

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?

□ 1545

Newer is always cleaner than upgraded, retrofitted older plants. What the heck?

This is all done in the name of climate change. Climate change has happened since God created our Earth. Over 66 million years ago my home State of Texas was under water. Texas, as an ocean, is huge climate change unlikely due to human campfires set at that time.

In September 2014, a high ranking former Obama administration member, the under secretary for science at the Department of Education, Dr. Steven Koonin, wrote this in *The Wall Street Journal*: “The climate has always changed and always will.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I will quote from Dr. Koonin: “There isn’t a useful consensus at the level of detail relevant to assess human influence on climate change.”

Yet, here we are, fighting for American jobs and commonsense regulations while world leaders are in Paris making promises they can’t keep. Enough of the Band-Aids from EPA.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for S.J. Res. 24 and S.J. Res. 23 and for American jobs.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we are considering two resolutions today that are designed to prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from moving forward with critical regulations to reduce carbon emissions from existing and new power plants.

That previous resolution that was just aired in the House and now this resolution should be called exactly what they are, that being an attack on EPA’s Clean Air Act authority. These resolutions would block this administration or any future administration from taking meaningful action to curb carbon emissions from our power plants.

We have ample evidence from more than four decades’ worth of clean air regulation that shows that a strong economy and strong environmental and public health protections do indeed go hand in hand. So let’s stop promoting this false notion that we cannot improve the air we breathe while simultaneously growing our economy and, yes, creating jobs.

The EPA’s Clean Power Plan will promote public health. The EPA estimates that the Clean Power Plan will reduce carbon pollution from the power sector by 32 percent—32 percent—below 2005 levels. There will also be significant reductions in sulfur dioxide and NO_x emissions.

This is a tremendous public health victory. It will avoid thousands of premature deaths and an estimated 90,000 asthma attacks in children in 2030 alone.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the concerns of the individuals, families, and communities that may have their jobs lost or displaced due to this energy transition. We share those concerns.

I agree that these people who have dedicated their lives to providing us with reliable power deserve a lot more than a pink slip, but we do these people no favors by promising job security that the economy will no longer deliver.

Instead of working together to find ways to ease the transition for States and communities that already are challenged by the many changes that are happening in the electric utility sector, we are spending time trying to turn back the clock. It cannot be done.

EPA is a convenient scapegoat here, but the transition that is occurring is driven by much more than EPA regulations. Natural gas—its abundance and low price—is out-competing coal within the utility sector. Power plants are aging.

Even more important, the economy has changed. Many of the older plants are located in areas that once had far more demand for electricity, demand from large manufacturing plants and heavy industry. Those factories have closed or modernized, both resulting in far less electricity use.

There are new technologies. Wind and solar generation is growing, and those renewable energy sources have strong, broad-based, public support.

Other technologies that enable the electric grid to be smarter, more flexible, and more resilient are being deployed now, and more are in development. State policies to encourage energy efficiency and to diversify energy sources are also driving this transition.

As I have said before, Mr. Speaker, was the transition from wire to wireless communication a war on copper? Was the transition to the automobile a war on horses? No, of course not.

EPA’s regulations are playing some role in driving the changes we see. That is true. But the Agency is doing what Congress directed it to do on behalf of all Americans: to act in defense of public health and to act in defense of our environment.

Let’s put aside the EPA scapegoating and have a real dialogue on our changing power sector and what can be done to support those working in impacted industries. Meanwhile, we are debating these resolutions as our negotiators are in Paris working on an international climate agreement.

The bottom line is there is an overwhelming scientific consensus that climate change is happening and is primarily caused by human activity, particularly the burning of fossil fuels.

Climate change is no longer a problem for future generations. We are already feeling its effects in every corner of our Nation and across the globe, which threaten our economic and our national security.

The Clean Power Plan will play a significant role in the fight against cli-

mate change. The United States’ action alone won’t stop climate change, but action by the rest of the world without the United States’ action also will not succeed.

Other countries will have an excuse to delay action as long as the giant, the United States, does as well. This is the dynamic that has prevented us from action in the past. But now we have seen major commitments from the world’s largest developed and developing nations.

Mr. Speaker, the Clean Power Plan demonstrates United States leadership and is key to our effort to secure an ambitious and lasting international climate agreement.

We cannot fool ourselves that the Clean Power Plan, an agreement in Paris, or any one action alone will solve all of our climate crises. But these rules will deliver substantial benefits to our society, and they will move us in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject these resolutions. Let’s work together in a meaningful strategy to address the problems that are emerging from the transition in our own electricity sector while promoting a cleaner, more sustainable Nation and growing significant jobs that are not yet on the radar screen.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON). He is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S.J. Res. 24, which expresses congressional disapproval under the Congressional Review Act of the EPA’s rule on existing power plants. I also support S.J. Res. 23 that was just debated.

According to the EPA’s own cost-benefit analysis, these regulations would do very little to impact global temperatures, but these regulations will, without a doubt, be devastating for Hoosier businesses and families that rely on affordable energy. Those hurt the most will be the poor and seniors on a fixed income.

Mr. Speaker, advances in how we produce energy should be achieved through innovation, technology, and efficient business practices, not by unobtainable Federal Government mandates from the EPA.

Mr. Speaker, Indiana disapproves of the EPA’s attack on our State’s economy and our State’s jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this overreach by supporting S.J. Res. 23 and 24.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), my colleague and friend. He is the cochair of the SEEC Coalition in the House, the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition. He is an outstanding leader with SEEC, and he is an outstanding leader for his district and the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend from New York, who is the cochair of the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition and does such a superlative job.

I rise to support him in opposing this legislative effort which argues overreach, but what it is really all about is making sure that the government does not protect the public, that we live in a Darwinian world where you apparently take your chances, whether it is asthma, other respiratory illnesses, cancer, and all kinds of other ailments that can affect communities that suffer from this pollution. We, as a country, can do better. We can create jobs, not lose them.

