

this issue has been tremendous because he understands it is not only important for the Lone Star State, but it is important for our country.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, while the Senator from North Dakota is still here, let me just say that he gave a speech that I wish I could have given. I couldn't say it any better than he did, but I will just make one point as he is preparing to leave the floor.

Some people wonder why is it that the Texas economy is doing so well relative to the rest of the country. Last year, 2014, our economy grew at 5.2 percent. The U.S. economy grew at 2.2 percent. Now the fact that we are producing energy using the techniques the Senator from North Dakota talked about—fracking and horizontal drilling—fracking, by the way, has been around for 70 years or more—that has helped contribute to job creation and our economic growth. This is something we would like to see expand across the country.

We have been blessed, as has the Senator from North Dakota, with abundant natural resources. What we are asking to be able to do is to sell those to willing buyers overseas. Many of them are some of our closest allies, who are being terrorized by thugs such as Vladimir Putin, who uses energy as a weapon. Think about how powerful this would be in our national security toolbox to be able to sell natural gas and crude oil to some of our closest allies so they don't have to rely on people like Mr. Putin.

I congratulate the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. HOEVEN, for his leadership on this issue. We have all worked together on it, and it has been a team effort, and we are close to getting it done.

The final point I want to make is that this is not just about energy-producing States, this is a net positive for the United States and for our allies abroad.

Mr. HOEVEN. Will the Senator from Texas yield for just a minute?

Mr. CORNYN. I will be happy to.

Mr. HOEVEN. I want to pick up on that last point. It is particularly important when you consider this legislation that this bill just doesn't benefit the oil-and-gas-producing States, it really benefits everybody when you think about all of the infrastructure and the materials, the equipment that goes into producing that energy. When you talk about drilling down 10,000 feet, 2 miles underground, and drilling out 3 miles in multiple directions; when you talk about the equipment that is needed to do that, the tanks, the transportation; when you talk about all the things—the research, development, engineering—that go into it, I doubt there is a State in the Union that isn't touched by this energy industry. That is something I think all of

our Members have to keep in mind when we look at this legislation. It is not just about energy-producing States, it is about all of us in terms of the economy, and it is about all of us in terms of national security. We are the ones leading forward with the newest technology that will leave the environment with better stewardship.

I am glad the Senator actually brought up that point, and I hope our colleagues will keep that in mind as we bring forward this legislation.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, there is another benefit that spreads evenly among Americans, and that is low gasoline prices. The single driver for low gasoline prices is the supply of oil. Because of the abundant supply of oil due to innovation and these techniques the Senator from North Dakota talked about, oil prices are lower than they have been in a long time.

You can buy a gallon of gasoline in Texas for well under \$2. I think I saw it as cheap as \$1.80 or maybe lower than that in some places. That has a direct impact on the pocketbook of working families. That is another reason why this legislation needs to be passed on Friday of this week in the House and in the Senate. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for this brief discussion.

WORKING TOGETHER IN THE SENATE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I wanted to come to the floor and talk about what we have been able to accomplish this year because sometimes I think people, when they hear us talk, think we are somehow claiming credit where credit is not entirely due or whether we are trying to make this purely a partisan matter. It is not, but it does require good leadership.

As the Presiding Officer knows, having been speaker of the house in North Carolina, the people who set the agenda—that is a pretty important power. All of the legislation that has passed this year would not have passed if it weren't for the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, under the new majority scheduling it for a vote in the Senate and chairmen in the relevant committees processing that legislation at the committee level and making it available for floor consideration.

It is not just the Republican majority. Time after time, we have seen Republicans and Democrats working together hand in glove to try to pass legislation that is good for the American people. We saw that on the Education reform bill, where Senator MURRAY and Senator ALEXANDER worked so closely together. We saw it on the highway bill—the first multiyear highway bill in a decade—where the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER, working together with Senator INHOFE from Oklahoma and the majority leader, worked to really turn things around in the House of Representatives, to give them the space and time to pass a multiyear highway bill and to work with us to

reconcile the differences and get it to the President. That is pretty important.

