



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 12, 2016

No. 112

## Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Father in Heaven, may Your Name be honored. Today, lead our Senators along the road of humility so that You can exalt them in due time. May they have the wisdom to reap the bountiful harvest that comes from planting the seeds of lowliness and reverential awe.

Lord, make them wise and strong as they face national challenges that threaten our freedom. Guide them, strong Deliverer, for they are pilgrims in time who are headed for eternity. Continue in everything to work for the good of those who love You, who are the called according to Your purposes. Keep us, O God, so dedicated to You and Your purposes that we may do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with You.

We pray in Your majestic Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The majority leader is recognized.

### TRAGEDY IN DALLAS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today the city of Dallas will hold a me-

morial service in honor of the five police officers slain in the senseless shooting during last week's peaceful protest. The victims are individuals who, like law enforcement officials in each of our communities, willingly put their lives on the line every day to keep us safe. Their loss is a tragic reminder of the courage and selflessness they possessed, just as it is a reminder of the burdens their family bear on our behalf. Today we remember each of them.

I know I speak for the entire Senate in saying our hearts are with the families and friends of each of these victims, the others wounded, the entire law enforcement community, and the city of Dallas.

Our Nation experienced a great deal of suffering and heartbreak last week. We must come together now to overcome these tragedies and allow healing to prevail.

### CARA AND MILCON-VA AND ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING LEGISLATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Now, Mr. President, let me speak on an entirely different matter.

Angie was "a beautiful girl with a heart of gold and a smile that would light up a room" before her life was changed by heroin. Angie described her addiction to her mother, saying: "Mom, I need this drug like I need air to breathe." It would take Angie experiencing an overdose and her mom begging her to quit before she agreed to seek treatment. Unfortunately, though, like so many addicts, Angie left the treatment facility and started using again. She told her mother: "I'm in a black hole and I can't get out." Angie would end up dying from an overdose, her body dumped callously at the bottom of a muddy creek by her drug dealer.

Tragically, Angie's story is just one glimpse into the widespread prescription opioid and heroin epidemic sweep-

ing our country. In fact, drug overdoses now claim 129 lives a day in America. The families of these victims know more must be done to prevent others from enduring the pain of drug addiction and overdose.

Antidrug groups and law enforcement officials also know more must be done to prevent the widespread loss communities have experienced at the hands of this crisis. That is why nearly 250 antidrug and law enforcement groups across the country have voiced their support for the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act conference report.

Just last week, these groups collectively sent a letter urging passage of this legislation, which they called a "truly comprehensive response to the opioid epidemic" that represents "the critical response we need." These groups represent States from coast to coast, from Lifehouse Recovery Connection in California to Justice and Recovery Advocates in Maryland, to Friends of Recovery in New York, among dozens and dozens of others. They have seen the crisis firsthand, and they know the positive impact this bipartisan comprehensive response can have.

Here is what I mean. The National Association of Counties and the National League of Cities have asked Congress to "act quickly" and pass the CARA conference report. They call it "a pivotal step towards stemming the tide of this epidemic."

The Addiction Policy Forum has warned Congress "not [to] play politics" by blocking passage of this CARA conference report. They call it "a monumental step forward—a tipping point to better addressing the paralyzing opioid epidemic."

The Faces and Voices of Recovery has urged support too. They call it "the most expansive Federal, bipartisan legislation to date for addiction support services," and they say it can "help save the lives of countless people."

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4953

The Fraternal Order of Police has asked Congress “to adopt the conference report” on behalf of its more than 330,000 members. They call it another “tool to reduce the deaths from this epidemic.”

So we are just one step away from sending this legislation to the President's desk. The House overwhelmingly passed it by a vote of 407 to 5. With continued cooperation, the Senate can send it to the President this week.

Remember, this Senate has provided more than twice as much funding for opioid-related issues as under the previous Senate majority. Let me say that again. This Senate has provided more than twice as much funding for opioid-related issues as under the previous Senate majority. The passage of CARA would represent another crucial step toward combating this crisis.

Of course, this wouldn't have been possible without the unwavering commitment of Members like Senator PORTMAN, Senator AYOTTE, Senator GRASSLEY, and Senator ALEXANDER to move this bill forward. From raising awareness about this crisis to serving as voices for the voiceless and working across the aisle to develop this comprehensive legislative response, these Senators were resolute in their support. In no small part, because of their efforts to drive this bill forward, communities will be better equipped to prevent heroin and prescription opioid abuse in the first place, just as they will be better equipped to save lives and foster treatment and recovery.

I also want to recognize the work of Democratic Members like Senator WHITEHOUSE and Senator KLOBUCHAR for their efforts to help garner support for this bill and move it through the legislative process. There is no reason every Senator shouldn't support it now. The sooner we send this bill to the President's desk, the sooner we can help our communities begin to heal from the prescription opioid and heroin crisis.

