

so many of the parts that are working—that now 24 million people in this country get healthcare who otherwise will have it taken away from them. That is not right. That is not the right thing to do. We don't want to treat our fellow human beings that way.

To recapitulate, what does the House of Representatives' TrumpCare plan do?

It cuts Medicaid. It has higher costs and less coverage. It cuts taxes for the wealthy, and it increases costs to seniors.

I think we want to do exactly the opposite of what it does.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, let me add one additional thing to the statement that was made by the Senator from Florida; and that is, what does the House version do?

I would like to first of all make it very clear that what we are going to see and ultimately vote on is what the House has right now. They have a starting place. But it does some things that I think are significant. One, it repeals the mandate and the Obama taxes. It changes the regulations back to the State—where most individuals prefer they be in—from Washington. HSAs are part of this plan. Preexisting conditions are there. It converts Medicaid.

So I think we need to keep our powder dry. We need to look and see. I think most of the people in my State of Oklahoma consider ObamaCare to be a disaster, and it needs to be changed and it is going to be changed.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I think tomorrow President Trump is going—or at least is planning—to sign an Executive order rolling back the Obama Clean Power Plan. I will have a lot to say about that, but I think it is important at an appropriate time to discuss the history of this issue. It has been going on a long time.

At the start of the 114th Congress, the Senate voted 98 to 1 in support of the Inhofe-Whitehouse amendment, stating that climate change is real and not a hoax. That is something we can actually agree on; that climate has been changing since the beginning of time, and there is all the archeological evidence, there is the Scriptural evidence, the historic evidence. Climate has been changing and will continue to change.

The hoax is that some on the far left believe man controls changes in the climate. We have endured 8 years of an administration that buys into the alarmist mentality that the world is coming to an end, and it is due to man-made gases. That is what the hoax is. Even though individuals—occasionally you will find some scientists who agree with this, but they will say that there may be some contribution, but it is minimal. It is not even measurable.

The Obama administration has used climate change as justification for taking unauthorized actions, such as the so-called Clean Power Plan. Every administrative entity under Obama was forced to embrace his climate change agenda as a top priority and used it as a convenient sounding board.

We have seen agencies such as the Department of Defense divert resources away from their core responsibilities and instead spend them on finding ways to justify statements from the President that climate change is the greatest threat, a greater threat than terrorism.

So other agencies have spared no taxpayer expense in supporting the outcome-driven science in an attempt to bolster their claims. In fact, the Congressional Research Service has reported that the Obama administration spent \$120 billion on climate change issues. That is a total waste of money. I don't think anyone can tell me what that \$120 billion was spent for. It was not authorized, it was not appropriated, but it was spent.

This comes from the Congressional Research Service. So this is a total waste of money, money needed to defend America. Despite the administration's efforts, as research and data around climate change continue to improve, the results do not support their claims but instead call them into question. This is especially true for all of the "hottest month" or "hottest season" or "hottest year" in history. This is something that is often claimed by those who are reading the script and trying to make those claims.

So 2014 was previously the warmest year on record, until a reporter pressed NOAA and NASA on the claim and the agencies were forced to admit they were only 38 percent sure that claim was accurate. A December 2015 study from the American Geophysical Union concluded that after analyzing over 1,200 ground-based weather stations: "The warmest-ever claims by government scientists are inflated due to compromised U.S. temperature stations impacted by encroachment of artificial surfaces like concrete, asphalt, and heat sources like air conditioning exhaust."

Because of NOAA's methods, they failed to account for these factors. Additionally, surface thermometers continue to be at odds with satellite data, which shows essentially no warming for the past 18 years, continuing the hiatus the Economist magazine originally wrote about in 2013.

In fact, just a few weeks ago, a whistleblower alleged that a June 2015 NOAA report manipulated data in an attempt to discredit this 18-year pause. Now, the 18-year pause has been agreed to. People understand, this is what they call the hiatus. This is a time when temperature has not changed, but they have done this to influence the public debate surrounding the Clean Power Plan and the Paris climate conference. Conveniently, the computer

with the data suffered a complete failure and none of the data was saved.

