

does not operate predominantly in such areas. Finally, Title LXXXIX provides expanded authority for the Bureau to exempt creditors serving rural or underserved areas from requirements applicable to escrow and impound accounts relating to certain consumer credit transactions. The House passed legislation substantially similar to the provisions contained in Title LXXXIX by a vote of 401-1 on April 13, 2015.

ADVISORY OF EARMARKS

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, it shall not be in order to consider in the House of Representative a conference report to accompany a bill or joint resolution unless the joint explanatory statement includes a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(e), 9(f), and 9(g) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits. No provision in the conference report accompanying H.R. 22 includes an earmark, limited tax benefit, or limited tariff benefit under clause 9(e), 9(f), or 9(g) of rule XXI.

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of the House amendment and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference.

BILL SHUSTER,
JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr.,
SAM GRAVES,
CANDICE S. MILLER,
ERIC A. "RICK" CRAWFORD,
LOU BARLETTA,
BLAKE FARENTHOLD,
BOB GIBBS,
JEFF DENHAM,
REID J. RIBBLE,
SCOTT PERRY,
ROB WOODALL,
JOHN KATKO,
BRIAN BABIN,
CRESENT HARDY,
GARRET GRAVES,
PETER A. DEFazio,
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON,
JERROLD NADLER,
CORRINE BROWN,
EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS,
RICK LARSEN,
MICHAEL E. CAPUANO,
GRACE F. NAPOLITANO,
DANIEL LIPINSKI,
STEVE COHEN,
ALBIO SIREs,

As additional conferees from the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of sec. 1111 of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

MAC THORNBERRY,
LORETTA SANCHEZ,

As additional conferees from the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of secs. 1109, 1201, 1202, 3003, Division B, secs. 31101, 31201, and Division F of the House amendment and secs. 11005, 11006, 11013, 21003, 21004, subtitles B and D of title XXXIV, secs. 51101 and 51201 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

FRED UPTON,
MARKWAYNE MULLIN,
FRANK PALLONE, Jr.,

As additional conferees from the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of sec. 32202 and Division G of the House amendment and secs. 52203 and 52205 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

MAXINE WATERS,

As additional conferees from the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of secs.

1313, 24406, and 43001 of the House amendment and secs. 32502 and 35437 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

BOB GOODLATTE,
TOM MARINO,
ZOE LOFGREN,

As additional conferees from the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of secs. 1114-16, 1120, 1301, 1302, 1304, 1305, 1307, 1308, 1310-13, 1316, 1317, 10001, and 10002 of the House amendment and secs. 11024-27, 11101-13, 11116-18, 15006, 31103-05, and 73103 of the Senate amendment and modifications committed to conference:

GLENN THOMPSON,
DARIN LAHOOD,

As additional conferees from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for consideration of secs. 5106, 5223, 5504, 5505, 61003, and 61004 of the House amendment and secs. 12004, 21019, 31203, 32401, 32508, 32606, 35203, 35311, and 35312 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

JOHN L. MICA,
WILL HURD,
GERALD E. CONNOLLY,

As additional conferees from the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for consideration of secs. 3008, 3015, 4003, and title VI of the House amendment and secs. 11001, 12001, 12002, 12004, 12102, 21009, 21017, subtitle B of title XXXI, secs. 35105 and 72003 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

LAMAR SMITH,
BARBARA COMSTOCK,
DONNA F. EDWARDS,

As additional conferees from the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of secs. 31101, 31201, and 31203 of the House amendment and secs. 51101, 51201, 51203, 52101, 52103-05, 52108, 62001, and 74001 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

KEVIN BRADY,
DAVID G. REICHERT,
SANDER LEVIN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JAMES M. INHOFE,
JOHN THUNE,
ORRIN G. HATCH,
LISA MURKOWSKI,
DEB FISCHER,
JOHN BARRASSO,
JOHN CORNYN,
BARBARA BOXER,
BILL NELSON,
RICHARD J. DURBIN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 539, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 23) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 539, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 23

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units" (published at 80 Fed. Reg. 64510 (October 23, 2015)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S.J. Res. 23.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, we will debate resolutions of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act for the two EPA rules regulating greenhouse gas emissions from new and existing electric generating units.

I might say that it is appropriate that we are debating these resolutions today. As we know, the President and other leaders are meeting in France as we speak. They are speaking in generalities; they are not being detailed in their plans. Yet, in America, we are becoming aware more each day of exactly the impact the EPA's regulations are having on the American people.

I remind everyone that Congress was not a part of any of this. The White House did not talk to us about any of this. The clean energy plan comes from the White House and is being implemented by the EPA.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

Mr. MULLIN. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage Members to support these resolutions.

In 1996, Congress passed and the President signed into law an important tool for ensuring our three branches of government stay true to the vision of our Founding Fathers that was set over 200 years ago. Today, we are here to use

this tool to rein in a President who has forgotten that the legislative branch makes the laws and that the executive branch enforces them.

The final rules regarding emissions from new and existing power plants are a clear executive overreach. In issuing these rules, the EPA has acted outside the authority it was granted by Congress in the Clean Air Act.

Electricity generation has always been the responsibility of States, but with these rules the President is threatening communities, businesses, and families by attempting to put the Federal Government in charge. These rules are unworkable, and they put the reliability of our electric grid at risk.