I was on the phone earlier today talking with some of the folks at the Austin American-Statesman about the impact on the traffic situation we have on I-35. It is a veritable parking lot during many times of the day. People understand the importance of taking care of infrastructure and maintaining it but also expanding it so people can get from point A to point B, but more importantly, what that means in terms of the environment and their quality of life.

So my simple point is that there is a big difference to the way this Chamber operated under the Democratic leader, when Senator REID was majority leader, back when our friends across the aisle were in the majority. The statistic has been mentioned that there were 15 rollcall votes on amendments. We have had more than 200 so far this year alone. Frankly, I think our Democratic friends like the way the Senate has been operating under the current majority more than they did when they were in the majority because under the dysfunction of the previous majority, even Democrats in the majority weren't able to get votes on the amendments. When they stood before the voters, people asked "What have you done?" and they didn't have much to show except dysfunction.

As the Presiding Officer knows, whether it is North Carolina or other places around the country, we got a number of new Senators as a result of that misguided dysfunction, which was calculated but I think proved to be a miscalculation.

It is a good thing to see the Senate operating again in the interests of the American people. We have had a pretty busy session. I am not claiming it was perfect. Frustrations abound. It is in the nature of divided government.

The legislative process was designed by our Founding Fathers in the Constitution to be hard because they actually saw the concentration of power as a threat to their freedom and their liberty, and they didn't want an efficient Federal Government. They wanted checks and balances. They wanted checks between the various branches, between the two branches of the legislature, and also checks and balances with regard to the allocation of power to the Federal Government relative to the States and individuals. All of that separation of power was designed to require deliberation and to require transparency and the building of consensus before legislation was passed that would have an impact on their lives.

It has been a good thing to see the Senate working again, and I think all of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, can be proud of some of the work we have done.

One of the things I am most proud of this year is the fact that we were able to pass a bill called the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act by 99 to 0. This

was the first legislation that actually provided a crime victims compensation fund to help provide grants to victims of human trafficking. As I have described before on this floor, the typical profile of a victim of human trafficking is a young girl between the ages of 12 and 14. We need to have resources available for people with big hearts in communities all across this country to help rescue these victims of trafficking and help them recover their lives and get on with their lives in a more productive and safe manner. This is one of the things we have done together.

PARIS CLIMATE CHANGE AGREEMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Now, Mr. President, I want to spend a few minutes talking about some of the things on which I don't think we are going to be able to find political consensus. That has to do with the President's moving up his list of priorities. Among all the other things that are going on in the world, he seems to be saying that climate change is the most urgent challenge facing the United States and the world. I worry a little bit any time I hear a politician—or anybody, for that matter—making sort of messianic claims. The President characterized the agreement in Paris—and I will talk more about the nature of that agreement—“a turning point for the world.” It strikes me that it takes quite a bit of hubris and really arrogance to be claiming that yes, this is going to be a turning point for the world. As a matter of fact, the Wall Street Journal said that it pays to be skeptical of a politician who claims to be saving the planet.

I don't share the President's priorities when it comes to climate change because I think there are actually more urgent priorities, such as fighting terrorism both abroad and here at home. That would be a more urgent priority. Some of the other more prosaic work we do here is pretty important to the quality of lives of the American people and to the economy, our ability to create an environment where they can find work and provide for their families. I think those needs are more urgent.

Nevertheless, the President seems to be once again exaggerating what his authority is under our Constitution. Of course, the President has no legal authority to bind his successor. What he seems to be saying is “This is an agreement between me and the 140-some-odd nations,” and it won't last beyond his Presidency. Last time I checked, the President will be leaving the White House sometime in January 2017. What he has purported to do is enter into an agreement that would somehow bind his successor and would somehow bind the Congress and the American people. But under our Constitution, this President—no President has any authority to do anything like that.

So it is clear that this agreement has been crafted in a way that gives some

of the countries that are parties to the agreement more leeway than others. Some major economies don't have to play by the same rules that the United States would.