Another way to do that is by passing the conference report that would fight Zika and enact record levels of funding for veterans' medical services, including millions for substance abuse and treatment. Democrats are clearly very nervous about their decision to attack women's health and veterans with the filibuster of the anti-Zika funding bill. Who can blame them? They put forth a variety of tortured excuses that don't stand up to scrutiny. They have offered a proposal they hoped would provide political cover by ditching funding for our Nation's veterans. That is clearly not a solution.

I don't know how Democrats plan to explain any of this to veterans this summer. I certainly don't know how Democrats plan to explain this to pregnant mothers. Either Democrats believe Zika is a crisis that requires immediate action or they do not. Republicans believe we ought to pass this bill now because this is a crisis. Our friends across the aisle will have to decide if

they feel the same or if a partisan political group is worth delaying funding to protect families from Zika or funding our veterans.

There is only one option to get anti-Zika funding on the President's desk before September; that is, passing the compromise Zika control and veterans funding legislation that is before us and sending it down to the President for signature.

The rules don't allow for a conference report to be amended, and repassing the same bill that went to conference will not put a bill on the President's desk, it will not create a vaccine, it will not kill a single mosquito, and it will not help a single pregnant mother. So let's do the right thing for our Nation and pass the legislation that is before us.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### CARA AND MILCON-VA AND ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING LEGISLATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the tortured explanation from my friend the Republican leader this morning about two important issues—opioids and Zika—is an indication of why the Republicans will no longer have the majority come election day. That is very clear. You can't go on doing what they are doing and expect people to support you.

In the morning, we are going to vote on opioid legislation. It is important we do that. Everyone in this Chamber knows we have to do something to stop this epidemic. It has claimed the lives of too many Americans, and it is doing it every day. Our CARA conference report is a start, but it is a missed opportunity to do something really substantive to stem the number of opioid overdoses across the country, and the reason for that is Republicans refused to allocate money for this legislation.

To have my friend talk about we have done twice as much as we did under the previous majority—why wasn't anything done before? Because it was filibustered. We couldn't do it. There is not enough money to do all the authorizing we have done for these programs. There is not enough money.

In conference, Republicans again rejected our efforts to insert funding into the report. Authorizing legislation is a start, but without resources it is very meaningless. Without any real funding, the conference report comes up really short.

For example, editorials around the country have said as much, and I will pick on one—the New York Times editorial board. This morning, in their piece entitled “Congress Is Voting on an Inadequate Opioid Bill,” they say:

Congress is about to pass a bill meant to deal with the nation's opioid epidemic. It contains some good ideas. It will also be far

less effective at saving lives than it should be.

The Senate is expected to vote on this measure, approved by the House on Friday by an overwhelming 407-to-5 majority. It would authorize addiction treatment and prevention programs to stem what has become a scourge and a disgrace—more than 28,600 overdose deaths in 2014.

And it has gotten worse, not better, but this legislation contains not a penny to support any of these initiatives.

Continuing to read from the article:

The bill would allow the federal government to award grants to states to treat people who are hooked on prescription painkillers and illicit drugs like heroin. In Congress, however, getting a program authorized is only half the battle. Republican leaders say they will allocate funding when lawmakers return to Washington after a seven-week break that begins at the end of this week and ends after Labor Day. Yet there is no good reason for Congress to put off a vote on funding, given the urgency of the problem.

Quoting again, the editorial ends with a further funding caution:

Many lawmakers, especially those who are up for reelection, clearly want to show voters they are doing something about opioids. This bill amounts to progress, but it will not change the trajectory of this epidemic.

That says it all.

Without real funding, this legislation is far from adequate. If we want to stop the increasing number of opioid overdoses, then we need to get serious about finding a way to do it. One way is funding our Nation's response to this scourge.

So I repeat, it is no wonder that there will be a change in the majority of this body with what went on, as evidenced by this morning's statement by my friend the Republican leader. To talk about a tortured explanation on Zika, the Zika problem we have in America today is significant. Last night, 39 new cases were reported in 1 day in America.

These mosquitoes are ravaging—basically two breeds of mosquitoes are causing these problems. They are vicious. They are awful. Mosquitoes have been bad for generations, making people sick and causing people to die, but this is new. Never in the history of all the problems mosquitoes have caused have they caused birth defects. But they do now, and they do it big-time. The President is aware of the issue. He is aware of the issue. It is a very, very frightening thing for our country.

In May, the Senate passed a bipartisan compromise to address this crisis. The bill wasn't perfect. The legislation called for \$1.1 billion in funding and was well short of the \$1.9 billion health experts said was needed to address the crisis, but it was OK. It was certainly a step forward, and 89 Senators—Democrats and Republicans—agreed it was a good step forward. The Senate compromise at the very least was a step in the right direction. That is why, in spite of our serious reservations about the lack of adequate funding, we voted for this legislation, and I am glad we

did. The overwhelming majority of Republicans voted for this bill, and I am glad they did. The Zika compromise passed, as I said, with 89 votes. Only the most extreme, conservative Members of this body voted against it. That was 2 months ago. But since then, it has become increasingly clear in the last 2 months that Republicans are not serious. They are playing games again because they are not responding to the threat posed by these mosquitoes and by this horrible, horrible condition that they are causing for human beings.