It is not just the inflated temperature claims that can be called into question. A growing body of scientific study suggests variations in solar radiation and natural climate variability have a leading role in climate change. That is a novel idea, that the Sun has something to do with warming. A number of the incident studies assessing the impact of clouds have even suggested that water vapor feedback is entirely canceled out by cloud processes, as global data shows no increase in the number or the intensity of hurricanes, tornadoes, droughts or floods, in spite of what they say on the Senate floor.

Even the IPCC's 2013 report concluded that the current datasets indicate no significant observed trends in global tropical cyclone frequency over the past century. No robust trends in the annual numbers of tropical storms, hurricanes—major hurricane count—have been identified in the past 100 years in the North Atlantic Basin, but we still hear it over and over again.

When it comes to droughts, the IPCC report indicated that previous conclusions regarding global increase trends in drought since the 1970s were probably overstated.

The increasing observations from scientist Craig Idso suggests a much reduced and practically harmless climate response to the increased amount of atmospheric carbon dioxide. Further, there are benefits from the increase in carbon that have led to a greening of the planet and contributed to increased agricultural productivity. Now, this shows that the progression that has taken place—the green parts are the part where they have an increased amount of CO₂ activity.

The trend is in the annual gross productivity per decade by percentage. This is from 1982 to 2011. So you can see the great benefits. In fact, many people still remind us, over and over again, that CO₂ is actually a fertilizer. It helps things grow. But these points were kept out of the Obama administration's press releases, and the media has been more than willing to go along.

None of this is surprising. As I have given a lot of speeches on climate change, my message tends to be one that the alarmists on the far left do not want to hear and do not want to believe, but they have been proven wrong time and time again.

Despite millions of dollars of the Tom Steyers of the world, Americans do care about climate change, but it is not high on their list. Right now, which I will state in just a moment, some of the polling activity that has taken place has surprised a lot of people. This is Tom Steyer. We keep hearing about the Koch brothers and other people who are putting money in the campaign, but Tom Steyer is the one who has said—that was his statement—that prior to the 2014 races, he was going to put \$100 million in there to elect people to promote such things as Obama's plan.

The Environment and Public Works Committee last Congress—and this is when I chaired that committee—held 10 hearings assessing the President's climate agenda, where we heard from a diverse group of expert witnesses who testified to the enormous costs, especially for low-income minority communities, the economic consequences, the legal vulnerabilities, and the miniscule environmental impacts. We had the president of the Black Chamber of Commerce, Harry Alford, come to a hearing. He was the one who talked about how disproportionate the harm is that is done to poor people. He talked about the Blacks and the Hispanics who are at risk. I will elaborate on that in just a moment.

Taking committee action is a further step that Democrats and Republicans in both Houses of Congress rejected Obama's and the radical left's key climate regulations. Then, in February of last year, the U.S. Supreme Court put a stay on the so-called Clean Power Plan because they too had significant legal questions surrounding the validity of this.

Well, needless to say, there is a well-documented, substantive rejection to Obama's climate actions across the institution designed to keep the executive branch in check.

I have not attended one of the United Nation's climate conferences since 2009, when I was kind of a one-man truth squad in Copenhagen. Let me mention what this is. The United Nations, they are the ones that started the whole thing in the very beginning in talking about global warming, talking about all the problems that were out there. We have a pretty documented case. In fact, there is a book that was written—I will not mention the name of the book—that comes to the conclusion that the United Nations was right in the middle of this whole discussion as far back as 1972. So what the United Nations does is every year they have a big party. This is the big party of the year. It is in December. They have had 21 in 21 consecutive years.

What they do is invite everybody to come in who says that we will voluntarily reduce targets for CO₂ emissions. Of course, most of them who come in are coming in to get some of the billions of dollars they say they are going to be distributing. This is really interesting because these parties—I can remember one time I was talking to someone I know from Benin in West Africa. In fact, the Chair knows this individual too. I saw him at one of these meetings. I said: Now, you don't go along with all of this.

He said: No, but this is the biggest party of the year.

So they have these every year. That is what I think is important for people to understand. Anyway, I hadn't gone to any of these since the big event in Copenhagen, but the message I carried to the international bureaucrats then is exactly what happened: Congress did not then and does not now support the

radical climate change actions, and the U.S. role in any associated international agreement will be limited accordingly.