The arguments on the other side have always been that the Clean Air Act costs jobs and raises costs, neither of which are true. We have gotten lots of experience since 1970 with the Clean Air Act. I can tell you that, in my home State of Virginia, electric costs came down. They didn't go up. Jobs got created, not lost.

I end, Mr. Speaker, by reminding us of what His Holiness Pope Francis has argued. When Pope Francis came to the White House, before he spoke to this body, he personally thanked the President for these rules in protecting clean air.

His first encyclical is on climate change, which he believes is one of the most important and imperative moral issues facing mankind today. That is what the Pope has to say about this subject. We ought to heed his words and his moral warning as we debate this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the legislation and support the amendments with respect to the Clean Air Act.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky and my neighbor across the river.

Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration's Clean Power Plan rule is a dagger aimed at the heart of the coal industry and affordable, American-made energy.

According to recent studies, the regulation will increase electric costs in my home State of Illinois by 27 percent. That is an unbearable burden on working families, seniors, and those people who are on set incomes.

On top of that, Mr. Speaker, the mining industry employs thousands of workers in southern Illinois and supports thousands more in union retirees.

I have heard here today on this floor that it doesn't affect jobs. Well, tell that to the people of my district who have watched the coal mines close and who have watched the suffering. These people don't have the opportunity to keep their children working near their own homes. They have to move away.

Mr. Speaker, if this regulation takes effect, the local coal mines that are left and coal generation plants will close down. Our priority must be affordable energy and American jobs.

For this reason, I ask, I beg, and I plead: Vote for S.J. Res. 24.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR). She is a member of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power, and that reports to the greater Committee on Energy and Commerce that we both serve. I have witnessed her straightforward thinking and her very strong, passionate response on behalf of climate change.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the gentleman from New York for his kind words and his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution that seeks to hamstring America's ability to combat carbon pollution and the impacts of the changing climate.

In Paris today, 195 nations from around the world are meeting to tackle the challenges of the changing climate. I am proud to see that America is leading this effort.

America's willingness to tackle the economic and environmental impacts of climate change is a reflection of our values. We do not cower in the face of difficult circumstances. That is the essence of the United States of America.

□ 1600

Yet that is what this Republican majority in the Congress would have us do—ignore the problem, pretend it doesn't exist, hope it goes away.

Well, we cannot do that. Scientific consensus is clear: The Earth's climate is changing, temperatures are getting warmer, and it is the greenhouse gases that are the primary drivers. Over the long term, the consequences will be very serious and the costs will be very high, indeed, unless we take action.

My neighbors back home in Florida are particularly vulnerable. Florida has more private property at risk from flooding linked to climate change than any other State, an amount that could double in the next 4 years.

Already, local governments and taxpayers are being asked to pay more for stormwater drainage, drinking water initiatives, and beach renourishment. Extreme weather events will likely cause increases in property insurance and flood insurance.

We just experienced, colleagues, one of the warmest Novembers on record in central Florida. Because of the heat, we had to run our air conditioners a lot longer than we are used to. We are used to turning them off in November, so we are paying more on our electric bills.

For my friends in agriculture, the tomato crop was harvested earlier this year because of the heat, and while the yield was comparable to past years, the size was affected. The increase in the number of days with extreme heat is sure to impact other crops in Florida's economy.

We are not alone. We are going to continue to see the impacts all across America. So we have a challenge before us. We cannot shirk our responsibility to this great country or to future generations.

We must unleash American ingenuity to reduce carbon pollution. So much is already happening. Technology today helps consumers conserve energy and save on their electric bills. Smartphones and smart meters can help you control your thermostat.

Renewable energy, such as solar and wind power, hold great promise and are growing by leaps and bounds. I have seen it at home, where local businesses like IKEA and the big beer distributorship have put solar panels on the roofs of their huge buildings to save on their electric bills.

Roughly 20,000 megawatts of solar capacity is forecasted to come on line over the next 2 years, doubling the country's existing solar capacity.

And industrial energy and heat that was once wasted is being turned into fuel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. TONKO. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

All of these efforts are creating the jobs of tomorrow in clean energy, in engineering, in energy efficiency and green building.

So, colleagues, I urge you to defeat this resolution. It is largely a symbolic vote. A "yes" vote is one to ignore the costs and consequences of the changing climate, but if it passes, it will also be another low point for this Congress, a Congress that has demonstrated time and again an inability to deal with the complicated and thorny problems that face America. I predict that many will come to regret that legacy.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully disagree with the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida who says this is a symbolic vote.

We want this vote to be held because the Senate has already adopted this resolution. We want the House to adopt this resolution while the climate change conference is going on in France so that the world will know that in America there is a disagreement about the extreme power grab that this President is initiating under his clean energy plan.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), who has been a real leader for Ohio in this issue and in the Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, and I couldn't agree with my chairman more on his comments.

I rise today in strong support of S.J. Res. 24, a joint resolution disapproving of the EPA's regulations targeting existing power plants.

If the administration allows the Clean Power Plan to move forward, countless coal and coal-related jobs across the country will be eliminated, families and small businesses will be forced to pay higher electricity prices, and grid reliability will be seriously jeopardized.

It is estimated that, to comply with the EPA's existing power plant regulations, energy sector expenditures

would increase from \$220 billion to \$292 billion, with retail electricity prices doubling in 40 States. In fact, by 2030, one study predicts Ohio's wholesale electricity prices will increase by 31.2 percent due to this regulation. The regulation will force consumers to absorb a \$64 billion cost just to replace the power plants shut down by the rule.

This resolution of disapproval sends a clear message to the President that a majority of the Senate, the House, and America do not approve of higher electricity prices and an unreliable electric grid.

At least 27 States, including Ohio, are now challenging the regulations in court. Ohio EPA Director Craig Butler is correct; it would be irresponsible for the U.S. EPA to force immediate compliance until the legal issues are resolved.

America faces real challenges. ISIS and other terrorist groups are plotting to attack us. We have a staggering national debt that our children and grandchildren will be buried under if we don't address it. We have a Tax Code and regulatory framework that are stifling and strangling innovation and job creation. And our education system isn't keeping pace with those of our rivals.