Instead of working to send the bill to the President's desk, the Republicans derailed the bipartisan response—89 Senators who voted—to send that to the House of Representatives. There was a conference. The Republicans chose a very reckless approach. They ignored what went on here in the Senate, even as more and more Americans are getting infected every day. There are almost 4,000 people in the United States and territories that have Zika right now. At least 600 pregnant women have shown evidence of infection. We don't know how many of those pregnant women who have this infection—this virus—are going to bear very, very sick babies. We don't know how many, but it is going to be a lot.

We should be working to fight Zika. We should be working together. We should be providing public health experts with the tools they need to fight this virus. It is not being done, as the Republican leader says. In the Senate, we are stuck in limbo as the Republican leader forces an unnecessary revote on this failed proposal we got from the House of Representatives and approved by the Republicans in the Senate—this conference report. We don't need to vote on this again. It was already rejected. It will be rejected again. Why? For very good reasons.

It is an abomination of a conference report. It restricts funding for birth control provided by Planned Parenthood. My friend talked about pregnant women. If we want to talk about pregnant women, we ought to talk about women who don't want to get pregnant. Where do they go? The vast majority of women in America go to Planned Parenthood. Millions go. This legislation that the Republicans are trying to foist on the American people stops them from being able to do that. It restricts funding for birth control provided by Planned Parenthood. Planned Parenthood is a whipping boy for the Republicans.

This legislation also exempts pesticide spraying from the Clean Water Act. They had to get Planned Parenthood, and they had to do something to the environmental community. Here is what they are going to do to whack the environmental community: We will just not have the Clean Water Act apply.

Veterans—my friend the Republican leader talks about veterans funding. Understand that the legislation being

proposed to help fight Zika takes \$500 million—one-half billion dollars—from the veterans program. That money was to be used for processing claims for veterans, which are way behind. We need that extra money. That is going to be gone.

The so-called salvation of the Zika problem also rescinds \$543 million from ObamaCare. Right now, I could raise a point of order, and that would go. That would be gone. It rescinds \$543 million from ObamaCare. They have to do this.

They are so ideological: Let's go after Planned Parenthood; let's go after the environmental community; let's make sure we do something about ObamaCare; and, just for good measure, because Ebola is not an emergency this very second, let's take more money from that. Two years ago, Ebola was a big emergency, and it will be again. And, just for good measure, to satisfy the right-wing—as Speaker Boehner called them—crazies over there, they said: We will strike a provision on the Confederate flag that was in the House bill.

How is that for an effort to do something constructive? We all know the Senate will not pass this Republican conference report. President Obama will not sign it into law. So why waste more time on this? We should pass the bipartisan Senate compromise as soon as possible. My friend said: Well, we can't amend the conference report. Of course, we can do anything here. With unanimous consent, we can do all kinds of good things.

That is obviously the responsible path forward, and we need to get this legislation to the President's desk. In order to do that, we must bring the Zika compromise legislation before the Senate as a stand-alone. I tried yesterday to do that. I asked unanimous consent that the Senate move to the compromise legislation and the Senate vote on that passage. But despite his previous support for this bipartisan legislation, the Republican leader objected. Senate Democrats are not going to be deterred.

Is there a State in the Union that is going to suffer more than Florida? No. So the senior Senator from Florida is going to come to the floor in a little while this morning, and he is going to ask consent that the Senate proceed to the Zika compromise as a stand-alone bill. It can be done. We should do that. Florida has been hit really hard, and the worst is yet to come. Yesterday alone, as I indicated, there were new cases reported. According to the Palm Beach Post, that brings the number of Floridians—just Floridians—affected with Zika today to almost 300, including 43 pregnant women. So I hope they are going to consider the request by Senator NELSON. We are willing to work with Republicans to get this done. The Senate is going to adjourn for the long, 7-week vacation once we get this done.

Our country is facing an emergency. It is time for the Republicans to start

treating it as such. "Opioids," "Zika" are only words from the Republicans. I repeat for the third time this morning, it is so clear why the Republicans are going to lose the majority in the U.S. Senate. All you have to do is listen to what the Republican leader had to say today.

Will the Chair announce the business of the Senate this morning.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

#### COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2016—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 524, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

Conference report to accompany S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Illinois.

#### ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, 5 months—5 months—that is how long it has been since the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention formally asked the U.S. Congress to respond to a public health emergency to combat the Zika virus—5 months.

In that time, we have seen the number of Americans infected with Zika soar to 3,667. Of those, 599 are pregnant women. In Illinois, there are 26 confirmed cases of Zika—5 months. To date, seven infants have been born with Zika-related birth defects in the United States. Five pregnancies have ended because of Zika-related birth defects—5 months. Last week, Utah health officials announced the first U.S. death related to the Zika virus—5 months. In Puerto Rico, where this situation gets worse by the day, officials reported a 1-week jump of 40 percent in the number of pregnant women on the island diagnosed with Zika—5 months. Three thousand, six hundred sixty-seven Americans to date are infected with Zika that we know of, 599 pregnant women, 7 babies born with severe birth defects, 5 ended because of the virus, and the first Zika-related death—5 months since the President of the United States said this was a public health crisis.