I ask my colleagues to seriously consider the consequences of allowing such clear executive overreach to stand, and I urge them to support this resolution of disapproval.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong opposition to this resolution, and I oppose the other resolution that we will also consider this afternoon.

Once again, Republicans are attempting to stop any action by this administration to reduce carbon emissions, and, once again, the opponents of the EPA's regulations have no constructive alternative to offer that would improve the environmental performance of the electricity sector.

In fact, this week, the House of Representatives will not only consider these two unnecessary, ill-conceived resolutions, but it will also consider an energy bill that is dedicated to rolling back gains that have been made in energy efficiency, grid modernization, and renewable energy.

Mr. Speaker, governments and many of the world's largest private sector companies are gathered in Paris this week. They are putting forward innovative ideas, and they are making commitments to forge a different energy path—one that will prevent us from further overheating the Earth and causing major disruptions to people's lives, their property, and the global economy.

We know that climate change is harming us today through droughts, fires, floods, and storms, and we know that it will endanger our children's future if we don't act now.

Some of the opposition to these resolutions is based on the assertion that they will not solve the world's carbon emissions problems or ensure that we will avoid increased warming and catastrophic climate change, but that is not true. Reducing carbon pollution from the power sector through the implementation of performance standards for new power plants and improving the overall environmental performance of our grid will reduce carbon emissions here in the United States.

By making a commitment to this effort and demonstrating that reducing pollution is consistent with maintaining a reliable, resilient electricity sup-

ply, the United States exercises its leadership, giving assurance to other nations to follow our example.

This resolution and its companion will block the EPA and this administration from taking prudent steps to reduce carbon pollution from one of the highest emitting sectors, the power sector.

That is not all. The Congressional Review Act stipulates that the passage of a resolution to block a final rule also bars the Agency from issuing any rules that are substantially similar. So these resolutions prevent any future administration from developing similar rules to control carbon emissions from power plants.

The irony is that this sector already is poised to make many of the changes that are contained within these EPA rules. These changes are being driven by a combination of factors, only one of which is Federal regulation. State policies, changes in the relative price of natural gas and coal, smart grid technologies, consumer demand, and the further expansion of wind and solar generation all are factors that are reshaping the grid and redefining relationships within the electricity sector.

Instead of trying to hold back these forces, we should be helping States, local governments, consumers, grid operators, utilities, and displaced workers to make this transition easier.

Every significant effort to improve air quality through the Clean Air Act regulations has met the same tired, old arguments from the GOP—that it will cost too much, that it will jeopardize the reliability of our electricity system, that we don't have the technology to meet these new standards. Every time these dire predictions by my Republican colleagues are put forward, they have failed to materialize.

We have already had delayed action on climate change, Mr. Speaker, for too long. The EPA's rules to set greenhouse gas emissions standards for new and reconstructed generating units is an essential first step toward a more sustainable energy future. This rule sends a strong signal to the market in favor of technologies that provide improved environmental performance.

These EPA rules—this one and the one that will be mentioned later today—should move forward, and this joint resolution should be defeated. I urge a "no" vote on the resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We are taking this action today to protect the American people. The American people do not expect unelected bureaucrats, acting at the discretion and the direction of the President of the United States, to unilaterally adopt regulations that are questionably illegal.

We have 23 States that are filing lawsuits on the new coal plant rules, and we have 27 States that have already filed lawsuits on the existing electric

generating rules. I might add that, in the last 5 years, this administration has spent a total of \$77 billion on climate change.

People ask why we have not taken action. This administration has been so extreme, so aggressive—and view this as the number one priority facing mankind—that we don't have enough money to act. Also, there are 61 separate Federal programs under the Obama administration that address climate change.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS).

□ 1445

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, back in October I had the opportunity to attend the Indiana Industrial Energy Consumers annual conference in Indianapolis. There I heard from stakeholders across the energy supply chain about the serious economic and reliability issues emanating from the EPA Clean Power Plan.

For instance, John Hughes with the Electricity Consumers Resource Council presented findings showing that Indiana alone stands to lose 12,500 jobs because of these rules. This comes on top of the previous Obama administration regulations that have severely restricted my State's economic competitiveness and has dramatically increased electricity bills for Hoosiers.

In fact, Indiana's electric rates have gone from the fifth lowest in the Nation in 2003 to the twenty-sixth lowest in 2014. When these rules take effect, electricity rates in my State will continue to climb to the tune of up to 20 percent each year.

As a result, Hoosier manufacturers, who drive more than 30 percent of our economy, will be forced to shutter assembly lines and lay off employees simply to pay their utility bills.

Congress needs to think about the very real consequences of this, even if the EPA and the Obama administration are not thinking about this. The EPA Clean Power Plan means lost jobs, lost economic growth, and higher utility costs for both individuals and businesses.

That is why I strongly support both of the bills before us, which put an end to the executive overreach, protect the American ratepayer, and allow us to truly pursue an all-of-the-above energy strategy that will transform our economy and lay that strong foundation for our energy future.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, this week something historic is happening. Leaders from 195 countries are meeting in Paris to discuss a global solution to a global problem: climate change.

There is no denying it anymore. Climate change is real. Human activity is contributing to it. Without action, the results will be catastrophic.

Yet, while the nations of the world gather in agreement and concern, what are the House Republicans doing? They are rejecting science and reversing what progress we have made.

