

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

REMEMBERING WENDELL FORD

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, many have now heard the sad news that one of the giants of Kentucky politics passed away last night. Wendell Ford first came to the Senate in the 1970s, calling himself just "a dumb country boy with dirt between his toes." But over a distinguished two-decade career, this workhorse of the Senate would prove he was anything but.

I had the opportunity to watch my Senate colleague up close as he ascended to leadership in his party and established himself as a leader on issues of importance to my State. A proud Kentuckian who rose from page in the statehouse to Governor of the State, Ford shaped the history of the Commonwealth in ways few others had before him.

He never forgot the lessons about hard work he learned while milking cows or tending to chores on the family farm. This World War II veteran never backed down from a fight either.

We imagine he approached his final battle with the same spirit. Elaine and I, and I am certain I speak for the entire Senate, send our condolences to his wife Jean—Mrs. Ford, as Wendell often called her—and the rest of the Ford family at this difficult time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Senator ENZI was going to be here, so I am hoping his schedule will allow him to use his time this afternoon.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, yesterday we had an interesting debate on climate change in the Senate, and there were three separate votes. The first one I and virtually all the Republicans supported, the Whitehouse amendment No. 29, said climate change is real and not a hoax.

This is true. Climate has always changed, and I think there is an effort by those on the other side who are trying to promote the big Obama program that would cost \$479 billion and not accomplish anything in terms of setting up a new bureaucracy of trying to say we are denying that climate changes.

As I said on the floor yesterday, climate has always changed. If we go back and read history, look at archeological findings, and read the Scriptures, it has changed since the very beginning of time. We know it is real.

The hoax is that somehow there are people so arrogant who are going to go along with the President's program to say: Yes, if we spend enough money we, the human beings, can stop the climate from changing. I think people do understand that is not going to happen. So I am very happy we were able to get it out so it cannot be used in a way that would be deceptive to the public—because the climate has been changing since the beginning of time.

The hoax I have referred to since 2002 is that man is going to be in the position to change climate. That is not going to happen.

What is interesting is these votes could have taken place any time over the last year. I hope I am not divulging something someone else is going to use, but we are on pace now to have more amendments and votes on this one bill—a popular bill—than we had on amendments in the entire year last year.

We were very critical of the majority and the fact that we were not doing anything here. I would go home this last year and people would say: What did you accomplish?

Nothing. We didn't have any votes. We didn't do anything.

We had 15 votes on amendments in the entire year last year. By the end of today we will have that many votes on amendments just in 1 week. So it is very significant that we are actually getting things done.

Why did the Democrats not have a vote on the Keystone Pipeline or on climate? Because voters don't care or because people have lost interest in that. They have caught on. They know that, despite the money that has been put in this thing by Tom Steyer—we have already talked about that on this floor—that went into midterm elec-

tions, the proglobal warming votes would be seen negatively by voters.

This wasn't true back in the 1990s. At that time they had everyone scared that global warming was coming and the world was going to come to an end. There was polling by the Gallup polls, and that was the No. 1 and No. 2 concern in America. Environmental concerns are now No. 14 out of 15 in America.

So that is where it is. That is why Tom Steyer has spent, by his own admission, some \$70 million on the elections. He stated he was going to get involved in eight senatorial elections—and I say to the Presiding Officer, he knows which ones they would be—and they lost them all. But Tom Steyer is not out of money, and they are going to do what they can to try to resurrect this global warming as an issue.

So the Gallup polls—and not just the polls. The Pew Research Center said 53 percent of Americans either don't believe global warming exists or believe it is caused by natural variation. I don't have it here, but I do know there was a university that put together a poll of all of the television weather people and it came out to the same thing: It was 63 percent said either it doesn't exist or, if it does exist, it exists because of natural causes.

What do the American people care about? They are concerned about the deficit and they are concerned about jobs.

Yesterday on the floor we talked about the deficit. Under this President—not a believable figure but an accurate figure—he has increased the debt in America more than all Presidents in the history of America, from George Washington to George Bush.

So that is what people care about.

As chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, one of my top priorities in this Congress is to conduct vigorous oversight of EPA regulations and getting into President Obama's excessive regulation regime through numerous hearings. We are going to have hearings on these regulations. We actually have dates set already to have hearings so people will understand what the cost is of these regulations.