The Republican-controlled Congress has waited 5 months to respond to this crisis, and now we are on the verge of leaving town for 7 more weeks—until

September, after the conventions—and we will leave without providing our Federal health agencies the money they urgently need to fight Zika. By the time Congress returns, it will be 7 months since the President asked Congress on an emergency basis to deal with this public health crisis of Zika. Every single American should be disgusted by this, and every single Member of Congress should be embarrassed.

What is perhaps most infuriating about this situation is that we have a bipartisan Zika funding bill ready to go, and the President would sign it tomorrow if he could. In May, the Senate passed a bill. I will concede, it was 3 months after the President asked for it, but we did pass a bill. We had 89 votes supporting a bill to provide \$1.1 billion to fight this public health disaster. It was less than the President asked, but was a good-faith, bipartisan effort supporting mosquito control programs, lab capacity, surveillance efforts, and maternal health services. It wasn't the bill that Democrats would have written or the President asked for. It wasn't really the bill that the Republicans wanted to start with. It was a bipartisan, good-faith compromise.

But what happened to that bill after it left the Senate? Instead of that bipartisan bill moving through the House and quickly to the President, it went into a conference committee, and that is when things went terribly bad. Right before adjourning for the Fourth of July recess, the House Republicans decided to take our bipartisan bill with 89 votes and load it up like a right-wing Christmas tree. They decided to attack environmental protection by overturning the clean water regulations. They decided to block money to women's health providers. Most people remember when the Republicans were prepared to shut down the government of the United States over the funding of Planned Parenthood. Now, in this bill that they have sent back to us from conference, they are prepared to shut down our response to this public health crisis of the Zika virus in order to defund Planned Parenthood.

It also undermines the Affordable Care Act, which has been a traditional whipping boy of the rightwing, and it raids Ebola funds. They knew the Democrats wouldn't accept these riders. They made it as disgusting and repugnant politically as it could be. They said: Remember, we don't need Ebola funds. It turns out we do.

To this day, the CDC still has 80 disease specialists stationed in West Africa. A few months ago, there was an Ebola cluster in Guinea. In order to respond to that unexpected outbreak, the CDC had to vaccinate 1,700 people, track 20,000 people through surveillance, and open five emergency operation centers in two different countries.

The Republicans say: Well, we will just take the money away from Ebola, maybe things will work out fine in Africa.

The Republican bill proposes decimating our Ebola prevention funding and diverting the resources. The majority leader and majority whip claim the House Zika bill is a compromise and bipartisan. Let me be clear. It is neither. It is not a compromise, and it is not bipartisan. Not a single Democrat signed the conference report that came out of the House. Despite the fact that 89 Senators of both parties had voted for bipartisan funding in the Senate, when they took it into conference, it turned into a political football.

This is a cynical attempt by the Republicans in the House to hijack a public health crisis and push a grab bag of their favorite unrelated poison pill riders. That is why their bill, as shown by the vote here last month, is a non-starter in the Senate, and it is a non-starter with the American people.

What is being lost during this entire posturing and politicizing is the very real toll Zika is taking. During the past 5 months, we have discovered new and alarming things about Zika. We know the Zika virus can be transmitted through sexual contact. Women infected with Zika in their first trimester can face a 13-percent likelihood of a baby born with a serious problem. Even if a pregnant woman doesn't show any signs of infection, her baby can be born with serious, physical, and neurological disorders.

It has been 5 months since the President asked for funding. This Republican-led Congress just can't get it right. Eighty-nine Senators, Democrats and Republicans, came up with a bipartisan answer, they couldn't get it through the House of Representatives, and we sit here today languishing in this political mess.

Researchers are examining the links to other negative health consequences: eye infections that lead to blindness, autoimmune disorders that cause paralysis related to Zika virus.

What about the impact of maternal stress on the baby? I spent the last several weeks meeting with maternal and fetal health care providers and community health leaders in Chicago. Yesterday I was in the Belleville area. They shared with me the fear and stress their patients are experiencing. Hundreds of pregnant women in Illinois are seeking care and advice from doctors. They have undergone tests to make sure their babies are safe. Sadly, three of those Illinois women have learned they are already infected with Zika. I am sick and tired of this political game being played by the House and Senate Republicans when it comes to a public health crisis.

The President got it right 5 months ago. Why can't this Congress get it right now before we leave for this 7-week vacation? Enough is enough. It is time for the Republican majority in the House and the Senate to do their job: respond to this public health crisis in a sensible, bipartisan way, just as our bill that passed the Senate with 89 votes addressed, instead of making this

a political test for the most outrageous claims.