These disapproval resolutions effectively gut EPA's Clean Power Plan and carbon pollution standards for power plants. By attacking the EPA, Republicans are opening the smokestacks to release more of the dangerous emissions we know contribute to global warming. This is reckless.

Not only do these resolutions ignore the warnings of the scientific community by reversing progress, they also block the EPA from issuing any standards in the future that are substantially similar. Republicans must accept that our country is evolving.

In fact, many States are already running on an increasing amount of renewable energy, reducing energy waste, and decreasing carbon pollution. My own State of California has set a goal of 50 percent renewable energy by 2030, and others are developing their own plans to meet pollution reduction targets.

Each new goal towards a cleaner environment only encourages the investments and innovations that will help get us there. That is a benefit to our economy and our world, which is why two-thirds of Americans support a climate change pact.

It is time we listen to our constituents, to the vast majority of scientists and experts, and to the tens of thousands of world leaders, experts, and advocates who are seeking a path toward a sustainable future for our children and grandchildren.

I oppose these resolutions and these reckless attacks on our environment.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I might say that no one on our side of the aisle has denied climate change. I think we still live in a country where we all can express our views and we simply disagree with the President on the urgency of the issue. The President has even told the world that climate change is a more pressing issue to mankind than terrorism.

When we talk to people in the developing world, when we talk to people in Europe and around the globe, representatives come here and they stress to us that they are more concerned about clean water, a job, electricity, health, hygiene, issues like that, than they are about climate change.

Even in the polls here in America, only about 5 percent of the American people view climate change as one of the most pressing issues facing mankind. So that is why we have over 180 separate groups around the country that support these joint resolutions to turn back what President Obama is doing in an extreme and unprecedented way.

I would also just like to read that the Partnership for a Better Energy Future, which is a 181-member coalition,

including national as well as State and local organizations in 36 States, writes of EPA's rule for new plants, which is precisely what we are discussing today: The EPA set a regulation so strict that the only technology that meets the requirement for a coal-fired power plant, carbon capture and sequestration is not commercially available.

There is no technology available to meet the stringent emissions standard set by EPA. Yet, China, India, and every other country in the world can build a new coal plant if they decide to do so.

We are not mandating that a plant be built, but we are recognizing the increased need for electricity in America and that it must be affordable and it must be abundant. For us to compete in the global marketplace, we simply want that option, and that is what this is about.

I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S.J. Res. 23, which disapproves of the EPA's carbon standard rules for power plants.

Our country is blessed with an abundance of energy sources. Reliable, affordable, and secured energy is critical to our national security, and a diverse energy portfolio adds to our strength.

While new technologies have allowed us to tap into sustainable sources of energy, we lack the infrastructure to use that energy nationwide. Clean coal, natural gas, and nuclear produce the bulk of America's energy for a reason. They are affordable, reliable, and the most available.

The carbon capture and storage technologies mandated by this rule are not commercially viable. Make no mistake. The EPA is seeking to ban the construction of any new fossil fuel power plants and severely limit the production of the others. With its companion rule on greenhouse gases, the EPA will simultaneously force the closure of many existing power plants.

Until alternative sources of energy are affordable and available from coast to coast, we must ensure that Americans can continue to affordably light and heat their homes. Under this rule, we will be unable to achieve this.

I urge my colleagues to protect families and the economy by supporting this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just have to say, I listened to my colleague from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), who I respect a great deal. I think he is suggesting that somehow the Republicans on our committee or maybe the leadership in the House do want to address climate change.

Every time that I have tried in the committee to bring up the issue of climate change, nothing has happened. We haven't had a hearing. We haven't had a bill. We haven't had any initiative since I have been on the committee, let alone served as the ranking member, in the last year—any initia-

tive—that would address the issue of climate change.

So when my colleague from Kentucky says, "Well, we are not denying that this exists. We just don't think it is a priority," well, it is not only not a priority. It is not something we have addressed at all in any way anytime the Democrats or myself have tried to raise this issue.

To suggest that it shouldn't be a priority—and maybe that is not what he is saying, but it sounded that way—well, I come from a district where we had Hurricane Sandy that devastated our district. We have droughts in California—we were just discussing it with my California colleagues who will be speaking soon—and all kinds of weather extremes that are causing all kinds of problems—loss of jobs, destruction around the country that has to be made up for later by FEMA and other Federal agencies that come in and spend billions of dollars to try to correct these problems. To suggest that this is not a priority I think is wrong. To suggest that somehow maybe the Republicans are dealing with it is simply not the case.

Again, I know you don't particularly like the President's power plan, but at least he is trying to do something. I don't see the GOP addressing this at all.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU).

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I am Congressman TED LIEU from California. I rise in opposition to the Republican resolution opposing the Clean Power Plan.

This is just another example of the Republican majority denying the urgency and severity of carbon pollution. At a time when the entire world is meeting in Paris to address carbon pollution, you now have the Republican majority doing exactly the opposite.

Now, America is an exceptional country, the best in the world. One reason we got here is because we believe in science. We believe in facts.

So if 9 out of 10 doctors said that your child is showing the symptoms of diabetes, would you ignore that and keep feeding your child doughnuts? No. You would go seek treatment.

So listen to 9 out of 10 scientists that are saying carbon pollution is real and it is going to kill us as a species if we don't do anything about it.

If you don't want to listen to those scientists, listen to some of the most conservative companies and organizations in America. Listen to ExxonMobil today. They say carbon pollution is real, it is being caused by humankind, and they support putting a price on carbon emissions.