The Presiding Officer is from a rural State, as I am. I am from Oklahoma. When I talk to farmers—in fact, Tom Buchanan, president of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau, said I can use his quote: Our farmers in Oklahoma—and I suggest all throughout America—are more concerned about the EPA regulations than they are all the other problems that are out there or anything that you will see in the farm bill.

He talks about the endangered species, that they can't plow their fields anymore in certain places because there might be some kind of a bug down there. He talks about containment of fuel on their farms. He talks about the water of the United States. That bill is probably the No. 1 concern of farmers.

The western part of my State is arid. I was out in Boise City, in the panhandle, and it is one of the most arid parts of the United States. It could actually be declared a wetland if we were to pass this and allow the Federal Government to replace the States and come in and regulate water on the land.

These are the things they are concerned about.

We should look closely at this, and this is quite a breakthrough. Our friends in Australia already tried regulating their emissions. I think we all know the IPCC is the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and that bureaucracy is supposedly the scientific community. Yet we find out now—and I talked about this yesterday. All the scientists were not believers in this, but a lot did believe and Australia did believe. So they joined in a Kyoto-type treaty and started stopping their emissions. They imposed a carbon tax on the economy a few years ago, and it caused horrendous damage—\$9 billion in lost economic activity per year, and destroyed tens of thousands of jobs. It was so bad that their government recently voted to repeal the carbon tax they imposed just a couple years ago, and their economy is now better for it. In fact, it was announced just following the repeal that Australia experienced record job growth of 120,000 jobs—far more than the 10,000 to 15,000 jobs economists had expected.

We also looked closely at this because scientists are having a difficult time explaining the 15-year hiatus we have seen in temperature increases. This isn't me. The IPCC agrees with this, Nature magazine agrees with this, the Economist magazine agrees. They are reputable publications.

Reviewing the science is one thing they have to do in the EPW Committee, the committee I chair, because it is on this disputed science the EPA is building its significant greenhouse gas regulation package scheduled for this summer, which all together would be the costliest regulation in history. The component regulating CO₂ emissions from existing sources is the cause of a great concern in particular.

We heard in the President's message on Tuesday night that as proposed right now, the EPA's regulation will raise energy prices, destroy jobs, and impose billions of dollars in costs on the U.S. economy without achieving any kind of an effect.

It is interesting, and I have quoted her many times. The first EPA Administrator appointed by Barack Obama was Lisa Jackson. Lisa Jackson came before our committee many times. I always appreciated her because she would not get a message from the White House and come and repeat it in our committee.

I asked her a question: If we were to pass any of these regulations or the legislation to have cap and trade in America—which is what the President

proposed on Tuesday night—would this have the effect of reducing CO₂ emissions worldwide.

Her answer, live on TV, in our meeting was, no, it wouldn't because this isn't where the problem is. The problem is in China, the problem is in India, the problem is in Mexico.

So what we do in the United States isn't going to affect what they do. In fact, the opposite is true. Because if we control emissions to the point where our manufacturing base runs out of energy in America, where do they go? They go to places such as China. China is sitting back hoping we pass something so they can benefit from our lost jobs in America.

The Wall Street Journal on June 3 called the proposal that the President suggested on Tuesday "a huge indirect tax and wealth redistribution scheme that the EPA is imposing by fiat [that] will profoundly touch every American."

Further quoting the Wall Street Journal: "It is impossible to raise the price of carbon energy without also raising costs across the economy."

This is clearly worthy of intense congressional oversight, and that is what we intend to do. EPA has gone beyond the plain reading of the Clean Air Act in an attempt to grossly expand its authority. It is forcing States to achieve dubious emission reduction targets from a limited menu of economically damaging and legally questionable options.

One of the foremost authorities in America is Richard Lindzen of MIT. Richard Lindzen some time ago made the statement, "Controlling carbon is a bureaucrat's dream."

That is what they want to do, try to control carbon emissions.

Controlling carbon is a bureaucrat's dream. If you control carbon, you control life.

The scientific community has been divided on this. We are in a position to try to make sure this doesn't happen to America, and so we are going to be very busy on that.