Did I mention the fact that in conference, the House and Senate Republicans decided to add another provision when it came to this public health crisis? That provision would allow the display of Confederate flags in veterans cemeteries. Give me a break. What does that have to do with this public health crisis or honoring our men and women in the military or our veterans who have served our country well?

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

#### PRIVATE SECTOR PENSIONS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, as chairman of the Budget Committee, I come to the floor on a regular basis and give some bad news, hopefully in small doses. If the small doses don't work, I am going to have to go to larger doses, but we do have a crisis of overspending. We are going to have some more opportunities to talk about that spending.

Private sector pensions are what I am going to talk about today. Private sector pensions are relied upon by millions of Americans for retirement security. They are agreements that are made between an employer and its employees or a union and its members which allow the recipients to receive payments in retirement. Those payments are based on a formula that includes a number of factors, including years of service.

I have worked on pension policy for all of my professional life. I have dealt with pensions as a young accountant, as the mayor of the city of Gillette, as a member of the Wyoming Legislature, as a member of the Senate Pensions Committee, as chairman of the Senate Pensions Committee, as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, as chairman of the Senate Retirement Security Subcommittee, as chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, and as chairman of the conference committee on the 2006 Pension Protection Act that saved pensions for thousands of workers without wholesale business bankruptcy.

I also authored the 2006 Pension Protection Act, which dramatically altered the funding rules and made single-employer pension plans much more stable. The act also made significant changes to defined contribution plans that drastically improved participation. I believe it is safe to say I speak from my experience as a Member of this body, with a large background in pension policy, and I am concerned about where we are heading.

Out of the 24,361 single-employer pension plans that we have information on, 4,486 are underfunded. The most recent actuarial estimations of the underfunding by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation is over \$758 billion. That should concern us because the assets of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's single-employer insurance program are \$85 billion. Let's see. Single-employer pensions are underfunded by \$758 billion. That is

rounding it down, actually. It should be \$759 billion, with assets of \$85 billion.

Let me say that another way and say it again. The insurance program for that \$758 billion only has \$85 billion in assets. That is not even our biggest pension problem. Out of the 1,361 multiemployer pension plans, that means the collectively bargained agreements we have information on, 1,238 are underfunded. The most recent actuarial estimations of that underfunding is just over \$611 billion.

What are the assets of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation? They are \$1.9 billion. In other words, the safety net for \$611 billion is one and nine-tenths billion. I would equate that to trying to catching a whale shark with a net made for minnows.

This shouldn't come as a surprise to anyone. The PBGC wrote in its 2015 annual report that "it is more likely than not that the multiemployer program's assets will be depleted in 2025." The insurance policy for collectively bargained pensions is on track to become insolvent in less than a decade. In fact, if the Central States Pension Fund goes under, it will reduce that amount considerably.

Altogether, private sector pensions are underfunded by \$1.35 trillion, or to put it in better perspective, \$1,350 billion. On top of that, per the most recent actuarial data available for State and local pensions, the total amount of underfunding in public sector pension plans is \$1.2 trillion, or \$1,200 billion.

The total amount of unfunded liabilities in both private and public sector pension plans is around \$2,600 billion. That means these pension plans have agreed to pay out \$2.6 trillion more than they have available. For reference, \$2.6 trillion is \$2,600 billion. It is more than double what our current annual spending is that Congress gets to make decisions on. That includes defense, transportation, agriculture, and education—twice what we spend on the things we get to make decisions on.

I have heard from some of my colleagues who have come to the Senate floor and speak to the troubling predicaments of specific pension plans. Many of them are currently advocating for shoring up the United Mine Workers of America pension plan, which is just one of the 1,238 union pension plans that are underfunded. I am concerned about this for several reasons.

First, if we take the steps my colleagues are advocating for with regard to the United Mine Workers of America, what are we going to do with the next underfunded pension plan that comes around looking for assistance? What about the plan after that? There are hundreds of private-sector pension plans in critical and declining or endangered status throughout America today so I am not sure how Congress would help the United Mine Workers of America and not the others. Paraphrasing President Washington: We are walking on untrodden ground. There is

scarcely any part of our conduct which may not hereafter be drawn into precedent.

I have frequently heard my colleagues try to differentiate this case by speaking of a promise of a pension that was made to retirees in this particular union, but that agreement was between the members and the union. It was not an agreement with the Federal Government.

Second, I find it necessary to remind my colleagues this country is \$19 trillion in debt and consistently increasing its spending. We don't have the money to shore up pension plans. To be clear, despite proponents arguing that this legislation is paid for by coal companies' contributions to the Abandoned Mine Land Trust, in reality, it would be paid for by the taxpayers.

The Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act is funded by a tax levied on mining operators per tonnage of coal harvested. Interest from the abandoned mine land fund can be transferred to three trusts to support United Mineworkers' health care benefits of orphaned miners. Orphaned miners are those whose companies no longer exist but whose health plans still exist. If the abandoned mine land interest does not cover these health care costs, the three United Mine Workers' health care plans are entitled to payments from the U.S. Treasury.