Listen to the U.S. military. I served in Active Duty, and I am still in the Reserves. I am very proud of our military. They take the world as it is, not as they think it should be, not as they hope it will be, but as it is. They rely on facts and science.

They are telling us carbon pollution is a national security threat and it is

going to flood our bases, it is going to cause more extreme weather events, and it is going to make it much worse for humanity if we don't do something about it.

At the end of the day, America is going to lead and the history books are going to say we led the way in saving humanity and dealing with carbon pollution or there will be no history books.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I wish President Obama took the threat of radical Islamic jihadists as seriously as he takes the pseudo science behind the manmade climate change threat.

Folks, these EPA rules affect jobs and they affect the amount of money in the pockets of moms and dads all across this great country. Now, transportation fuel costs are down for moms and dads, but the power to heat and cool their homes, the power to run the engines of the economy—the cost of that power has gone up because of the EPA regulations and rule writing that we have seen.

What does that mean? Well, wholesale electricity prices in South Carolina will spike as high as 13.9 percent. Households will pay as much as \$84.19 more a year. Industrial customers will pay as much as \$40,200 more a year just in South Carolina. It will cause 11,700 manufacturing jobs to be impacted.

Since 2012, 27 coal mining companies with core operations in West Virginia have filed for bankruptcy protection. But you know what? The TPP trade deal will allow West Virginia coal and Wyoming coal to be shipped to China to be burned. Now, where is the hypocrisy in that?

Let me tell you this: We rely on 24/7, always on, baseload power to run the engines of our society to heat and cool our homes. We can't do that with intermittent solar and wind. You can do that with nuclear, hydro, and fossil-fuel-fired power plants.

Think about the morality of 24/7 baseload power. That means the incubators in the hospitals are there to provide the incubation for the preemie children. That means that you can keep food from spoiling. That means you can heat your homes with some sort of source that doesn't cause pollution inside your home like it does, say, in Latin America or Africa, where they are burning wood or coal.

We have the ability through nuclear, hydro, and through fossil-fuel-fired power plants to provide that 24/7 baseload power. You can't do it with regulations that continue to kill the industry. You can't do it with intermittent energy sources like wind and solar. These regulations and these rules, written because of those regulations, are killing job creation in this country.

□ 1500

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Without objection, the

gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) will control the time on behalf of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAL-LONE).

There was no objection.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS). She serves as a member of the Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy. She is an outspoken voice for defending the environment and calling for our sound stewardship of the environment.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in unwavering opposition to these resolutions which deny the real effects of climate change and express opposition to our Nation's effort to address it.

These resolutions are particularly embarrassing because they come at a time when the rest of the world is coming together in Paris to identify solutions to climate change. There is overwhelming consensus around the globe that climate change is one of the most critical issues facing our world, not just for the environment, but for human health and for our local economies.

Our climate is changing. Our actions are emitting the greenhouse gasses that are contributing to this problem. Climate change is threatening public health, people's livelihoods, and the very environment that we live in.

While we should be determining a course forward to protect our constituents and safeguard our planet for generations to come, we are instead sending a signal to the rest of the world of willful negligence and disregard. Instead of arguing about whether the climate is changing, which it is, or if we are responsible, which we are, it is high time that we work together to determine solutions.

The new source carbon pollution standards and the Clean Power Plan will not solve all of the problems associated with greenhouse gasses, but it is a necessary step in the right direction. In addition to enacting meaningful change to curb emissions from the power sector, which is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in this country, these regulations also send a signal to people across America and across the world that we are working to address this broader issue.

Curbing carbon emissions from new and existing power plants in the country signifies that we are serious about working toward a cleaner, healthier future.

In addition to providing for a healthier environment for current and future generations, these regulations are important for both our public health and our business community alike. EPA's carbon regulations will lead to billions of dollars of public health benefits, potentially averting thousands of premature deaths and tens of thousands of asthma attacks in children.

The private sector has also stressed the need to take action because they understand the long-term costs and

benefits. Businesses understand the economic consequences of inaction, that they are severe, and that we need to prepare for climate change today. They know the regulations are projected to create over 300,000 new clean energy jobs.

On the central coast of California, my congressional district, we have seen firsthand how important the jobs associated with the clean energy technologies are. Renewable energy projects in my district have created hundreds of new jobs, and provide enough energy for over 100,000 homes.

Instead, here we are today, debating and voting on resolutions of disapproval that deny these facts and show again the willingness of the majority to bury its head in the sand when faced with the need for action on climate change.

Just a few months ago, we all sat in this Chamber together as the Pope spoke of our world's most pressing challenges. In that speech, he reminded us that it is our moral obligation to respond to climate change. I couldn't agree more. We must band together to enact meaningful and lasting change for our people and our planet. I urge my colleagues to oppose these resolutions.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

One of the great things about having a debate in this body is that we all get to express our different views, and the world benefits when different views can be expressed.

One of the reasons that we brought these resolutions to the House floor today is because of the climate change conference in France going on today. We want the world to know that there is disagreement with the President on this issue, not about the fact that the climate is changing, but about the priority that is being placed on it.

Why should this President penalize America and put us in jeopardy compared to other countries of the world and require us to do more than other countries of the world are doing just so that he can go to France and claim to be the world leader on climate change?