I wish to also mention we have seen Europe go down the road of imposing these mandates—the cap and trade and regimes they are proposing for America and in the green energy subsidies—and we have seen where that has gotten them. Electricity prices are up to 2½ times higher than those in the United States. In Germany, in 2012, CO₂ emissions actually rose by 1.3 percent over the 2011 levels, while the U.S. emissions fell by 3.9 percent—and they were imposing these new restrictions, we were not.

As a matter of fact, things got so bad in Germany that they backed off of their disastrous renewable fuels program and now plan to build 10 new coal-fired powerplants in Germany.

Make sure we heard that, 10 new coal-fired powerplants. This is what they are trying to do away with altogether in America—as if we could run the "machine" called America without

fossil fuels and without nuclear. We can't do it.

A look closer to home: California has adopted similar carbon reduction policies, and its cap-and-trade scheme alone will increase electricity rates by 8 percent, according to the California Public Utilities Commission.

That is in California today. If we pass this, I don't have a figure as to how much that is going to increase out in California. Do we want our entire economy following the path of the State of California? It has one of the country's highest electricity rates. The rates in California are 65 percent higher than our rates in the State of Oklahoma, and it has one of the worst unemployment rates, one of the worst insolvent fiscal positions of any State, not to mention some of the worst air quality in the country.

Predictions of this rule's devastating impacts are prevalent. In Oklahoma, residential rates are projected to increase by 15 to 19 percent and industrial rates by 24 percent; that is, in the event they are successful in this program.

I notice the other side has not arrived. I ask unanimous consent to go an additional 7 minutes.

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

Mr. INHOFE. The Kansas Corporation Commission calculates that compliance with the rule as proposed would cost the State \$5 to \$15 billion, the equivalent of a 10- to 30-percent increase in electric rates. The loss of cheaper and more reliable coal units will increase the power prices by as much as 25 percent on grids that serve about a third of the Nation's population, according to the Brattle Group in Massachusetts.

Now, I have gone on and talked about how much more this would cost State by State. There isn't time to go over all of it now. But let's stop and realize the cost of this. NERA's analysis of the increased cost if we were to adopt these programs projects that the cost to comply with the EPA's plan could be a total of \$479 billion or more, with 43 States having double-digit electricity increases and 14 States potentially facing peak-year electricity price increases exceeding 20 percent.

I say this because—who is having to pay this? Everybody pays it, and they have to pay it equally. It has to be the most regressive type of increase in taxation that we could have. If you have a pilot program, with a family that is in poverty they have to spend the same amount of money for their electricity. That is a must, not a luxury. It is something they have to have. So they could easily spend half of their expendable income on electricity price increases, while wealthy people might only face a 1-percent increase of their income. That is why it is important and why we need to pay attention to it—to make sure we know the public is aware of this.

NERA also estimates that atmospheric CO₂ concentrations would be reduced by less than one-half of 1 percent—that is if they are successful in doing this—equating to reductions in global average temperatures of less than two one-hundredths of a degree. So all these things they say they might be able to accomplish, they have studied it and say it is just not true.

I have already talked about the fact that within the President's own administration, Lisa Jackson, the former head of the EPA, said even if they are successful, even if they are right about this, it is not going to reduce CO₂ emissions because this isn't where the problem is.

So this is going on right now. We have a committee that is clearly going to be working on this so the American people will be aware of what is happening. The Energy Information Administration determined that the China agreement would result in a 34-percent increase in electricity prices.

I bring this up because we heard in the President's speech on Tuesday that they were negotiating with China and some very successful negotiations took place. The Presiding Officer remembers that this was back when our Secretary of State went over and met with President Xi of China and came back and said it was a successful meeting. What came out of that negotiation? China said: Well, we will keep increasing our emissions until 2020, and then we will look at it and decide whether we want to lower it. That is not much of a negotiation, and it was not very comforting to us.

A comprehensive survey conducted by a Harvard political scientist shows that people who are worried about climate change are only willing to pay energy bills up to 5 percent higher. Whether it is global warming or climate change, the American people understand this proposal is in no way about protecting the environment or improving public health. This rule is an executive and bureaucratic power grab unlike anything this country has ever seen, and it is merely the tip of the spear in a radical war against affordable energy and fossil fuels.

