

megawatts of wind to 98,000 megawatts of wind in 10 years.

That is the revolution the Koch brothers are afraid of, and that is the revolution the polluters want to stop because it is the existential threat to their business model. That is what the fight is all about out here—the Koch brothers v. the Green New Deal. It is one business model against another, and our business model is the job creation engine of this generation for blue-collar jobs.

Now, who paid for the Republican study that they all came out on the floor to use? It was paid for by the Koch brothers. They put together what they believe are the costs of the Green New Deal. This was not some private, independent group. The Koch brothers themselves paid for the study that the Republicans have used out here on the floor.

The hearings, if the majority leader had ever ordered them to have been conducted, would have just picked out some of the items regarding how much harm had been done to our planet and to our own country in the last 2 years—\$24 billion from western wildfires in 2018, \$24 billion from Hurricane Michael, \$24 billion from Hurricane Florence, \$18 billion from western wildfires in 2017, \$91 billion from Hurricane Maria, and on and on and on—Hurricane Harvey, \$127.5 billion.

This is all climate related. We pay the price for this. There is no exempting America from having to pick up the costs. Shouldn't we be investing in job creation? Shouldn't we be investing in this incredible change that is already taking place in our economy?

The Green New Deal is not just a resolution; it is a revolution that is taking place across our country. That is why people are rising up all across our country. It is because they know we can do this and because they know this is a job-creation engine that absolutely can create millions of jobs and that can absolutely begin the process of having America, once again, be the leader on this issue.

The denier in chief sits in the White House. The denier in chief addressed the United States at the State of the Union for an hour and 20 minutes just 7 weeks ago, but he did not mention climate change and did not mention clean energy jobs. That is why we are in this fight. We are in the fight because, if we don't lead, the rest of the world will not follow. You cannot preach temperance from a barstool. You can't tell China and you can't tell India what to do if you yourself are not leading. We are the United States of America.

President Kennedy challenged our country to have a mission to the Moon. He said in his speech at Rice University that we would have to invent new metals, new alloys, and propulsion systems that did not exist. He said we would have to bring that mission safely back from the Moon through heat that was half the intensity of the Sun and

get it completed within 10 years. We did that as a nation. We can do this as well. We can deploy these technologies; we can invent new technologies; and we can create millions of jobs within our country because we are bold—because we are a country that can do it.

The President is, for all intents and purposes, John F. Kennedy in reverse. He says we can't do it. He says we should not accept this challenge. Ladies and gentlemen, the Green New Deal is our accepting the challenge, and we are looking forward to this debate today and every day until election day of 2020. We are going to inject this issue into the Presidential and congressional races of 2020 in a way that ensures that unlike in 2016, when Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton were not asked a single question about climate change, the candidates will be asked every day about what their plans are.

We say to the Republican leader: Do you believe in the science? Do you believe it is an existential threat? If you do, where is your plan? Where is the Republican plan to deal with the science of climate change?

If you do not believe it is a threat, then, say it. If you do not believe the science, then, say it. But if you do believe the science, then, all we say to you is this: Where is your plan to deal with this challenge?

President Kennedy responded to the challenge of the Soviet Union controlling outer space, and we succeeded. What is the plan of this Republican era to deal with the challenge of climate, an existential threat to our planet?

We thank you for your attention.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

S.J. RES. 9

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, we shortly will be voting on cloture on a Senate resolution.

As I understand it, a Senate resolution in regards to a policy issue is basically trying to express the Senate's collective views on a policy issue without implementing the legislation itself. If we are going to take up such a resolution, we should take up one that can get broad consensus here in the Senate. Although the Green New Deal has support, it certainly will not have consensus in this body at this time.

Therefore, I urge the leader to bring up S.J. Res. 9, introduced by my colleague Senator CARPER, which deals with climate change with three specific issues that I think all of us should be able to agree on: one, that climate change is real and it is happening; second, that our conduct here on Earth is a major factor in accelerating climate change's activities, leading to the types of extreme weather we have seen

around the world; and, third, that it is urgent that we take action to mitigate the impact of climate change.

Climate change is real. I represent the State of Maryland, with 3,000 miles of shoreline in my State. I see it in flooding and shoreline erosion. I see the impact it has on the Chesapeake Bay, which is iconic to my State and to our economy. Climate change is having an impact—a negative impact. I see it in communities such as Ellicott City, which experienced two 100-year floods within 20 months, just recently, and cost loss of life and property. I see the impact it has on our environment and on our economy.

Clearly, our activities are having a significant impact on accelerating climate change. Carbon emissions, greenhouse gas emissions, and the use of fossil fuels have had an impact on accelerating that. We use too much energy, and we get too much of our energy from sources that are not friendly toward the issue of greenhouse gas emissions.

Third is the urgency. An October 2018 report from the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change made clear that it is urgent that we deal with climate change now and that science tells us that we can reverse the most extreme impact of climate change. We can mitigate the impact of climate change if we take action—if we act now—on this issue.

The Trump administration is an outlier in the global community in dealing with the realities of climate change. Every other nation in the world—every other nation in the world—has acknowledged that we need to act as a civilized world, that we need to work together, and that there is no geographical boundary as to dealing with climate change.