According to the Energy Information Administration, energy-related CO₂ emissions in America will remain below 2005 levels through 2040. Our CO₂ emissions today are roughly the same as they were 20 years ago. America does not have to take a backseat to anyone on addressing climate change. That is the point that we want the world to understand. We are doing a lot. We would like to help other countries do more, but why should we be penalized?

At this time, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, you have heard the facts from the gentleman from Kentucky just now. What we are dealing with here on the other side is an ideology.

Today I rise in support of the two resolutions that work to keep electricity affordable and reliable for Americans. S.J. Res. 23 and S.J. Res. 24 are a response to harmful regulations established by the EPA under the President's Clean Power Plan. The EPA's regulations implement the first-ever caps on carbon emissions, which will result in higher energy costs for American families, businesses, and consumers. Some experts have said that the Clean Power Plan could be the most expensive regulation ever imposed on Americans.

Congress must protect Americans from legacy-driven agendas that trample the rights of our citizens, hurt our economy, and hinder job growth. These two resolutions work to provide protection for existing and future American power plants and safeguard Americans from higher energy costs.

The Senate has already passed this legislation. As the people's House, it is imperative that we vote to protect Americans from these destructive regulations.

I will continue to fight against the EPA's power grab. That is why I strongly support these two pieces of legislation.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for our colleague from Kentucky. However, when he talks about being in disagreement with the President of the United States, I should point out also that he is in disagreement with 97 percent of the scientist community that professes that we need to do something tremendously strong in response to climate change.

In regard to our role in this whole arena, putting ourselves at a competitive disadvantage, one of the responsibilities that befalls the leading nation like the United States is that, in fact, we must be that inspiration that inspires the international community. We have been able to bring some 150 countries to the fold to speak to their efforts of climate change, and we have inspired efforts from major nations like that of China, Brazil, and Mexico so as to begin that process.

When I met in my office with representatives from the EU—I think there were 13 nations represented—they all wanted to know where the giant was on this issue. The world is looking to the United States for its leadership, and that is a role that we should not take lightly, and it is one that we should move forward with in bold fashion.

With that being said, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McNERNEY), who has been an outstanding voice on the Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy.

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose S.J. Res. 23 and S.J. Res. 24.

Frankly, this effort to deny climate change reminds me of the 50-plus votes we have taken to try to eliminate the Affordable Care Act.

As a global leader, we must reduce carbon emissions. To simply ignore our responsibility is misguided and will harm generations to come. We can't solve climate change by ourselves, but we must lead and be part of a larger effort.

I know that fossil fuels—and in particular, liquid fuels—will be needed in the years ahead, but we can still move toward a more efficient and sustainable energy system.

For example, I have actually had coal plants in my region shut down, shift to biomass, and become very successful while also benefiting the climate. I would also note that California is again leading the world in efforts to promote cleaner energy with a 50 percent renewable energy goal by 2050.

I represent part of the Central Valley, which has some of the worst air quality in the Nation. While this comes from a variety of sources, it impacts everyone. In an area that is already hurt economically, dirty air affects school- and workdays and disproportionately hurts children and other adults. This makes me more determined than ever to develop green energy.

This vote will again show that most or all House Republicans deny the obvious: climate change is taking place as a result of human activity. I expect that many of my Republican colleagues know and believe that climate change is real and is a long-term threat, and yet we are voting on these two resolutions today.

Lastly, one argument we hear is that the Clean Power Plan is administrative overreach and that it was never authorized by Congress. But this is exactly what the Clean Air Act does. The Supreme Court has ruled that carbon emissions can be regulated by the Clean Air Act.

I urge my colleagues to support our future, reject efforts that increase pollution, and oppose this measure.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 16½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 14½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE).

Mr. RATCLIFFE. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, every day Washington hits the American people with more regulations that hurt families, but very few will hurt these families more than President Obama's so-called Clean Power Plan because, according to the U.S. Energy Information Agency, the average electricity cost for a Texas household each year is \$1,800, which is already 26 percent higher than the national average. To put this in perspective, almost half of all Texans spend more than 15 percent of their annual

household budget on energy costs alone.

To stand up for middle-income families, we have an obligation to fight for policies that will keep energy costs down. Unfortunately, the administration's new regulations do exactly the opposite, which is why I introduced resolutions to combat these regulations immediately after they were announced and garnered the support of cosponsors from 15 different States. Americans across every corner of this country are impacted by this administration's overregulatory zeal, and we have got to do everything we can to stop it.

The facts are clear. These regulations will shut down vital power plants across the country, costing thousands of hardworking Americans their jobs, and in the process driving up electricity costs for every American. To that point, the Electric Reliability Council of Texas anticipates that these regulations will increase retail power prices in Texas by up to 16 percent; and when family budgets are already stretched so thin, they simply can't afford this increase. In developing these regulations, the Obama administration once again has ignored everyday Americans and instead doubled down on its extreme ideological agenda.

Making matters worse, the EPA itself admits that these regulations come at a cost of anywhere between \$5.1 billion and \$8.4 billion in year 2030 alone.

What are the benefits of these regulations, you may ask? In exchange for crushing American families, losing American jobs at a cost of billions and billions of dollars, what profound effect will these regulations have on our environment?

Well, the scientific experts estimate that these regulations would only reduce the global temperature by one one-hundredth of a degree Fahrenheit and reduce sea levels by a mere two-tenths of 1 millimeter. Mr. Speaker, we simply can't let the Obama administration force Americans to sacrifice so much when even the most optimistic of calculations predict that the return would be negligible at best.