The outlook for environmental activists and climate change alarmists is grim. With the significant losses in the White House, the Congress, the Supreme Court, and a persistently skeptical public, their political leverage and relevance has dwindled.

For the past 8 years, the Obama administration and the American economy have suffered under the effects of the climate agenda. That era is over, and President Trump is already delivering on his campaign promises.

Just a few weeks ago, I was at the White House when President Trump signed an Executive order instructing the EPA to roll back the waters of the United States rule. This is the rule that would have allowed the EPA to regulate waters in the United States. I think most people know this has always been regulated by the States, but the true liberals, they want to have regulation taking place not by the States but in Washington.

A guy named Tom Buchanan is the Oklahoma Farm Bureau chairman. He was talking about all the problems farmers have throughout America, farmers and ranchers. The biggest problem they have is overregulation by the EPA. Do you know what he singled out as being the most onerous of all of these regulations? It was the regulation on water. Of course, I was in there when the President did away with that particular rule.

As I previously mentioned, President Trump has also committed to rolling back the Clean Power Plan and its \$300 billion pricetag. This rule would lead to dramatic increases in energy prices and reduce the reliability of the grid. These two rules are examples of major expansions of Federal power and a departure from the core functions and responsibilities provided by Congress to the EPA.

The steps taken by the Trump administration will return the rules of those agencies to their statutory intent. We have seen great successes in our air and water quality based on the EPA operating within its statutory limits. I can remember the 1990 amendments to the Clean Air Act. Right now, our pollution has dramatically dropped down. This is at a time when vehicle miles have actually doubled. So we are doing some things that are successful, and I look forward to continuing that success.

That is the end of my prepared remarks. I want to visit just a little bit about what is going on and what we have been doing over the last quite a few years now. I think it is important. People ask me: What are the motives of those individuals who are promoting all of these regulations that are on greenhouse gases? There has to be a motive for that.

I suggest, and this will surprise a lot of people, you go back originally—and

I can remember when Koyoto first came out. Koyoto was the first regulation—they tried to get all the countries to join in. In fact, that was at a time when Clinton was President of the United States, and they were trying anxiously to get this thing—to join in the Koyoto treaty.

The ones who originally were involved in it—and I could go back to people who have forgotten about this. The former European Union Minister of the Environment, Margot Wallstrom, said: "Kyoto is about the economy, about leveling the playing field for big business worldwide."

Then the French weighed in; that was President Jacques Chirac. He said during his speech at the Hague in November of 2000 that Kyoto represents "the first component of an authentic global governance."

You know, it hadn't really changed that much. Christiana Figueres was the one in charge of the Paris convention that took place where they were talking about the great successes they had there, and she said the real goal was "to change the economic development model"—in other words, redistribute wealth among the nations.

So let's keep in mind that is what the original motivation was.

Then the United Nations weighed in. This goes all the way back to 1972. In 1972, the United Nations held a conference on human environment in Stockholm, Sweden. Fifteen years later, in 1987, the U.N. published the report "Sustainable development: Our Common Future."

"Sustainable development" is a word that they changed—a phrase, because it is easier to sell to the public. That was 1987, and then you go forward to 1992 and the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. They announced their intention to pursue sustainable development through the Kyoto Protocol.

It is kind of interesting because Reuters wrote an article in 2012 that said:

The "sustainable" branding for this year's summit, rather than climate, is by design, said Ambassador Andre Correa do Lago, who headed Brazil's delegation to the U.N. climate talks in Durban and will be a chief negotiator for Brazil in Rio.

That is behind us now, but this is an article that came out in 2012.

Sustainable development is an easier sell globally than climate change, even though sustainable development is a way of tackling global warming and other environmental issues, he said.

He said the end goal is not about the environment but about the redistribution of wealth.

Again, if anyone doubts that he was accurate in that statement, the Secretary General of the United Nations at that time was Ban Ki-moon, and he proposed how the challenges must be addressed. In talking about what they were going to do at these annual meetings, he said:

More than \$2.1 trillion a year in wealth transfers from rich countries to poorer ones, in the name of fostering "green infrastructure," "climate adaptation" and other "green economy" measures.

So there again, after all these years, it is still about the same thing.