These are real problems. America's air and water have never been cleaner. For the President to continue his crusade to shut down the coal industry and all the jobs that go with it is shortsighted, foolish, and wrong.

And it won't just be the coal miners who pay for the President's policy on coal, Mr. Speaker. It will be every family and small business who end up paying more for their electricity as a result.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 24.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), a member of the Ways and Means Committee and, more important to this discussion, an outstanding, passionate voice concerning climate change and carbon emission.

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, the Republican propaganda machine is out here pushing a false choice: You either have no regulations or you have no economy. That is what it is. You have to get rid of all the regulations, or you won't have an economy.

Now, that simply is not true. The facts are piling up worldwide that we cannot continue what we are doing.

Now, on the front page of today's Washington Post is a picture of a Chinese city where you can't see a guy riding a bicycle in the street. That is true in Delhi. That is true in Beijing. It is all over the world.

And, unfortunately, climate is all over the world. We can't just have it clean in our neighborhood and have it

awful in the rest of the world. We have to think about a larger issue than our own.

I have heard the same arguments that I am hearing today when we said, "You got to stop smoking on the airplanes." Why, we heard the tobacco boys running in here saying, "Oh, this is the end of the Earth. There will be nobody smoking tobacco."

And look what has happened. The air is cleaned up on planes, it is cleaned up in restaurants, it is cleaned up on this floor because we had rules and regulations.

This is a public health problem as much as it is an economic problem. Since I got out of the military in 1968, 76,000 miners have died of black lung disease—76,000. We have appropriated in this House \$45 billion in money to those miners because of their problems.

Our ravenous appetite for fossil fuels continues to be a real problem, and it is getting worse. And yet, with all the reckless bills, the Republicans are once again turning a blind eye to these costs. "They don't mean anything. We want the mine owners to have freedom to do whatever they want and the power companies to do whatever they want. We don't want anybody to tell them you have to clean it up."

In Seattle, we have a steel plant right in the middle of town. It is run by Nucor. The Nucor Steel rebar plant is right in the middle of the city. It has been cleaned up, and you can do it.

But the coal boys and the power boys, they don't want to spend any money cleaning anything up. They don't want anybody telling them, with regulations, you have to reduce the amount of particulates in the air. So we have this problem that is going on and on and on.

Now, as industry and the industry-bought Republicans fight tooth and nail against any effort to reduce dependence on fossil fuels, they are not just condemning future generations to a world battered by increasing extreme and erratic weather patterns—we are seeing them all over the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TONKO. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. McDERMOTT. They are really betraying a generation of Americans who are already reeling from the impact of all of this. Coal miners and the communities they live in are bearing the brunt of this irresponsible action by the coal owners.

We had the same thing in Washington State with the forests. People said, "You have to keep cutting trees. Cut every tree you can see that is standing anywhere." And we said, "If you do that, you destroy the environment." So we stopped, and we helped the loggers find another way to make a living, and they are doing just fine.

Now, if we keep this up and keep resisting and keep exposing the American public, both in the mines and in the cities, to this kind of environment, we are going to pay for it.

It is like that FRAM commercial when I was a kid. The FRAM commercial was you either clean your air filter on your car now or you are going to pay me later by having to have the motor redone.

That is what this is about. We are talking about a President who says, let's put some new FRAM filters in here and see if we can't cut down the pollution and save both the people and the economy.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding and for bringing this legislation to the floor.

I rise in strong support of S.J. Res. 24.

Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about is rejecting this radical plan by President Obama's EPA that is going to actually impact every power plant in this country.

The President has a war on coal. He declared a war on coal years ago, and we are seeing the results of it. The results of it here in America are thousands of good jobs lost, thousands of middle class families that are now unemployed and trying to fight to get back in the middle class. And even more than that, Mr. Speaker, what you see is millions of people across this country paying more for electricity costs because of these regulations.

So what is President Obama's answer? It is to go to Paris and say that the biggest threat to national security is global warming. For goodness' sake, doesn't he see what is going on across the world?

We are here focusing on national security, Mr. Speaker. We are also focusing on energy security, and we are standing up against a radical regulation that is going to increase costs on the most needy in this country.

When you look at the impact, this proposal by President Obama's EPA would have a \$29-billion-per-year cost on middle class families. The people that are going to be hit the hardest are low-income families, Mr. Speaker. In Louisiana alone, nearly 1 million middle-and low-income families will be hit by this radical regulation.

At Christmas season, I think families would much rather be spending their hard-earned dollars going and buying Christmas presents for their families instead of seeing a 13-percent increase in their utility bills for a regulation that is not going to do anything to clean the air.

We are already seeing a reduction in carbon emissions because of the American innovation. When some of these European countries signed Kyoto and some of these other accords that are wrecking their economies, we didn't do it. Because we are actually doing better than them without signing an accord because we used great American innovation.

And, instead, the President wants to come behind and bring a regulation that is going to strangle small businesses, it is going to strangle families, and it is going to increase electricity costs on those that can least afford to pay it.

Again, let them keep the money in their own pockets. Let's innovate, let's create jobs in this economy, not use radical regulations to strangle our economy and our middle class. Let's pass this resolution.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), our distinguished ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, who has led a fight for carbon emission and climate change on behalf of the Democrats in the House, and that he may control that time.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1615

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague Congressman McDERMOTT pointed to this picture in today's edition of The Washington Post. This is during the daylight. It is outside. It is in China.

I have been over there about four times, and I can relate to this picture in case nobody has been over there. Anybody who has been over there knows how the environment, the air quality, and people's health are impacted by the lack of regulations that have existed over in China. They have an acute air pollution problem.

The fact is we don't have air pollution like that here in America because we have had regulations promulgated by agencies like the EPA, particularly the EPA, that have resulted in, yes, some increased costs to Americans, but the result of that cost is air quality that does not look like this.

This is worth paying for, and the people will continue to pay. We will continue to pay. I mean, life is not free. It is true, though, that, with companies making so much money these days due to the misbalance in the economy, people are being squeezed.

