal. Without remarking on the reasoning of the Court contained within the decision itself, the result nonetheless creates adverse precedent with other suits pending, which would harm not only Colowyo and the town of Craig, but potentially numerous other mining operations and towns in other states as well. The federal government must vigorously defend the legality of its permitting actions, and leave policy debates over the role of coal to the legislative and rulemaking proceedings where those debates belong.

Respectfully,

CORY GARDNER,
U.S. Senator.
SCOTT TIPTON,
Member of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Colorado for his insights. This is the beginning of a process of eliminating coal mining in the United States. Here is a company that has their permit for 8 years for mining coal, and that permit took extensive permitting. Now what they are saying is that you have to take a look at where the coal is burned to see what the impacts are. That has never been one of the requirements. Again, it is one of those increases in regulation that this administration is fond of. It is designed to put things out of business, to raise costs.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article called "The Case For Legislative Impact Accounting Economics 21," which is part of the Manhattan Institute.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[June 9, 2015]

THE CASE FOR LEGISLATIVE IMPACT ACCOUNTING ECONOMICS 21 (PART OF THE MANHATTAN INSTITUTE)

(By Jason J. Fichtner, Patrick A. McLaughlin)

For the first time in six years, Congress finally passed a budget resolution. The federal budget process, when it works, permits Congress to monitor and fund programs based on their fiscal impact. Yet every Congressional budget masks the true economic costs of federal spending. Mandatory spending, which makes up the vast majority of federal spending and includes interest on the national debt, Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, is not part of the annual budget process. Also excluded from the annual budget

process are the costs of regulations. In fact, the vast majority of economic costs induced by federal actions remain off the books.

We propose reforming the legislative and regulatory processes to put these costs on the books. After all, proper budgeting is about making trade-offs between competing wants and limited resources, and it requires planning, setting priorities and making difficult decisions. But these decisions cannot be made without a more complete understanding of the direct and indirect costs of proposed legislation and spending bills, and their regulatory progeny. Our proposal, called legislative impact accounting, would provide that information to Congress.

Estimates of the total cost of regulations vary widely, but by any account, they represent a significant cost to the economy. Government economists in the Office of Management and Budget tally up the direct compliance costs associated with rules created in the last decade that have an effect of more than \$100 million annually. OMB's most recent estimate was that annual costs fall between \$57 and \$84 billion. Conversely, economists John Dawson and John Seater estimated how the economy would look if federal regulations were held to 1949 levels—essentially asking the question: What if, instead of spending resources on regulatory compliance, businesses invested in research and development? The answer was shocking: In 2011, instead of \$15.1 trillion, annual GDP would have equaled \$54 trillion . . .

Our proposal, legislative impact accounting, would incorporate economic analyses of legislation and regulation into the budget process in two ways: First, when new legislation is proposed, an independent office—perhaps the Congressional Budget Office—would produce an estimate of the economic costs the legislation would create. Importantly, a legislative impact assessment would attempt to consider economic costs of proposed legislation, not just budgetary outlays. Examples of some of the effects that could be included as specific line items are: direct compliance costs, employment effects, technological hindrances, trade distortions, and changes to the cumulative regulatory burden. This type of analysis is not unprecedented. The European Commission provides impact assessments on all legislation considered by the European Parliament.

Second, legislative impact accounting would require retrospective analyses of the economic effects of legislation, starting five years after the legislation passed. The idea is to learn what the real effects have been, and to then update the original estimates produced in the first stage. This would effectively create a much-needed feedback loop that communicates information about the economic effects of legislation back to Congress.

Mr. ENZI. I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1735, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for mili-

tary construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McCain amendment No. 1463, in the nature of a substitute.

McCain amendment No. 1456 (to amendment No. 1463), to require additional information supporting long-range plans for construction of naval vessels.

Cornyn amendment No. 1486 (to amendment No. 1463), to require reporting on energy security issues involving Europe and the Russian Federation, and to express the sense of Congress regarding ways the United States could help vulnerable allies and partners with energy security.