The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change met in December of 2015. I was there with 9 of my colleagues, in Paris, where 195 nations agreed to deal with climate change. I was proud to be part of the U.S. delegation. Now we have left those discussions, and we are alone.

This is too important and too urgent of an issue to play partisan games with, and that is exactly what the majority leader is trying to do today. We need to commit to work together, Democrats and Republicans, in the U.S. Senate to restore the U.S. leadership on this key issue, knowing full well that America's full leadership is desperately needed in order to deal with these issues, and we need to make sure that we take action.

More than passing a resolution, let's start with legislation that will really make a difference on climate change and commit much stronger to renewable energy, rather than using fossil fuels to the extent that we do today. Let's put a price on carbon to allow the U.S. market economy to figure out the solution for reducing the amount of fossil fuels. Let's commit to conservation in our buildings and the way we

deal with auto fuel efficiencies. That type of action will make a real difference and will follow in the best traditions of the U.S. Senate in providing leadership for the United States to work with the global community to solve a global problem.

I urge my colleagues: Let's work together on issues to make a difference and stop playing partisan politics.

I yield the floor.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:07 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m., and was reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bade nomination?

Mr. DAINES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 21, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 51 Ex.]

#### YEAS—78

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Bennet	Graham	Reed
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hassan	Roberts
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Heinrich	Rosen
Brown	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cardin	Isakson	Schatz
Carper	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Jones	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kaine	Shaheen
Coons	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	King	Sinema
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Leahy	Tester
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	Manchin	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Duckworth	McSally	Van Hollen
Durbin	Moran	Warner
Enzi	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murphy	Wicker
Feinstein	Paul	Young

#### NAYS—21

Baldwin	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Markey	Smith
Casey	Menendez	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden

#### NOT VOTING—1

Udall

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

#### RECOGNIZING THE DUTY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO CREATE A GREEN NEW DEAL—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to legislative session to resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 8, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 27, S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 4 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, last month our colleague, the Senator from New York, the Democratic leader, said:

So when the Republican leader says he wants to bring the Green New Deal resolution up for a vote, I say: Go for it. Bring it on.

Well, here we are. Senators will soon have a chance to vote on the Green New Deal, and we have already seen a lot of confusion and more than a little waffling from our friends on the other side of the aisle, some apparently confused on exactly what they should do on a resolution they themselves proposed.

When it was announced, the senior Senator from Massachusetts quickly pledged her support, as did the junior Senator from New Jersey. But I find it pretty curious that some of our colleagues who were among the first to join these Senators and voice their support for this proposal are now among those saying they will simply vote present—present.

Even more interesting is one of the bill's authors, the junior Senator from Massachusetts, who called this vote "sabotage."

Ordinarily, when proposing a piece of legislation around here, one is tickled pink when the majority leader schedules it for a vote, but somehow some of our colleagues will vote present—neither yea nor nay—and others claim it is sabotage. As the vote approaches, we have seen many of our Democratic friends running for the hills, trying to provide space between them and this issue.

The Green New Deal is chock full of utopian ideas but completely devoid of concrete plans to implement any of its overreaching policies. Even the name is a little disorienting because the Green New Deal is not just a new radical environmental policy; it is that, but it is more. It encompasses much

more than that with Medicare for All, free college, and guaranteed jobs. I might add, parenthetically, you might as well throw in free beer and pizza too.

What has been billed as an economy invigorator and job innovator in order to lift up the middle class is really anything but. The bottom line of this proposal is a solution in search of a problem. It is about a message; it is not about finding solutions to real problems.

Maybe it is useful to take a step back to look at what we have already done in this Congress to help the middle class and to generate job growth. Over the last 2 years, we have worked to roll back burdensome regulations left over from the previous administration and make much needed reforms to our outdated Tax Code—the first time in 30 years.

My constituents in Texas have taken notice, and I have heard from many of them who have seen an increase in their take-home pay, thanks to the tax reform bill, for example. Small businesses in Texas have been able to help give their employees more benefits. For example, Village Foods and Pharmacy in Bryan, TX, said that because of the tax reform bill, they were able to provide employee bonuses and implement a 401(k) retirement program, something they were previously unable to do. In San Antonio, my hometown, Hinee Gourmet Coffee said they used their tax cut savings to give their employees raises, as well as to increase employee benefits and upgrade their equipment.

The unemployment rate in Texas remains at 3.8 percent, near its historic 43-year low and on par with the national average. The Lone Star State has added 268,000-plus jobs since February 2018. If you go to Midland, TX, and the Permian Basin, the unemployment rate is 2.1 percent. Labor is tight, and employers are looking for workers because the economy is booming, and they need good people to fill these unfilled jobs.

I think my State is proof positive that when the government gets out of the way, the economy can flourish. That is why we have seen so many people flooding into Texas to take advantage of the low taxes and abundant job opportunities. It is also why I find it so ironic that a few weeks ago one of the Green New Deal creators, the Congresswoman from New York, chose South by Southwest in Austin to peddle her socialist agenda, because if implemented, the Green New Deal would wipe out most of this prosperity. It would cut job growth; it would dramatically increase taxes and cripple our red-hot economy.

One group has estimated that in order to achieve just one portion of this radical agenda—a net-zero emissions transportation system—the annual cost to families would be about \$2,000. That is just for part of the Green New Deal.

Add in another Green New Deal proposal, and it gets more expensive—to