I hate to ask people to pay more, but I myself cannot live just based on the price that businesses have to pay to make sure that they are not polluting our environment. They should pay, and we have to pay our fair share, too.

The question is: Are we going to be able to save our planet from countries that don't have regulations?

We are going in the opposite direction here. We are talking about doing away with the EPA. Why is it that the first thing my friends on the other side of the aisle and all of their Presidential candidates talk about is getting rid of the EPA?

There is a reason for that. The reason is that they want to protect the ability of polluters to just pollute at will and to continue to make all of the money at the expense of people's health, with our paying them exorbitant amounts for the energy that they are creating.

When are we going to do something about this? If not now, then when? If it is not America that is leading, then who?

They talk about President Obama going to Paris. There are 185 nations being represented in Paris that are working on this problem, which is a profound problem not just for America, but for the world. We all live in this same ship together, and we have got to take care of it.

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

I will reiterate and make sure that everyone understands that S.J. Res. 24 does not eliminate the EPA. It refers only to the President's existing coal plant rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), who has been very involved in this issue in his career in Congress.

Mr. WOMACK. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky for his leadership on the issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S.J. Res. 24 and to echo the sentiments of my colleagues.

There is no question that we are all searching for a brighter future for generations to come. We disagree, however, on how to get there and, in this case, on the effects that our decisions could have on the environment and on the American family in the process.

Frankly, the EPA's Clean Power Plan will result in little to no environmental benefit at the expense of thousands of jobs and countless dollars and hours spent on compliance, all for the sake of an unrelenting government agency's agenda and the desired environmental legacy of this administration. It is as simple as that.

Not only will the Clean Power Plan fail to achieve the results intended, but the administration's very authority to implement it is questionable at best. The letter of the law itself denies the EPA this authority to regulate power plants under section 111(d), something specifically cited under section 112. Twenty-seven States' attorneys general, including our very own Leslie Rutledge in Arkansas, agree and have filed suit in response.

The Constitution clearly states that legislative powers are vested in the Congress. The Clean Power Plan is a clear attempt to take policymaking out of the hands of Congress. That is unacceptable. President Obama's never-ending regulatory overreach has to be stopped.

If the EPA will not halt, Congress must act to prevent this egregious power grab. This resolution will stop the EPA in its tracks and return the power to where it rightfully exists.

Maybe then we can all get back to this Nation's historic, all-of-the-above energy policy.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to leave our successors a better future, supporting the two resolutions that have been debated here on the floor today is a really good first step.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time that remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of both joint resolutions, which will block the Obama administration's so-called Clean Power Plan, a regulation, I will add, that was never authorized by Congress, that will hurt our economy, lower our standard of living, and have absolutely no impact on the climate.

Mr. Speaker, I often say the things that make America great are the things that America makes. Now, how do we do that? We do that with an affordable, dependable, reliable energy supply.

According to the Electric Reliability Council of Texas, which operates my State's electric grid, energy costs would increase protections by up to 16 percent due to this Clean Power Plan. This will have a disproportionate impact on the poor and on those on fixed incomes. Sadly, most of those folks don't even see it coming.

According to testimony we heard today, Mr. Speaker, in the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, the Clean Power Plan will reduce global temperatures by just .023 degrees Fahrenheit by the year 2100.

Furthermore, the EPA's claimed public health benefits from this regulation are due solely to reductions in air pollutants that are already regulated by the Agency under existing standards. The reduction of carbon dioxide on its own has no public health benefits.

I mentioned that the things that make America great are the way that we have a reliable, affordable power supply. I guess we could say that the EPA stands for an "energy and power assault."

Mr. Speaker, the facts are clear. This regulation will hurt our economy, and it will have none of the stated benefits the administration claims. I often say that the EPA seems to stand for "eventually paralyzing America."

We must adopt these resolutions of disapproval and hold this administration accountable for its regulatory assault on our economy and on our low-income families. That is how I see it here in America.

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

I have heard my Republican colleagues say over and over again that the President's Clean Power Plan won't have any impact on air quality and that it won't do anything to improve the environment. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The rule that we are discussing in this joint resolution and that the joint resolution would seek to disapprove establishes State-by-State targets for lowering carbon emissions. When it is implemented, the rule will reduce emissions from the power sector by 32 percent over the next 15 years as compared to emissions in 2005.

The final rule has public health and other benefits of up to \$54 billion per year by 2030, and this includes thousands of fewer premature deaths from air pollution and tens of thousands of fewer childhood asthma attacks each year—emphasizing again, thousands of fewer premature deaths from air pollution and tens of thousands of fewer childhood asthma attacks each year.

I keep hearing from my GOP colleagues about the costs. What are the costs to society of air pollution and of people suffering from asthma and of premature deaths and of hospitalizations and of all of the costs? None of these things are calculated by the Republicans in their speeches. They just assume that somehow none of this matters.

Some of my Democratic colleagues have said over and over again that this is sort of a wasted debate because we know that the President has said he is going to veto the bill and that there wouldn't be enough votes in the House or in the Senate to overcome the President's veto.

The theme that you are getting from the Republicans is somehow a clean environment and a good economy don't go together. In fact, the opposite is true.

The fact of the matter is that, ever since the Clean Air Act was implemented years ago, we have seen reductions in air pollution. We have seen people's lives saved. We have seen fewer people suffer from asthma attacks and the other consequences of pollution. At the same time, the economy has improved.

In the Statement of Administration Policy, in which the President says that he will veto this resolution, he specifically says that, since it was enacted in 1970 and amended in 1977 and 1990, each time with strong bipartisan support, the Clean Air Act has improved the Nation's air quality and has protected public health.

Over that same period of time, the economy has tripled in size while emissions of key pollutants have decreased by more than 70 percent. Forty-five years of clean air regulation have shown that a strong economy and strong environmental and public health protections go hand in hand.

I just keep hearing these negative comments from the other side of the aisle. The fact of the matter is, when

you reduce air pollution, you eliminate the consequences of people having bad health, of dying, of getting sick.