Now we go into more science and the different weather events. I notice when people come to the floor and they talk about all the bad weather and the hurricanes and the tornadoes and the fires and that all that is as a result of these events, I would like to remind people that George Mason University reported that 63 percent of the weathercasters believe that any global warming that occurs is a result of natural variation and not human activities.

Here is another one too. The Democrats will like this because Dr. Martin Hertzberg was a lifelong liberal Democrat, a retired Navy meteorologist with a Ph.D. in physical chemistry. He also declared his dissent of warming fears in 2008. This is a quote from this guy. He said:

As a scientist and life-long liberal Democrat, I find the constant regurgitation of the anecdotal, fear mongering clap-trap about human-caused global warming to be a disservice to science.

The global warming alarmists don't even bother with data! All they have are half-baked computer models that are totally out of touch with reality and have already been proven to be false.

That is coming from a very liberal Democrat.

So you start looking at some of the things they say are linked to CO₂. NOAA, the scientists, rejected the global warming link to tornado. NOAA said that no specific consensus or connection between global warming and tornadic activity exists.

According to NOAA, hurricanes have been in decline in the United States since the beginning of records in the 19th century. The worst decade for major . . . hurricanes was in the 1940s.

Journal of Geographical Research: Since 2006, global tropical cyclone energy has decreased dramatically to the lowest levels since the 1970s. Global frequency of tropical cyclones has reached a historic low.

On droughts, the same thing: Severe droughts in 1934 covered 80 percent of the country, while the one they talk about in 2011—it was just 25 percent.

On sea level, the Journal of Geographical Research: There is no statistically significant acceleration in sea level rise over the past 100 years.

Again, these are the people who know, and we are talking about in this case the Journal of Geographical Research.

So enough of that. That is something that is a fact in terms of the weather events.

The other thing I want to mention here, going back to my notes on Antarctica, this is kind of interesting because in September, according to NASA and the data on the National Snow and Ice Data Center website, Antarctic ice hit a new record high in recorded history as it has increased to more than 19.4 million square kilometers. That was happening in terms of the data center information.

In January of 2010, Time magazine talked about the Himalayas melting. I

remember people on the floor of this Senate standing up and talking about how the Himalayas are going to melt because of global warming. The article in Time magazine said: "Himalayan Melting: How a Climate Panel Got It Wrong."

Glacierrate is a black eye for the IPCC and the climate science community as a whole.

Sometimes some humorous things do happen. They were trying to build their case back in 2013. This was a research expedition to gauge the effect of climate on the Antarctic. It began actually on December 24. There was a Russian ship carrying climate scientists, journalists, tourists, and crew members for the expedition until it became trapped in deep ice up to 10 feet thick. Now, here they were going up there to show that things were warming in Antarctica. The whole crowd was wanting this to happen. They got stuck in ice. Well, they were stuck there for 6 days. Then an Australia icebreaker was sent to rescue the ship, but efforts were suspended due to bad weather. On January 2, they were still there. A Chinese icebreaker sent out a helicopter and airlifted the 52 passengers from the Russian ship to safety on an Australian icebreaker. The Chinese vessel was also stuck in the ice, along with the Russian vessel. There were 22 Russian crewmembers onboard the Russian ship, and an unreported number of crewmembers remained on the Chinese ship. Finally, the U.S. Coast Guard came along, and they were able to get in there and pull them out. The ship was called Polar Star.

I remember when that happened because they were going there with the express purpose of explaining to the world the problems they have in the Antarctic.

OK. Let's talk about bears. You don't get people talking about this without dancing out the polar bears and talking about what is happening to polar bears.

It is kind of interesting because when we look at the bear populations, they say that in the Davis Strait, they have flourished despite the shrinking Arctic Sea ice since the 1970s. In fact, in 2007 they escalated up to 2,158 bears, and they only had 1,400 in 1993. Another way of looking at it is, when Al Gore was born, there were 5,000 polar bears. In 2005, that number grew to 22,000. Today, there are 30,000 polar bears. So don't worry about the polar bears. If there is a serious problem there, it is because of overpopulation. But it looks so good. It is such good theater to dance out the polar bears and say the polar bears are all going to disappear.

When Climategate happened, I was convinced that this whole issue was over.