Vitter amendment No. 1473 (to amendment No. 1463), to limit the retirement of Army combat units.

Markey amendment No. 1645 (to amendment No. 1463), to express the sense of Congress that exports of crude oil to United States allies and partners should not be determined to be consistent with the national interest if those exports would increase energy prices in the United States for American consumers or businesses or increase the reliance of the United States on imported oil.

Reed (for Blumenthal) amendment No. 1564 (to amendment No. 1463), to increase civil penalties for violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

McCain (for Paul) modified amendment No. 1543 (to amendment No. 1463), to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government.

Reed (for Durbin) modified amendment No. 1559 (to amendment No. 1463), to prohibit the award of Department of Defense contracts to inverted domestic corporations.

McCain (for Burr) modified amendment No. 1569 (to amendment No. 1463), to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats.

Feinstein (for McCain) amendment No. 1889 (to amendment No. 1463), to reaffirm the prohibition on torture.

Fischer/Booker amendment No. 1825 (to amendment No. 1463), to authorize appropriations for national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, as we return to the legislation, unfortunately we are still, apparently, unable to move forward with managers' packages and amendments and others. So I would like to apologize to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have pending amendments, who have parts of managers' packages, and who have invested so many hours of time and effort to this legislation, not to mention members of the committee who spent an inordinate amount of time putting together a Defense authorization bill that I think all of us on both sides, with the exception of four who voted against it, were proud of and a product that was accomplished in a bipartisan fashion.

I, again, want to thank my friend from Rhode Island for all of his hard work. But apparently right now we are still stuck in resistance. Rather than go through all of the reasons why, I hope we can have some serious negotia-

tions in order for us to move forward and complete this legislation.

Meanwhile, the world moves on, and there are greater and greater challenges to our security. In fact, this morning the New York Times says: "Trainers Intended as Lift, but Quick Iraq Turnaround Is Unlikely." That is The New York Times.

The New York Times says:

Mr. Obama's plan does not call for small teams of American troops to accompany Iraqi fighters onto the battlefield, to call in airstrikes or advise on combat operations. Nor is it likely to significantly intensify an air campaign in which American warplanes have been able to locate and bomb their targets only about a quarter of the time.

"This alone is not going to do it," said Michele A. Flournoy, who was the senior policy official in the Pentagon during Mr. Obama's first term. "It is a great first step, but it should be the first in a series of steps."

One of the reasons I have that quote from Michele Flournoy is that it is not just former Bush administration officials. It is former Obama administration officials who all agree that what we are doing is without strategy and without prospect of success.

POLITICO article: "Obama's Iraq quagmire."

The President finds himself dragged back into a war he was elected to end.

When pressed on why the latest efforts do not include having American troops serve as spotters for airstrikes or sending Apache aircraft to back up the Iraqi troops, Deputy National Security Adviser Ben Rhodes told reporters the president "has been very clear he'll look at a range of different options."

That is encouraging that the President has been very clear. I love it. All these spokespeople use two sorts of fillers: One is "very clear" and the other is "quite frankly."

Do you ever notice that? Isn't that interesting? Maybe we should take that out of their vocabulary—"very clear" and "frankly"—when they are neither clear nor frank.

But anyway, Mr. Rhodes said—he is really a very interesting guy: "The U.S. military cannot and should not do this simply for Iraqis, and, frankly, Iraqis want to be in the lead themselves."

"The U.S. military cannot and should not do this simply for Iraqis."

Does anyone in the world think that the United States of America would be engaged simply for Iraqis? Has Mr. Rhodes ever listened to Mr. Baghadt and ISIS and their intentions to attack and destroy America as much as they possibly can?

POLITICO: "Trainers or advisors? White House and Pentagon don't agree."

The White House says the new batch of troops deploying to Iraq are going to train Iraqi recruits to fight the Islamic State. The Pentagon says the 450 American personnel headed to Al-Taqaddum Air Base are going over just as advisers.

The mixed signals come as President Barack Obama struggles to find a balance between achieving his goal of "degrading and ultimately destroying" the terrorist group known as the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant while avoiding restarting a war in