At the same time, the economy has improved because we have come up with alternatives to the awful pollution that has resulted which this Clean Power Plan is designed to thwart.

Again, I keep hearing my colleagues saying all of these things, but the fact of the matter is you can have clean air, you can have a good environment, and you can have a good economy and grow jobs. That is exactly what this rule that the President has put forward is designed to achieve.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. I thank my good friend from Kentucky for allowing me to speak.

Mr. Speaker, we are as concerned about our environment and jobs and the economy as anybody else is, and there was a point in time when we needed this. We saw those pictures of China with the red glow and where you couldn't see the bicycle rider. China has got a problem, and they need to address that.

We have addressed that in this country, but it gets to a point at which you cross a line and you can't squeeze any more out of the rock. Back 40 years ago the mercury coming out of the smokestacks of the coal-fired power plants was about 50 pounds of mercury a year. Now it is less than 2 pounds of mercury a year. So how much more can you increase that?

Mr. Speaker, this administration has proven that it is no friend to the hard-working American families across our country or to the power-producing companies that supply power to all Americans.

Instead, this administration is placing added requirements on our Nation's energy producers, requirements that will increase costs to all Americans, affecting those most who can least afford it. It will increase costs, it will decrease the grid's reliability, and it will jeopardize our national security.

As we speak, nations across the world are meeting in Paris to discuss further restrictions on energy producers. As Americans, we do not bow to foreign pressure or influence. America needs to do what is best for America, especially when it is a foreign country that is putting out more than 50 percent of the carbon emitted into the atmosphere.

Instead of limiting our energy production, which, again, hits hard-working Americans especially at the lower economic scales, why don't we use all of the resources that America has been blessed with and take a commonsense approach in making our economy stronger and more competitive rather than in crippling it?

□ 1630

The issue is near and dear to my heart as a Member from Florida who

represents five co-ops in my district, and it is what we see.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. YOHO. The EPA's own report says that their new emissions standards will not reduce the CO₂ emissions or improve air quality or human health, but they are going ahead with it anyway to the detriment of American manufacturing jobs and costs to the American taxpayers.

I stand in strong support of S.J. Res. 24.

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

Again, I listened to the previous speaker. House Republicans keep telling us that greenhouse gas emissions are falling in the United States. The previous speaker suggested that the United States doesn't need to do much more about climate change. That couldn't be more wrong.

U.S. greenhouse gas emissions did fall in 2008 and 2009 during the economic recession. Since that time, our overall emissions have grown. Cumulatively, U.S. emissions grew, not fell, in 2012 and 2013, the two most recent years for which data is available.

What matters really is whether U.S. emissions are on track to decline in the future by the amount needed to prevent dangerous climate change. Scientists say we need to reduce carbon pollution by 80 percent by 2050 to avoid catastrophic climate change. The EPA already predicts that, without any new policies to control carbon pollution, policies like the Clean Power Plan, the U.S. will only see a 2 percent drop in CO₂ emissions by 2040 compared to 2005 levels.

So this data highlights the importance of the Clean Power Plan and the Obama administration's overall push to cut greenhouse gas emissions. To suggest the United States doesn't need to do any more, that is just not the case. We need to do a lot more, and that is what the Clean Power Plan is designed to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S.J. Res. 23 and 24, resolutions that would protect my constituents from egregious EPA overreach. This burdensome regulation is projected to raise electric rates in Florida annually between 11 and 15 percent for over 10 years while providing virtually no environmental benefits.

The regulations for existing power plants, commonly called the Clean Power Plan, could have disastrous consequences for the safety, affordability, and reliability of my constituents' electricity. In my district, there are over 200,000 residents who get their

electricity from rural electric cooperatives, utilities formed during the Great Depression to serve rural, traditionally underserved areas with electricity.

If the Clean Power Plan continues without serious alterations, it has the potential to negatively affect these underserved areas the most. The Clean Power Plan could close down power plants in rural areas that provide jobs and economic activity.

In Florida, the Seminole Electric Cooperative operates two power plants whose baseload generating units do not meet the emission rate requirements. Their Seminole generating station employs over 300 individuals. If the EPA forces the plant to close prematurely, these jobs are at risk, and rural electric cooperative members, like my constituents, will still have to pay for the closed plant in their rates through 2042 while also paying for a new electricity source.

The Congressional Review Act was created for a reason: to give this body the authority to check the executive branch when it oversteps its bounds and enacts policy against the will of the people.

I urge my colleagues to support these resolutions, both of them, to protect my constituents from needless rate increases and to protect the powers of this institution.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. May I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S.J. Res. 24, which expresses Congress' disapproval of the EPA's carbon emission rule for existing power plants. The administration's unprecedented rule would inhibit our ability to produce affordable and reliable electricity.

A robust energy supply is essential to national security, public health, and the economy, yet the administration continues to wage war on the source of 85 percent of America's energy. Until our energy infrastructure can support widespread use of alternate energy sources, we cannot arbitrarily force the closure of plants that are keeping lights on for millions of Americans.

Implementing this rule would result in the loss of over 125,000 jobs, as well as significantly higher electric bills in 48 States. Forty of these States would see double-digit electricity price increases.

Our Nation is still in a period of economic recovery. Low- and middle-income American families already spend 17 percent of their household budget on electric bills. These families cannot afford to have another costly mandate forced upon them.

Our economy cannot recover, much less compete on a global level, with

this many jobs lost. This resolution would prevent this rule from having any effect and would prohibit the EPA from reissuing this rule in a similar form.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill so we can assure Americans are not disadvantaged by another costly regulation.

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

In closing, I just want to comment on two issues that keep coming up on the Republican side. One is this notion, which I think the GOP Whip SCALISE talked about, of the President's war on coal. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I agree that the transition away from coal is contributing to job losses in the coal industry, but setting aside these rules will not alter this trend. There are too many other changes occurring in the power sector that are impacting these workers.

Technologies—including distributed generation, smart grid, energy storage, energy efficiency, microgrids, and combined heat and power systems—are maturing and being incorporated at a faster pace. In some areas, they call into question the old grid model that was dominated by large, centralized generation.