The AML interest payments are often not sufficient to meet the three United Mine Workers' health care plans' needs so the general fund of the Treasury provides the balance. For example, in fiscal year 2012, interest from the abandoned mine land fund paid \$48.4 million toward the health care funds, and the U.S. Treasury general fund, the taxpayer dollars, provided \$205.6 million. The AML interest cannot take on another obligation. Now my colleagues are asking taxpayers to pay even more than the health care for the United Mine Workers' beneficiaries.

The portion of funds coming from the U.S. Treasury will only increase. As I mentioned, the AML trust is funded by a tax levied on coal harvested. The key word is "harvested." It breaks my heart to say this, but according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, U.S. coal production, or harvesting, is projected to be down over 25 percent this year compared to 2014. In large part, that is due to the mercury air toxics standards rule, the stream protection rule, the Clean Power Plan, the freeze on Federal coal leases, the proposed increase in coal royalty rates, and everything else the administration is doing to shut down coal. Less coal being harvested means less taxes will be paid into the abandoned mine land trust fund. As those abandoned mine land dollars dry up, more and more of the money this bill proposes to use for United Mine Workers' health care and pensions will come from taxpayer dollars.

Again, I will point out this agreement was made between the members

and the union, not between the members and the American taxpayer. That bears repeating. The United Mine Workers of America agreement was made between the members and the United Mine Workers of America, not between the members and the American taxpayer.

It is also worth noting that the AML fund is not unique in that it is comprised of fees paid by a specific industry or user base. One of the most significant pension problems we hear about today is the Central States Pension Fund, which I mentioned earlier and which includes a large number of truckers. That fund is going broke. So I will offer my colleagues an analogy using that fund. To be sure that there are roads to drive on, trucking companies pay a higher tax on their diesel fuel as well as taxes on truck and trailer sales, heavy tires, and heavy vehicle usage. Together with a tax that all consumers pay on every gallon of gasoline purchased, these taxes fund the highway trust fund. This trust fund for highways builds roads and pays for repairs and new bridges that the trucking industry and all drivers rely on. Using a dwindling AML trust fund to shore up the United Mine Workers of America pension would be like shoring up the Central States Pension Fund with the fund that builds highways because truckers pay into the highway fund. That is what the United Mine Workers of America is asking us to do.

My guess is that, if we examined all of the pension plans in critical and declining or endangered status, we could probably identify a fund that relevant employers or employees paid into in some way. If we go down this road, what is to stop those funds from being raided to shore up the quasi-related pensions? Where do we draw the line?

Lastly, I worry about the claims that we are helping all coal miners with this proposal when, in reality, the policy does absolutely nothing for miners who are not members of the United Mine Workers of America. According to Bureau of Labor Statistics, nearly 11,000 workers in the coal industry have lost their jobs in the last year, largely due to this administration's policies. Yet my colleagues have proposed a bill that would help only a portion of those people, and the bill wouldn't help put those folks back to work, developing the energy source that generated 33 percent of America's electricity last year. Instead, proponents of this bill are saying: If you are a member of the United Mine Workers of America, we want to help you with your health care benefits and pensions, but if you are not or if you want your job back, then too bad.

I am not without sympathy for the United Mine Workers of America's coal miners. Remember, I helped the miners get their health care. Coal miners play an integral part in our economy, and my colleagues have heard me say time and again that America runs on coal. Nowhere is that more evident than in

my home State of Wyoming, which produces 40 percent of the Nation's coal. In fact, we produce more coal than the second through the sixth States in coal production combined.

I have the deepest respect for coal miners and am worried about those who have been laid off in Wyoming and across the country. I understand the unique health care needs of miners, and I respect the health care promise this country has made to the miners over many decades. I have supported those health care needs in the past, most specifically by working across the aisle to shore up the three United Mine Workers of America's health care funds back in the mid-2000s. I believe it is important that coal miners continue to receive quality health care. I also believe it is crucial that they, as well as all Americans, have the opportunity to live out their retirement years in financial solvency, but I also want America to remain financially solvent. I don't believe the efforts of my colleagues advocating for this United Mine Workers of America bill help the mine workers in a way that is fair to the Federal taxpayers or to the other coal miners across America. I also know the troubling truth about some of America's pension plans, as I pointed out on this chart, that are underfunded, as well as the faces of the participants within those plans. I have met with them and heard their stories throughout my professional life. There are facets of our retirement system that we can fix to help retirees, but I remain concerned about the use of Federal tax dollars to shore up specific pension plans and to make false promises.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 5243

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I come to the floor for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request with regard to Zika.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 5243, which is at the desk; that all after the enacting clause be stricken; that the substitute amendment, which is the text of the Blunt-Murray amendment to provide \$1.1 billion of funding for Zika, be agreed to; that there be up to 1 hour of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 2577

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me just walk through this one more time in case anybody is confused about where we are.

As I said yesterday, Republican Senators are eager to pass the conference report which is before us and send it to the President's desk for signature. We should do that today—this very day. That would accomplish several important things before we leave for the week. First, it would provide \$1.1 billion in immediate funding to combat Zika. That is the exact amount of money in the Democrats' request. However, the Democrats' request includes only funding for Zika and leaves the rest of the important priorities behind.