I urge my colleagues to support both pieces of legislation which are so critical to stopping these regulations dead in their tracks.

□ 1515

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there is much talk of the impact the President has on this issue and that it is a one-person force driving this country in a given direction, but a memo has been brought to my attention from Cassandra Carmichael, Executive Director of the National Religious Partnership for the Environment, and the faith-based community, which incorporates several faiths, who have written very strongly about their belief that we need to move forward with climate change action.

They are disappointed in the lack of foresight and leadership reflected in these two resolutions. They make it abundantly clear that their communities are on the front lines of issues like health care, disaster relief, refugee resettlement, and development work. These are all issues that are somewhat connected in the external measurements of the fight on climate change.

They also talk about their beliefs that the Clean Power Plan is a solution that they have been advocating for over the course of many years, and that they believe that we can do this by assignment to the individual States, not imposing heavy economic pressure on some of our poorest neighborhoods, and that there is a way to be sound stewards of the environment and at the same time grow our economy.

I believe that it is a very powerful statement that should motivate all of us to think twice about our actions here, that we should move forward in a progressive fashion. They indicate God's creation is sacred and that we are called on to be responsible stewards of the gifts of creation while protecting our vulnerable neighbors. It doesn't get stronger than that.

So with that, I just think it needs to be brought into the discussion that it is not a one-person operation, a one-person show that is drawing us down this certain route of response to climate change but, rather, a large universe of support there that speaks to the wisdom of sound stewardship.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), who is a passionate voice on behalf of the environment and economic recovery.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose S.J. Res. 23 and 24, which constitute the latest salvo by my friends on the other side of the aisle attacking our Nation's commitment to cut carbon pollution and slow climate change.

Now, I do realize that some of us really don't care whether or not mankind's actions contribute to climate change. Some of us really don't care.

Some of us don't care to consider that 95 percent of scientists recognize that it is man's activities that are contributing to the astronomical rate of climate change that is occurring that has the potential to render our planet uninhabitable by human beings. You can laugh, you can smile, you can joke, but 95 percent of the scientists agree that if we continue along the same path that we are continuing along, it is the demise of humankind itself that is the end result.

Now, some say you can adapt. Well, what we should be adapting to is the reality of the fact that we can change this. We can make things better for our children. That is why 195 progressive-thinking leaders of 195 countries represented in Paris today—right now, as we speak—are working on this very profound issue that affects humankind.

And what are we here in Congress doing? We are trying to scuttle the plans that have been made by this country to try to reduce carbon pollution. We are trying to scuttle it. We are using the argument that it is too costly to the big businesses that are already making billions.

Don't you know that, regardless of the cost to the big businesses, they are going to transfer those costs on down to you and me? Well, I think the health of our babies, the health of our elderly, and our own health is something that most Americans are willing to pay for.

We have got to have leadership in this Congress. We can't allow ourselves to put our heads in the sand and let climate change just rape and pillage the world. 195 world leaders say that we can't do that. That is what they are working on now, today, and we should be supporting that effort.

Unfortunately, we are going in the wrong direction here in this particular body by trying to kill it. I don't know whether or not that is because President Obama represents this country. He has been the most mistreated President during my lifetime, certainly. I don't know whether or not it is the hatred for him that causes people to deny science. But whatever it is, let's get off of it. Let's do the right thing, and let's oppose these two resolutions.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that this is really not a debate about science today. I have said repeatedly and most people have said, yes, we agree the climate is changing, but this is a debate about the solution and about the policies being advanced by this administration. That is why for both rules you have a total of 50 States and a multitude of other entities that have filed lawsuits—because we believe it is illegal. In fact, on the existing rule, which we will discuss in the next hour, EPA changed 30 years of its legal opinions, saying that they could not regulate under 111(d) the way they intend to do it now.

So I have the greatest respect for every Member of this body, and certainly those on the Energy and Power Subcommittee and the Energy and Commerce Committee, but I think it is important that we be able to have the debate. And that is what we are doing: showing how we disagree with the President's policies and his solutions.

I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), who has been involved on this issue.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the two disapproval resolutions that the House will consider today.

Mr. Speaker, many of our bellies are still full from Thanksgiving and now we are thinking about what we are going to buy our loved ones and family for Christmas. Let me tell you what families in Texas do not want for Christmas, and that is higher energy

prices. But that is what we are going to get if EPA's proposed rules for new and existing power plants go into effect.

Many families in Texas are already living paycheck to paycheck. They are looking for ways to put a little extra aside so they can have a nice Christmas. But the EPA's rule for power plants will do more than just raise their electricity rates. Higher rates increase the cost of many other products and services that families need to buy.

During this weak economic recovery, families struggling to pay bills or still looking for good-paying jobs simply can't afford for their cost of living to go up. Folks in my district have had enough of this kind of executive overreach by the White House. They have had enough of the excessive red tape that just seems to keep on coming from Federal bureaucracies like the EPA. They know it destroys jobs and economic growth; and in this case, it also puts our national security at risk. This new red tape by the EPA will hamper American energy security, and American energy security is a critical component of American national security.