At a time when domestic oil and gas prices through hydraulic fracturing continue to be one of the only bright spots in our economy, a lot of people are trying to stop this from taking place. I kind of wind up with this because I think it is important. I come from an oil State, so I have to buy it. I understand that. The process of hydraulic fracturing started in my State of Oklahoma—in Duncan, OK—in 1948. Did you know that by their own admission the EPA said there has never been a documented case of groundwater contamination since they started using hydraulic fracturing?

When the President made the statement in the State of the Union Message that the United States has dramatically increased in the last 5 years our production of oil and gas, that is

correct, but that is in spite of the President. We have enjoyed a 61-percent increase in the production of oil and gas in America in the last 5 years—61 percent. However, all of that is either on State or private land. On Federal land we have had a reduction of 6 percent. So I look at that, and I believe it when people say that if we had been able to increase production on Federal land such as we have done in the last 5 years on private land and State land, we could be totally—100 percent—dependent from any other country in developing our resources.

So I am committed to using our committee, the Environment and Public Works Committee, not only to conduct a rigorous oversight of the Obama EPA policies which are running roughshod over our economy, operating outside the scope of the law, and directly ignoring the intent of Congress but also to rein in this out-of-control agency through any and all means at our disposal.

This has been a problem. People used to say that it was just big business that wanted to reduce these regulations. That isn't true. As I mentioned before, the farmers of America—just in my State of Oklahoma—say the over-regulation of EPA is the most difficult issue they have to deal with.

With that, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Pending:

Murkowski amendment No. 2, in the nature of a substitute.

Fischer amendment No. 18 (to amendment No. 2), to provide limits on the designation of new federally protected land.

Sanders amendment No. 24 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress regarding climate change.

Vitter/Cassidy modified amendment No. 80 (to amendment No. 2), to provide for the distribution of revenues from certain areas of the Outer Continental Shelf.

Menendez/Cantwell amendment No. 72 (to amendment No. 2), to ensure private property cannot be seized through condemnation or eminent domain for the private gain of a foreign-owned business entity.

Wyden amendment No. 27 (to amendment No. 2), to amend the Internal Revenue Code

of 1986 to clarify that products derived from tar sands are crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum.

Lee amendment No. 71 (to amendment No. 2), to require a procedure for issuing permits to drill.

Murkowski (for Blunt/Inhofe) amendment No. 78 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of the Senate regarding the conditions for the President entering into bilateral or other international agreements regarding greenhouse gas emissions without proper study of any adverse economic effects, including job losses and harm to the industrial sector, and without the approval of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we are back to continue debate and voting on amendments to this bipartisan Keystone XL bill.

I will focus on two main subjects today. The first is to speak to what I think is the good progress we have made on this bill, moving us toward ultimately a final vote and final passage. I believe we probably surprised a few people yesterday by adopting an amendment on climate change that few thought would be adopted. We have now processed a total of nine amendments. Some would say, well, nine is not much, but just to put it into context, last year, the Senate held just 15 rollcall votes on amendments. That was in all of 2014. Over just a couple of days here in this new Congress, we are already at 60 percent of last year's total, and it is still January. We have eight amendments that are pending at this moment and set to be voted on today. We will work out the timing and order of those votes. My hope is that we will exceed last year's total today.

I believe our productivity has been good. I appreciate the cooperation of the ranking member on the committee. What we have been able to do with this measure is important because I think it stands in pretty stark contrast to what we have seen in recent years and, quite honestly, to the delays the Keystone XL Pipeline has faced over those years.

The second part of my comments this morning—I wish to provide a little bit of perspective about how long this cross-border permit has been pending, awaiting a final decision by the President.

Sometimes when we talk in terms of the raw numbers, some ask: What does that really mean? What does it mean to be on the 2,316th day that has passed since the company seeking to build this pipeline first filed its first permit with the State Department?

It has been more than 6 years, more than 76 months, and more than 330 weeks.

The President noted in his State of the Union Address this week that Keystone XL was just a single oil pipeline. And he is right—it is just a single oil pipeline. We have multiple pipelines that cross the border. We have hundreds of pipelines that cross the country. So it begs the question: How and why has it taken so long to get action