Concern for these displaced energy workers should be motivating us to do something to help these people and their communities to transition to other good-paying jobs in new industries. Setting aside this rule is not going to replace the job security that they had in the past.

Instead of wasting time trying to hold back progress and ignore climate change, we should be working together to address this challenge. This rule moves us forward, and it represents our Nation's commitment to addressing a serious global problem that we helped to create.

I constantly hear this about job losses. The fact is that job losses are occurring regardless of anything that the Clean Power Plan would do. Instead of saying job losses, the Republicans should be thinking about ways of trying to help these workers.

The other thing I would mention is I kept hearing from the other side this whole notion that electricity rates, prices, and bills are going to go up.

I include in the RECORD a letter from Public Citizen and a number of other consumers groups.

PUBLIC CITIZEN—CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY—CITIZENS ACTION COALITION—CITIZENS COALITION—CONSUMERS UNION—ENERGY COORDINATING AGENCY OF PHILADELPHIA—FRIENDSHIP FOUNDATION—GREENLINING INSTITUTE—LOW-INCOME ENERGY AFFORDABILITY NETWORK—NATIONAL CONSUMER LAW CENTER—NW ENERGY COALITION—NUCLEAR INFORMATION AND RESOURCE SERVICE—OHIO PARTNERS FOR AFFORDABLE ENERGY—PUBLIC UTILITY LAW PROJECT OF NEW YORK—TURN THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK—VERMONT ENERGY INVESTMENT CORPORATION—VIRGINIA CITIZENS CONSUMER COUNCIL—WA STATE COMMUNITY ACTION PARTNERSHIP—A WORLD INSTITUTE FOR A SUSTAINABLE HUMANITY (A W.I.S.H.).

November 24, 2015.

RE: Consumer Groups Oppose S.J. Res. 23 and S.J. Res. 24.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We urge you to oppose S.J. Res. 23 and S.J. Res. 24. These resolutions would effectively repeal the EPA Clean Power Plan, which curbs carbon pollution from power plants. Opponents of the Clean Power Plan often argue that they are protecting consumers, but they are mistaken. The Clean Power Plan is good for consumers because it will mitigate climate change and can lower household electricity costs.

The Clean Power Plan will benefit consumers. Climate change poses a severe threat to American consumers and in particular to vulnerable populations. A few of the most salient risks include: higher taxes and market prices to cover the costs of widespread damage to property and infrastructure from extreme weather; diminished quality and higher prices for food and water, heightening food insecurity for America's most vulnerable populations; and increased illness and disease from extreme heat events, reduced air quality, increased food-borne, water-borne, and insect-borne pathogens.

By curbing carbon pollution, the Clean Power Plan will benefit consumers by mitigating these harms.

The Clean Power Plan should lower consumer electricity bills. The Clean Power Plan is likely to lower consumer costs, not raise them, because it will spur improvements in energy efficiency. Although electricity prices may rise modestly under the Plan, consumers will use less electricity. This should result in lower bills overall. The EPA projects that the rule will lower consumer bills by 7.0 to 7.7 percent by 2030. A Public Citizen analysis of the proposed rule found that the EPA's projection of bill reductions was conservative because it overestimated the cost of efficiency programs and underestimated how much progress the states can make on efficiency. These points remain valid with respect to the final rule, for which the EPA's analysis is similar. Consumer costs are likely to decline by more than the agency projects.

We strongly encourage members to support the Clean Power Plan and to oppose the resolutions disapproving it. Thank you for considering our views, and please feel free to contact David Arkush for further information at darkush@citizen.org or (202) 454-5132.

Sincerely,

David Arkush, Managing Director; Public Citizen's Climate Program; Dmitri Belser, Executive Director; Center for Accessible Technology; Kerwin Olson, Executive Director; Citizens Action Coalition; Joseph Patrick Meissner, Legal Counsel; Citizens Coalition; Friendship

Foundation; Shannon Baker-Branstetter, Policy Counsel, Energy and Environment; Consumers Union; Liz Robinson, Executive Director; Energy Coordinating Agency of Philadelphia; Stephanie Chen, Energy and Telecommunications Policy Director; The Greenlining Institute; Elliott Jacobson, Chair; Low-Income Energy Affordability Network; Charlie Harak, Attorney; National Consumer Law Center, on behalf of its low-income clients; Michael Mariotte, President; Nuclear Information and Resource Service; Wendy Gerlitz, Policy Director; NW Energy Coalition; David C. Rinebolt, Executive Director and Counsel; Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy; Richard A. Berkley, Esq., Executive Director; Public Utility Law Project of New York; Mark W. Toney, Ph.D., Executive Director; TURN—The Utility Reform Network; Beth Sachs, Founder; Vermont Energy Investment Corporation; Irene E. Leech, President; Virginia Citizens Consumer Council; Merritt Mount, Executive Director; WA State Community Action Partnership; Michael Karp, President & CEO; A World Institute for a Sustainable Humanity (A W.I.S.H).

Mr. PALLONE. I would like to just read some sections from the letter. The letter is from Public Citizen and a number of other consumers groups.

They say in the letter that “the Clean Power Plan will benefit consumers. Climate change poses a severe threat to American consumers and in particular to vulnerable populations . . . The Clean Power Plan should lower consumer electricity bills. The Clean Power Plan is likely to lower consumer costs, not raise them, because it will spur improvements in energy efficiency. Although electricity prices may rise modestly under the Plan, consumers will use less electricity. This should result in lower bills overall. The EPA projects that the rule will lower consumer bills by 7.0 to 7.7 percent by 2030. A Public Citizen analysis of the proposed rule found that the EPA’s projection of bill reductions was conservative because it overestimated the cost of efficiency programs and underestimated how much progress the states can make on efficiency. These points remain valid with respect to the final rule, for which the EPA’s analysis is similar. Consumers costs are likely to decline by more than the agency projects.”