This agreement represents the President once again trying to claim authority he simply does not have. We don't have a king. In America, we made that decision a long time ago. I think it was 1787 when we decided we would not have a king, but the President seems to act like a monarch and claim authorities from some source other than the Constitution. It seems unbelievable that after the Obama administration has failed to find support for so many of the President's overreaching regulations here at home—not in the Congress, not in the State houses, not in the courts—his response was to sign on to an agreement with the United Nations that seeks to tax our use of energy. It is another attempt to do an end run around the Constitution and around the American people.

What really frustrates me is the President's willingness to sacrifice our economy—job creation and the ability of people to find work and to provide for their family—to promote a cause that offers no guarantee of a more resilient climate or a clean environment.

The President and some of his supporters frequently like to say: Well, people who don't regard climate change as a priority are anti-science. I actually think people who think agreements such as this are going to provide the answer are anti-science.

First, if you start looking at some of the models that are used to predict temperatures decades and perhaps centuries out, this is not what you would call science, this is more like an economic projection or model, and we know how reliable they have been in the past.

I couldn't help but think about growing up and a book that I remember reading called “The Population Bomb,” which was written by a Stanford professor named Paul R. Ehrlich. The thesis of “The Population Bomb” was that unless we did something to control population, millions of people were going to starve to death because we were going to outstrip our food supply.

Well, obviously that didn't happen. One of the reasons it didn't happen is because of a man by the name of Norman Borlaug, a Nobel Prize winner, and now considered the father of the Green Revolution. By the way, he did spend a little bit of time at Texas A&M in Bryan College Station. But he was a very heroic figure who used science to help figure out how to increase production of the food supply in a way that made Paul Ehrlich's prediction a pipe dream. It just didn't happen.

I think that by predicting all these dire consequences, it is the predictors—it is the people who are embracing this sort of climate change theology—who don't have any confidence in our ability to innovate our way out of these problems.

I will use one more anecdote to try to make the point. At the start of the 20th century, horses in New York City were producing about 5 million pounds of manure a day. Can you imagine what an environmental hazard this would be with manure piled on vacant lots with rats? I will not go into all the details; it is pretty repulsive to think about. But there is a book called “SuperFreakonomics,” which uses this great example. They said: Well, what happened to that? Instead of some grandiose government policy or instead of some new tax or regulation that government issued, what happened to that and the environmental hazard that presented was the internal combustion engine. So not overnight, but apparently in short order, that manure was disposed of. Horses were replaced by cars.

Again, it is just another example of how American innovation, creativity, and entrepreneurialism can take care of many of these problems that some of our friends worry so much about and think should be such an important priority for us. America's entrepreneurs have shown time and again that they are simply more adaptive and genius than government regulators and bureaucrats.

By bypassing the American people and signing our country up for a bad international agreement that doesn't put our country first, we should instead focus on finding innovative solutions that fit the diverse needs of consumers, businesses, and a growing economy alike.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

HONORING OUR MEN AND WOMEN IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

SERGEANT SEAN RENFRO, TROOPER TAYLOR THYFAULT, JAIMIE JURSEVICS, AND OFFICER GARRETT SWASEY

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I rise today to honor our men and women in law enforcement. Across the United States this year, 118 law enforcement officers have paid the ultimate sacrifice.

In Colorado, we honor our four fallen officers: Sergeant Sean Renfro with the Jefferson County Sheriff's Office, whose care and concern for others did not end when he was off duty; Trooper Taylor Thyfault with the Colorado State Patrol, an Army veteran and a cadet training to become a trooper and due to his bravery was honored as a trooper before being laid to rest; Jaimie Jursevics with the Colorado State Patrol, a new mom and the victim of the careless actions of another; and Officer Garrett Swasey with the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs Police Department, our most recent loss, as he responded to the senseless attack in Colorado Springs.

Each of their legacies reflects an extraordinary Colorado spirit, each a cherished member of their community, leaving behind loved ones as they