I can remember when we had Lisa Jackson before the committee that I chaired. This was actually in 2009. In 2009, we had sent over all of these people to tell the 192 people at the U.N. meeting in Copenhagen that the world was coming to an end, that they needed

to all join in and sign an agreement on what they were going to do about CO₂. So the day before I left for Copenhagen, Lisa Jackson happened to be in our committee. On tape, with live TV, I asked the question—I said: Well, Madam Administrator, I am going to leave town. I have a feeling that when I leave town, you will have an endangerment finding. For you to get the authority to do something about global warming, you have to have an endangerment finding. An endangerment finding has to be based on science. What science are you going to use?

She said: Well, the IPCC.

That is the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. That is the United Nations. They set it up for that purpose.

So as luck would have it, it happened in a matter of days after that, after she said everything is put on the science of the IPCC, the worst scandal—some people say the greatest scientific scandal in history—took place. It took place at the University of East Anglia Climate Research Unit located in the UK. It revealed the scientific fraud. They have tapes and emails of individuals who were saying: We are going to have to rig this in order to come up with some facts to show that there is warming taking place.

These were the scientists of the IPCC. It was such a scandal that one of the UN scientists resigned, and he said: The result is not scientific.

Here is a good one. Clive Cooke of the Financial Times said:

The closed-mindedness of these supposed men of science, their willingness to go to any lengths to defend a preconceived message, is surprising even to me. The stink of intellectual corruption is overpowering.

Then we had Christopher Booker of the UK Telegraph say: "This is the worst scientific scandal of our generation."

So I had thought that since everything was based on that particular science, that would do it in, but it didn't happen.

If you look at all the damage that has been done in the last 8 years by the concentration of all these issues, the defense is one that took the biggest hit. A lot of people don't really believe or don't understand or don't appreciate what has happened to the defense during the time Obama was President. In fact, we have been watching very carefully what our new President is going to do to try to undo the damage—what I call the disarming of America—the damage that was done to our military.

They will say: Well, wait a minute, the Obama budget for the military was the same as the budget was before that, so it isn't any great reduction.

The difference is, they changed the function of the military. How many people are aware that despite all of the problems, they wasted money on the Green Fleet. Remember the Green Fleet? They were actually paying \$59 a gallon for biofuel to try to convince

people that we could use the military to experiment for other more pleasing sources. Twelve million dollars for operation and maintenance to exercise painting ships, printing hats, and transforming fuel to show off the Green Fleet at the foreign military show, and \$3.7 billion in solar panels and wind power. Why should the military be paying that? We have a Department of Energy. As I read the function of Energy, that is what they are supposed to be doing.

Then we have Tom Steyer. The reason I bring this up is because we keep hearing about the Koch brothers. And yes, the Koch brothers are in production. Their job is to try to find energy to run this machine called America, and they have done a very good job of it. But they get criticized all the time. So I think it is important that people realize that there are a lot of liberal billionaires who have made pledges. In this case, this individual, Tom Steyer—I am sure he is a fine guy. He actually made a commitment of \$10 million personally to try to promote the message that Obama had. Here is something interesting that we just found out or I just discovered: Even though this man is trying to kill fossil fuels, he made his money in fossil fuels. Since 2003, Steyer's hedge fund, Farallon Capital Management, has played a pivotal role in financing the tremendous restructuring and growth in thermal coal production in Jakarta and Sydney. All of this took place under Mr. Steyer's tenure as founder and senior partner of Farallon. The coal mines that Mr. Steyer has funded through Farallon produce an amount of CO₂ each year that is equivalent to about 28 percent of the amount of CO₂ produced in the United States each year by burning coal for electricity generation. So it is worthwhile to note that he now is putting huge investments out to defeat the very people who were the source of his wealth.

The other question I get quite often is, Why aren't more people talking about this? I have made an accumulation of various threats. There are two groups of people out there. We have those who are for the whole program that President Obama had, and they are the ones who are questioning and talking about the various science, and then we have threats coming from people such as James Hansen, who said that these are "high crimes against humanity."

Robert Kennedy, Jr., said: "This is treason and we need to start treating [people] as traitors."

Barone: "The warmists have 'a desire to kill heretics'—Calls for capital punishment for 'global warming deniers.'"