The EPA's plan is an unnecessary attempt to eliminate reliable and affordable energy. Let's help make sure our families, our veterans, and our senior citizens don't face higher energy bills. I encourage my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 23 and 24.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the policies, I believe that the many, many hearings on the many issues, in a way, provide for a doable, workable plan. But opposition to a policy or just saying "no" isn't public policy. It isn't a strong response. It isn't a substantive response. To just disagree with what is being offered here without having viable solutions, without addressing carbon emissions, without speaking to the nuances of greening up our power supplies and growing energy independence, we are failing to respond in an effective manner.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS), a very strong voice and progressive voice for the environment, who is strong in her beliefs about climate change.

Ms. TSONGAS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the misguided resolutions before the House that seek to block the Clean Power Plan and undermine United States global leadership on climate change.

Climate change is no longer an academic question for scientists to ponder. It is a very real crisis that, if left untouched, will cause irreparable harm to current and future generations.

Should the resolutions we are considering today become law, our country would be prevented from taking necessary steps to safeguard our future.

The Clean Power Plan calls for a 32 percent reduction in carbon dioxide

emissions below 2005 levels by 2030 and sets individual goals for each State in order to meet this national standard. It is a reasonable, commonsense approach that gives States the flexibility to reduce carbon pollution with strategies that work best in their State while bolstering clean energy investments and economic development.

Efforts to block the Clean Power Plan not only ignore overwhelming scientific consensus—we only have to turn on the radio today to hear it time after time, moment after moment—but they ignore the global consensus that we must take action to address climate change.

Right now, leaders from over 190 countries are gathered in Paris to outline long-term strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and stave off the worst impacts of climate change. While at the summit, President Obama personally met with other heads of state, including the leaders of China and India, to reaffirm their commitment to reducing carbon emissions.

America must be at the forefront and lead by example. We must embrace modern policies that cut emissions, increase the use of renewable energy, reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and encourage the development of innovative green technologies. If we are successful, the economic, security, and environmental benefits to our Nation will be widespread, long-lasting, and significant.

I urge my colleagues to reject these harmful resolutions. The cost of inaction on the critical generational challenge is simply unacceptable and the price of delay too high.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it raises the question once again. As I said, we have been very successful in America under the Clean Air Act. Our CO₂ emissions are as low as they were 20 years ago, and they are projected to be below 2005 levels through 2040. We are making great progress.

So why is the President committing America to being a country that cannot build a new coal-powered plant? We are not saying you should build one, but the President said he is for an all-of-the-above energy policy; yet he is prohibiting, through regulation, the building of a new coal-powered plant because the technology is not available to meet the emissions standards.

You don't think the Chinese would agree to not build a coal plant, do you? They are providing money for Pakistan to build coal plants. They are providing money for India to build coal plants. And even in Europe, with the natural gas prices from Russia so high, they are building new coal plants as they close down some gas plants.

So that is the kind of policy that we are discussing here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), who has been fo-

cused on this issue for his entire congressional career.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding the time and for his leadership.

I might add that, prior to being in Congress, I was focused on the issue for nearly 10 years as a regulator of the energy industry in North Dakota. I served nearly 10 years on the North Dakota Public Service Commission, where I regulated not only the siting of coal plants, the reclamation of coal mines, but the cost of electricity to consumers.

□ 1530

I have to address some of the comments made by the gentleman from Georgia. I am sure they were sincere. I am sure they were well-intentioned.

But to stand here, Mr. Speaker, and lecture us that we are somehow motivated by hatred for the President of the United States is so beneath the dignity of this Chamber, and I am embarrassed for him.

Let me tell you that Barack Obama has the right to his opinion, and he is entitled to have it be different than mine. He perfectly has the right to be wrong even, if he wants to be.

But he doesn't have the right to break the law because he couldn't get a law changed when he had a Democratic House and a Democratic Senate. And that is what we are here to talk about, the violation of the law, as the chairman has pointed to earlier.

I don't even want to deal with the merits of climate change or global warming. I want to deal with the solution.

We have heard today that Republicans don't have a solution. Well, let me tell you about my little rectangular spot in the middle of the North American continent, North Dakota, best known now, of course, for producing a whole bunch of oil.

But long before we produced oil, we produced coal, 30 million tons a year, as a matter of fact. Seventy-nine percent of our electricity is generated by coal. We generate coal-generated electricity for many States in our region.

But we also are one of the seven States that meet all ambient air quality standards as prescribed by the EPA. We have a grade A, perfect, year after year after year for our air by the American Lung Association. The counties that have the greatest concentration of coal-fired power plants get an A grade.

Our utilities have been investing hundreds of millions of dollars over the years in clean coal technologies and scrubbers and everything that we can do to make our environment cleaner.

We live there. We love it. No bureaucrat in Washington, D.C., is going to love the air that we breathe in North Dakota more than those of us who live in North Dakota.

We also enjoy, like other coal-producing States, some of the lowest-priced electricity in the country.

I also would like to point out that, long before it was cool, we were siting wind farms. I sited over 1,000 megawatts of wind farms when I was on the Commission. Now there are nearly 2,000 megawatts of installed wind in North Dakota.

We don't even have a mandate. We don't need to be lectured to by people who don't know a thing about where we live, a thing about our economy. We will do the right thing because it is the right thing. We will do the right thing because it is good for our families.

And, by the way, the rule that we are disapproving, the two rules we are disapproving, disproportionately hurt the poor and the middle income. Do you think it is the poor people that can afford to buy an Energy Star refrigerator at the end of the month? Is it the poor people that can afford to wrap their house in new insulation? Of course not.