Again, we keep hearing from the other side of the aisle, oh, electricity bills are going to go up. They are not. They are going to go down. We keep hearing we are going to lose jobs. Well, a lot of those jobs are going to be lost anyway because of the change in the types of generation of electricity. We should be thinking of ways to try to deal with that rather than saying that somehow we are going to stop it, because we are not going to be able to.

I also want to say that I heard the national security argument. We had, in the Energy and Commerce Committee, a minority hearing a couple of months ago at Annapolis. One of the reasons we went there is we know that our

military is seriously concerned about the impacts of climate change and sea level rise. When we were there, the superintendent of the Naval Academy was talking about hundreds of millions of dollars that were being spent just at Annapolis to deal with sea level rise at the academy and went on to talk about the impact of climate change on naval operations and so many other things.

Again, I don’t want to emphasize the impact on our national security, but it is there. To suggest that somehow there is no impact is simply not true. Climate change is very much in the minds of the admirals and the generals at the Pentagon. They are very worried about the impact and what it is going to mean in terms of our national security and what we have to do to address those concerns over the next few years.

The main thing I wanted to stress, Mr. Speaker, if I could, is that this rule that the Republicans are trying to get rid of provides States with a lot of flexibility to find the best path forward to meet their emission reduction goals. In fact, many States are already implementing policies that are consistent with these regulations.

The fact of the matter is that the EPA spent several years talking to States, talking to stakeholders, and talking to consumers. They have not put together some kind of straight-jacket here that says that the States have to implement these reductions in carbon emissions in a certain way. They are giving States a tremendous amount of flexibility. They had a lot of public hearings. They had millions of people who commented on the rule.

Somehow, when you listen to my colleagues here today, they suggest that this rule came out of nowhere without considering all of the economic impacts, without considering the costs. None of that is true. In fact, there were a lot of discussions about the costs and about the economic impact.

The bottom line is that there is every reason to believe that this rule will improve the public health, will improve the lives of Americans in terms of the negative impact that air pollution has on their health, and, in the long run, will improve the economy and lower costs for the consumer.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I certainly want to thank Mr. PALLONE and the great job he does as ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee. I am delighted that we have the opportunity to come to the House floor to debate things like S.J. Res. 24.

The Congressional Review Act is an instrument that is available to Congress to try to stop the President when we believe that the President has exceeded his legal authority, and that is precisely why we are here today on S.J. Res. 23 as well as S.J. Res. 24. We believe the President has exceeded his legal authority.

Now, the President in 2013 went to Georgetown University and gave a speech on climate change, and he set out his clean energy plan. I might say that he never consulted with Congress. He never talked to Congress. He never asked for any input from Congress on this issue. That is his prerogative. But the EPA took him at his word, and then they started the process of adopting these final regulations.

□ 1645

We have already talked about the regulation relating to new coal power plants so that America finds itself to be one of the only countries in the world today where you cannot build a new plant.

But right now we are talking about the regulation on existing plants. The reason we have such concern about it is that, first of all, EPA’s own legal team, their lawyers, reversed 20 years of legal opinion when they said that they could regulate under 111(d) of the Clean Air Act. Prior to that, they had always made the decision that, on this type of scale, they could not do it under 111(d).

I might also add that Professor Larry Tribe of Harvard Law School, who taught Barack Obama while Barack Obama was a student at Harvard, came to Congress and testified on this clean energy plan that, in his view, it was like tearing up the Constitution. In other words, the President exceeded his legal authority. In other words, it was a power grab.

Now, some people say, well, the end justifies the means. There are a lot of people who feel that way. But we are still a nation of laws. We believe—and not only we believe—every time the EPA has testified about this existing coal plant rule, they have stressed how they have met with the States, they give the States maximum flexibility to try to address this regulation. If that is the case, why have 27 States already filed lawsuits against the EPA and a multitude of other entities as well?

This is even a violation of the Federal Power Act because States, generally speaking, have jurisdiction over electric generation and intrastate distribution. But under this regulation of existing coal plants, EPA will have that authority.

Guess what. Normally, when EPA has a major rule like this, they will give the States 3 years to come up with their State implementation plan. But, in this instance, the rule came out and was finalized in September or October of this year. The States have until September, basically 1 year, to come up with a State implementation plan.

They wanted to finalize this rule so that the President could go and tell the world leaders in France that America was doing more than anyone else, and we already were doing more than anyone else.

With all due great respect to everyone, whether you agree with our position or not, we have the right to express that view. We decided explicitly

to bring these resolutions to the floor as the climate change conference is taking place in Paris because we want the world to know that there are differences of opinion between the Congress and the President on this issue and on his clean energy plan.

I would respectfully ask every Member of Congress to vote for this resolution. As we said earlier, the U.S. Senate has already passed both of these resolutions because they are concerned about the President exceeding his legal authority, his power grab, his extreme plan. Even Democrats in the Senate supported these resolutions.

That is all we are trying to do today. We are not debating climate change. We are not debating the science of climate change. But we are debating the President's view on the way you address it and the fact that he is jeopardizing America because he is making us jump through more severe obstacles and hoops than any other country is being asked to do. That is why we are here today.

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

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 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 passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. PALLONE. 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, this 15-minute vote on the passage of S.J. Res. 24 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of S.J. Res. 23.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 180, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 650]
YEAS—242

Abraham	Brooks (IN)	Culberson
Aderholt	Buchanan	Curbelo (FL)
Allen	Buck	Davis, Rodney
Amash	Bucshon	Denham
Amodei	Burgess	Dent
Ashford	Byrne	DeSantis
Babin	Calvert	DesJarlais
Barletta	Carter (GA)	Diaz-Balart
Barr	Carter (TX)	Donovan
Barton	Chabot	Duffy
Benishek	Chaffetz	Duncan (SC)
Bilirakis	Clawson (FL)	Duncan (TN)
Bishop (GA)	Coffman	Ellmers (NC)
Bishop (MI)	Cole	Emmer (MN)
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Farenthold
Black	Collins (NY)	Fincher
Blackburn	Comstock	Fitzpatrick
Blum	Conaway	Fleischmann
Bost	Cook	Fleming
Boustany	Costello (PA)	Flores
Brady (TX)	Cramer	Forbes
Brat	Crawford	Fortenberry
Bridenstine	Crenshaw	Fox
Brooks (AL)	Cuellar	Franks (AZ)