So it is not fun, and there are a lot of threats out there. If they don't have logic on their side and don't have science on their side, then the threats are what people use.

We talked about cap-and-trade legislation. They tried for a long period of time to get legislation through, and

when that didn't work, we might remember the first bills that were introduced were the McCain-Lieberman bills in 2003, 2005, and 2007. The first of those bills was a cap-and-trade bill that was defeated in this Chamber by 43 to 55. Two years later, they tried it again, and it was defeated by 38 to 60. Each year, the margin went up. President Obama came along and decided: Well, if we can't pass this stuff through legislation, let's do it by regulation. So we had cap-and-trade regulation.

I have already talked about going to Copenhagen after Obama, PELOSI, BARBARA BOXER, and John Kerry had gone there to a big United Nations party in 2009 and went with the idea of convincing everyone that we were going to pass legislation over here, and, of course, we didn't do it.

In 2010, Japan under no uncertain terms refused to extend the Kyoto Protocol. They dropped out when they said: If we don't have India and China, we are not going to be a part of it. Canada finally went through. Canada was one of the first countries to join in on the Kyoto Protocol, but they dropped out in 2011 and 2012.

That brings us to the Paris party that they had. They tried to make it look as if it was a success, when in fact it was a miserable, dismal failure. Our President said that we would reduce our CO₂ emissions by 27 percent by 2025. Obviously, we couldn't do it. We even had a committee hearing asking how were we going to do that? We had the EPA in, and they admitted that it couldn't be done.

Then they talked about the commitment that China made at the Paris conference. China has actually produced more—this diagram gives you an idea of where China is going. They are building a new coal-powered generation plant every 10 days, and they are not about to try to restrict their CO₂. They said: Ok, we will do it. Let us increase our CO₂ emissions until 2025, and then we will agree that we will do a waiver. That is the extent of the regulations that have not worked.

The polling and the truth are coming out. The polling is now different than it was at first. I can remember when global warming was one of the first—either in first place or second place in the polls as to the dangers that face America. Look at the polling today. The FOX News poll last week said that 97 percent of Americans don't care about global warming when they stacked it up against terrorism, immigration, healthcare, and the economy.

The Washington Post-ABC News poll just found that fewer Americans think climate change is a serious problem.

On March 12, 2015, the Gallup poll said that climate change came in dead last of national problems of concern to Americans. Shortly after that, the Gallup poll did their annual environmental survey, and global warming came in dead last in terms of environmental issues—15th out of 15 concerns. So I am stating that the people of America

have caught on. It is something that people are aware of now.

When we stop, look, and think about the cost of the Clean Power Plan, that is what this whole thing is about. I think that tomorrow the President is going to come up with a plan to do away with the Clean Power Plan. The compliance costs would be between \$29 and \$39 billion a year, up to \$292 billion over 12 years with double-digit electricity price increases in 40 States. It would be an absolute disaster, and it is not going to happen.

What is worse than that is not just the cost but how it is hitting the most vulnerable people. Harry Alford, who is the president of the National Black Chamber of Commerce, found that the proposed Clean Power Plan would increase Black poverty by 23 percent, Hispanic poverty by 26 percent, reduce Black jobs by 200,000 and Hispanic jobs by 300,000, with a cumulative job loss of 7 million for Blacks and nearly 12 million for Hispanics by the year 2035. I have to state also that the National Energy Assistance Directors' Association found that high energy costs force seniors to forgo meals, medical care, and prescriptions in order to comply.

I am very proud of the President. He is keeping his commitment. He is not going to allow our most vulnerable citizens to be taxed, and I thank him for his help.

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

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

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, on roll-call vote No. 86, the confirmation of the nomination of Seema Verma to be Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, I was not recorded because I was absent due to a flight delay. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.

H.J. RES. 57

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, in December 2015, this body came together to enact what then-President Obama called a Christmas miracle, the Every Student Succeeds Act, ESSA. This truly bipartisan, bicameral compromise reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, for the first time in more than 14 years on the compromise of local control for Federal safeguards. First enacted more than 50 years ago as a part of the civil rights era, the ESEA sought to ensure that all children, regardless of their ZIP Code, were able to obtain a high-quality education. The legislative process is about compromise, and I have