We need to pass these resolutions and reject these rules.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The whole effort to make certain that we move forward with carbon emission reduction and the claims that we have dropped since 2005 levels—well, there was a drop in 2008 and 2009 because of the recession, a wind-down of activity, of less use of electricity. But then, again, we had climbed in 2012 and 2013, the last measurements on record.

So we need to be real about this effort. We know that if we do nothing we will see drops by 2040 of only 9 percent, when efforts here to make certain that we can reduce that carbon emission by 80 percent by 2050 are a strong contrast, and the goals here are laudable and noble.

I would also make mention that we have it within our power to provide for issues that, with technology, enable us to respond to these goals. We need to do that. I think we need to set the standards in a way that pronounce our stewardship as very noble for the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I again encourage us to reject these resolutions. I think they set us back. It would nullify opportunities to policy standards that would require stronger response.

We would allow for build-out that provides for additional construction, additional pollution that would accompany that opportunity that would be dangerous to our environment.

It would nullify our efforts to address carbon pollution, so that this is a dangerous thing, and I think it is why the President has indicated that, should they come to his desk, he would veto these measures, and why we are having this debate today while we should be championing the cause in a bipartisan, bicameral way to show the world that we care significantly about carbon emission reduction and that we want to stand as a world leader. That is where we should place ourselves and posit ourselves in that noble dimension.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. TONKO, who does a great job on our committee, and I certainly respect his views.

I wanted to just touch previously on and reiterate why we are here today. The Senate has already passed both of these resolutions by a vote of 52-46 of disapproval of the President's clean energy plan and his regulation relating to new coal-fired plants.

We wanted this on the floor today because we want to send a message to the climate change conference in Paris that in America there is serious disagreement with the extreme policies of this President.

I would like to just point out briefly one of the reasons why we are so upset with this particular resolution about the emission standards for new coal-fired plants if one is going to be built.

EPA went to great detail of setting an emission standard, and they based that standard on four plants. And guess what? None of the three plants in America are even in operation.

In fact, the one in Texas, it looks like it is not going to be built at all. The one in California, DOE has suspended funding for it. The one in Mississippi has already experienced a \$4.2 billion cost overrun. And it is close to an oil field for enhanced oil recovery to make it work, but it is not in operation.

The only plant that is operating, on which EPA set this emission standard, is a very small project in Canada that would not have been built without the Canadian Government funding. And it looks like it will never achieve a technical readiness level that would show it is available for commercial demonstration.

So here you have EPA taking this drastic step based on emissions of plants that really are not even in operation.

Why should America be the only country where you cannot build a new coal plant because EPA has set an emission standard that commercially and technically is not feasible?

That is what we are talking about here, just the policy, just the disagreement on the solution. I would urge our Members to support this resolution, and let's send a message to the White House and to those conferees in Paris.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, this week, world leaders are meeting in Paris to address the serious threat of climate change. Across the globe and here at home, there is broad recognition of the need to act decisively to curb the climate crisis that threatens our communities. And yet today we are considering legislation that would allow continued carbon pollution, jeopardizing public health and the environment.

The President's Clean Power Plan limits carbon pollution from new and existing power plants for the first time ever. It is a flexible, meaningful plan that will help states transition to clean energy sources and greater effi-

ciency. It was developed with extensive stakeholder outreach. And it will create jobs, reduce the toxic pollution that is a leading contributor to climate change, and protect public health.

The resolutions on the Floor today would stop this common sense plan and prohibit any similar measure. And Congressional Republicans are not offering any plan to replace it. They continue to deny the problem of climate change, even in the face of overwhelming scientific evidence and the damaging storms, increased flooding, and drought that are already impacting our communities. They are ignoring the warnings from our Department of Defense, who call climate change a threat multiplier throughout the world.

We have the opportunity to lead, to expand opportunities in 21st century energy, and to protect our environment for future generations. The world is watching. We must reject these shameful, regressive resolutions and act to prevent climate change.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 539, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 24) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units" and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 539, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 24

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units" (published at 80 Fed. Reg.

64662 (October 23, 2015)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S.J. Res. 24.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, even more sweeping than EPA's new source performance standard for power plant greenhouse gas emissions is the rule governing existing sources. And that is what S.J. Res. 24 is about, and the impact that this rule is going to have on every existing coal plant in America and the impact that it could have on the electricity rates and the impediments that it could establish for future economic growth in America.

I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON), who is vice chair of the Energy and Power Subcommittee.

Mr. OLSON. I thank the chair and my good friend from Kentucky for the time to speak on this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, today is a sad day for America when our administration harms our country without a valid reason, and yet that is exactly what President Obama's EPA has done with their clean power rules.

Without input from Congress and with only small, limited public meetings, EPA rammed through new rules to limit CO₂. These rules destroy new coal power in America.

In my home State of Texas, our grid is regulated by ERCOT, 90 percent. They say they lose 4,000 megawatts of power, at a minimum, with the early retirements of coal plants because of the Clean Power Plan. Energy costs for customers may be up by 60 percent by 2030 due to the CPP.

EPA's actions violate the words and the intent of the Clean Air Act, and that is why a majority of States have sued in Federal court to stop its implementation.

EPA's actions have Texans scratching their heads and saying, "What the heck?" Why is EPA's CPP tougher on newer coal plants than older ones?