Frelinghuysen	Love
Garrett	Lucas
Gibbs	Luetkemeyer
Gibson	Lummis
Gohmert	MacArthur
Goodlatte	Marchant
Gosar	Marino
Gowdy	Massie
Granger	McCarthy
Graves (LA)	McCaul
Graves (MO)	McClintock
Griffith	McHenry
Grothman	McKinley
Guinta	McMorris
Guthrie	Rodgers
Hardy	McSally
Harper	Meadows
Harris	Meehan
Hartzler	Messer
Heck (NV)	Mica
Hensarling	Miller (FL)
Hice, Jody B.	Miller (MI)
Hill	Moolenaar
Holding	Mooney (WV)
Hudson	Mullin
Huelskamp	Mulvaney
Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)
Hultgren	Neugebauer
Hunter	Newhouse
Hurd (TX)	Noem
Hurt (VA)	Nugent
Issa	Nunes
Jenkins (KS)	Olson
Jenkins (WV)	Palazzo
Johnson (OH)	Palmer
Johnson, Sam	Paulsen
Jolly	Pearce
Jones	Perry
Jordan	Peterson
Joyce	Pittenger
Katko	Pitts
Kelly (MS)	Poe (TX)
Kelly (PA)	Poliquin
King (IA)	Pompeo
King (NY)	Posey
Kinzinger (IL)	Price, Tom
Kline	Ratcliffe
Knight	Reed
Labrador	Reichert
LaHood	Renacci
LaMalfa	Ribble
Lamborn	Rice (SC)
Lance	Rigell
Latta	Roby
LoBiondo	Roe (TN)
Long	Rogers (AL)
Loudermilk	Rogers (KY)

NAYS—180

Adams	Davis, Danny
Aguilar	DeFazio
Bass	DeGette
Beatty	Delaney
Becerra	DeLauro
Bera	DelBene
Beyer	DeSaulnier
Blumenauer	Deutch
Bonamici	Dingell
Boyle, Brendan	Doggett
F.	Dold
Brady (PA)	Doyle, Michael
Brown (FL)	F.
Brownley (CA)	Duckworth
Bustos	Edwards
Butterfield	Ellison
Capps	Engel
Capuano	Eshoo
Cardenas	Esty
Carney	Farr
Carson (IN)	Fattah
Cartwright	Foster
Castor (FL)	Frankel (FL)
Castro (TX)	Fudge
Chu, Judy	Gabbard
Ciциlline	Gallo
Clark (MA)	Garamendi
Clarke (NY)	Graham
Clay	Grayson
Cleaver	Green, Al
Clyburn	Green, Gene
Cohen	Grijalva
Connolly	Gutiérrez
Conyers	Hahn
Cooper	Hanna
Costa	Hastings
Courtney	Heck (WA)
Crowley	Higgins
Cummings	Himes
Davis (CA)	Hinojosa

Rohrabacher	McGovern
Rokita	McNerney
Rooney (FL)	Meeks
Ros-Lehtinen	Meng
Roskam	Moore
Ross	Moulton
Rothfus	Murphy (FL)
Rouzer	Nadler
Royce	Napolitano
Russell	Neal
Salmon	Nolan
Sanford	Norcross
Scalise	O'Rourke
Schweikert	Pallone
Scott, Austin	Pascrell
Sensenbrenner	Payne
Sessions	Pelosi
Shimkus	Perlmutter
Shuster	Peters
Simpson	Pingree
Smith (MO)	Pocan
Smith (NE)	Polis
Smith (NJ)	Price (NC)
Smith (TX)	
Stefanik	
Stivers	
Thompson (PA)	
Thornberry	
Tiberi	
Tipton	
Trott	
Turner	
Upton	
Valadao	
Wagner	
Walberg	
Walden	
Walker	
Walorski	
Walters, Mimi	
Pitts	
Weber (TX)	
Webster (FL)	
Wenstrup	
Westerman	
Westmoreland	
Whitfield	
Wilson (SC)	
Wittman	
Womack	
Woodall	
Yoder	
Yoho	
Young (AK)	
Young (IA)	
Young (IN)	
Zeldin	
Zinke	

Quigley	Takano
Rangel	Thompson (CA)
Rice (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Richmond	Titus
Roybal-Allard	Tonko
Ruiz	Torres
Ryan (OH)	Tsongas
Sánchez, Linda	Van Hollen
T.	Vargas
Sanchez, Loretta	Veasey
Sarbanes	Vela
Schakowsky	Velázquez
Schiff	Visclosky
Schrader	Walz
Scott (VA)	Wasserman
Scott, David	Schultz
Serrano	Waters, Maxine
Sherman	Sinema
Peters	Sires
Pingree	Smith (WA)
Pocan	Speier
Polis	Swalwell (CA)
Price (NC)	

NOT VOTING—11

Graves (GA)	Rush	Stutzman
Herrera Beutler	Sewell (AL)	Takai
Kirkpatrick	Slaughter	Williams
Ruppersberger	Stewart	

□ 1716

Mr. HANNA changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MEEHAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of 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", on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 188, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 651]
YEAS—235

Abraham	Bost	Coffman
Aderholt	Boustany	Cole
Allen	Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)
Amash	Brat	Collins (NY)
Amodei	Bridenstine	Comstock
Ashford	Brooks (AL)	Conaway
Babin	Brooks (IN)	Cook
Barletta	Buchanan	Crawford
Barr	Buck	Crenshaw
Barton	Bucshon	Cuellar
Benishek	Burgess	Culberson
Bilirakis	Byrne	Davis, Rodney
Bishop (GA)	Calvert	Denham
Bishop (MI)	Carter (GA)	Dent
Bishop (UT)	Carter (TX)	DeSantis
Black	Chabot	DesJarlais
Blackburn	Chaffetz	Diaz-Balart
Blum	Clawson (FL)	Donovan