The conference report that the House passed includes full funding for Zika, funding for military construction, funding for veterans programs, and temporary but meaningful reforms to ensure that we are able to combat mosquito-borne illnesses during the summer months, which are upon us.

We should pass the conference report today—this very day. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2577 and that the conference report be agreed to with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—first of all, did I hear an objection from the majority leader to my unanimous consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader has not yet objected.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I believe I reserved the right to object and then offered an alternative unanimous consent request to which I think the Senator from Florida is about to respond.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, now here we are in the same old political games. With a much needed bill, MILCON-VA—a very good bill—attaching a Zika bill that is loaded down with poison pills, that takes away family planning funds and also takes money out of the Affordable Care Act. So here again it is the same political games, and for that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the majority leader's request.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I will be objecting—let me just say to my good friend from Florida that regardless of the substantive arguments he is making, as a practical matter, if we were to repass the Senate bill, it would not pass the House, so it would not achieve the result we are looking for. So I guess who is playing political games is in the eye of the beholder.

If we want to get an outcome, if we want to get \$1.1 billion appropriated to combat Zika and do it now, and if we want to fund the military construction bill, the proposal the Senator from Florida is asking for will not achieve that; therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I would just say to the majority leader that one of the items in his proposal takes money away from Puerto Rico. By seeing the unanimous vote we had—not unanimous—the overwhelming vote last week for the financial assistance plan to help Puerto Rico get out of its financial woes—part of those financial woes is in the health care sector. We know that experts have told us that 20 percent of the population of Puerto Rico is estimated to be infected with the Zika virus by the end of this summer. So there is just one example of why we should not take an approach that is taking money out of the Affordable Care Act and taking money away from family planning, but specifically with regard to its effect upon Puerto Rico.

As I shared with the Senate last week, I represent the State that had 11 new cases of the Zika virus last week. Well, lo and behold, we now have 13 more new cases, bringing the total in our State to 276, which includes 43 pregnant women, and that is just one of the 50 States in the Union, not including the territories. The number of cases being reported across the country continues to rise. There have been seven infants born in the United States with Zika-related birth defects, and you know what I am talking about because you have seen the pictures of how, when the virus attacks the fetus in its development, it does not allow the development properly of the head and of the brain.

Right now in America, the CDC is monitoring 599 pregnant women. Public health experts estimate that caring for a child born with Zika-related microcephaly could amount to \$10 million in medical costs over that child's lifetime. That is just speaking about the dollars; that is not talking about the tragedy. By that estimate, it would cost up to \$2 billion to care for 200 children born with microcephaly. That is \$100 million more than the amount this Senator and the minority leader had asked for in the first place, reflecting the President's request of \$1.9 billion that the experts say is needed to curb the spread of the virus. That request was made 4 months ago, and we still haven't done anything about it.

At what point do the majority and the majority leader decide to stop playing these games and simply do what is needed?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, will my friend yield for a question?

Mr. NELSON. Of course.

Mr. REID. Is it true that your family first came to Florida in 1829 or somewhere in there—a long time ago?



Mr. NELSON. Can the Senator ask that again? I cannot hear.

Mr. REID. Is it true that your family came to the State of Florida around the turn of the 19th century?

Mr. NELSON. Through the Chair, Mr. President, I would answer the Senator. Yes, my family came to Florida right after Florida was acquired as a territory from Spain.

Mr. REID. Is it true that during your lifetime, you have served in various elected offices in the State of Florida. You were, as I recall, the State treasurer, which included insurance commissioner, and you represented the State of Florida in the House of Representatives; is that true?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, that is true.

Mr. REID. And you have been in this body since 2000; is that true?

Mr. NELSON. For 15½ years, that is true.

Mr. REID. Is it also true that during your tenure as a Floridian, you had the good fortune to be an American astronaut?

Mr. NELSON. Not only the good fortune but the great privilege, and now I have the opportunity to work on the policy for the Nation's space program.

Mr. REID. The point I am trying to outline here for the Senator from Florida, I think, without any stretch of the imagination, that you know the State of Florida pretty well, don't you?

Mr. NELSON. The good Lord willing, I know it pretty much like the back of my hand.

Mr. REID. And you understand as much, if not more, than anyone else the dangers of these mosquitoes that are ravaging your State and other States and, of course, the American citizens of Puerto Rico; is that true?

Mr. NELSON. Yes, sir. And I know that mosquitoes are all over Florida, but now this one strain of mosquito, the aegypti, for dinner feeds not on one human but on four. If the mosquito has the Zika virus, each of those four would then be infected with the virus after the mosquito has had its dinner.

Mr. REID. And you understand, I ask the Senator from Florida, that for generations of time, mosquitoes have caused all kinds of medical problems for people who are infected with different bites from mosquitoes; is that right?

Mr. NELSON. If you think of the building of the Panama Canal, mosquitoes transmitted malaria. So mosquitoes are a vector which transmits a lot of diseases. This strain of mosquito can lay its larvae in stagnant water contained in something as small as a bottle cap.

Mr. REID. It is true, is it not, that in generations past, mosquitoes have caused death and illness that we have tried to handle for the last 100 years?

Mr. NELSON. That is correct, and we usually meet those emergencies with emergency funding.

Mr. REID. Isn't it true that this strain of mosquito is now causing, for

the first time in history that we know of, not only death and sickness but also causing women to give birth to babies who are very ill?

Mr. NELSON. There is a direct link, I would say, Mr. President, in response to the Senator, between a pregnant woman being infected with the Zika virus and the probability that she will deliver a child who is deformed.

Mr. REID. Is the Senator aware that what we passed out of here by 89 votes was \$1.1 billion in emergency funding for the State of Florida and the rest of our States and, of course, the citizens of Puerto Rico?

Mr. NELSON. Not only that, but with bipartisan support early on in this whole dialogue. And now we are seeing the resistance of the majority leader to take up the very bill that passed with those overwhelming numbers of bipartisan support.

Mr. REID. And the Senator is aware that what we got back from the House of Representatives and what this Republican Senate signed on to is a bill that is an abomination. Is the Senator aware that what it does, among other things, is it allows the flying of Confederate flags at cemeteries; it takes \$543 million from ObamaCare; it takes money from emergencies we have today with Ebola? Is the Senator aware that they are taking a whack at the Clean Water Act with our inability to spray? Is the Senator aware that there are so many women who go to Planned Parenthood to handle the problems that women have, including wanting help to not get pregnant? Are you aware that the legislation they sent back to us prevents Planned Parenthood from being involved in this?

Mr. NELSON. It is a political message that is so reviled by the people of America. They want us to get down to the business.

If Senator McCONNELL had a flood or an earthquake in Kentucky, we would all support him with emergency funding to meet that emergency. We have an emergency now. Why are they adding all of these poison pills, such as those the Democratic leader has just enumerated, in this bill?

Mr. President, I think the Senator from Nevada has with his cross-examination exposed exactly what the problem is, and it is too bad. The clock continues to tick. At the end of this week, we will go out. We won't come back until the day after Labor Day, which is in the first week of September. And all along, the Government of the United States is going to have to figure out how it will get the money to the local mosquito control districts and how it will get the money to the drug companies to continue the R&D to find and produce a vaccine and all the other health-related expenses.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield through the Chair for a question?

Mr. NELSON. I certainly will yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Through the Chair, I would ask the Senator from Florida

whether it is true that it has been 5 months since President Obama declared this public health emergency and asked the Congress to respond to that emergency in a timely way. He asked for emergency funding of \$1.9 billion for mosquito abatement, for medical research, for expanding lab facilities, and for investing in developing a vaccine to protect Americans, if not this year, next year.

Mr. NELSON. It is true, and not only is it true that the President requested it, but immediately, a whole bunch of us out here filed a bill and brought it to the attention of the Senate, and it is now 5 months later.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask the Senator through the Chair, in dealing with a public health emergency, a public health crisis, the potential of an epidemic that we now think could infect 25 percent of the population of Puerto Rico, is a timely response an important part of the congressional response?

Mr. NELSON. Amen to that, and here we are dithering with these political games. We wonder why the American public is so turned off when they see what is going on up here, and here is one of the very best examples of an emergency.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask the Senator—and I see my colleague, Senator MURRAY of Washington, on the floor, who is in a very important position, and she is going to address this issue in a few moments. But is it not true that we worked out a bipartisan compromise in the Senate—not to give \$1.9 billion, which, on the Democratic side, is our aspiration, but at least to agree with the Republicans in the Senate to \$1.1 billion to respond to the President's request for an emergency response; and that we passed the bill in the Senate with 89 votes—an overwhelming bipartisan vote—with an agreement and a compromise in May, and this was sent over to the House of Representatives in May of this year?

Mr. NELSON. Not only is it true, but with 100 Senators, when something passes with 89 votes, that is a pretty strong consensus.

Mr. DURBIN. I would ask the Senator through the Chair—so we have the President identifying a public health emergency and the President telling us—and the CDC as well—that delaying this makes a possibility or probability of an epidemic even worse. We have a response by the Senate, on a bipartisan basis with 89 votes, to provide over \$1 billion for the President to get to work to protect America and to develop a vaccine. And is it not true that the House was given this measure with 89 votes and failed to send it back to us on a timely basis?

Mr. NELSON. Not only is that true, those four things, but then the House of Representatives put it on a very good bill, the MILCON appropriations, and they sent it down here thinking that we were going to have to take it at the eleventh hour with all of those poison pills, which include the Confederate flag.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask the Senator from Florida, through the Chair, is it also true that the bill sent to us by the House, after we passed a bipartisan bill with 89 votes, had no Democratic signatories—no House Members of the Democratic Party signing onto this conference report that was sent over to us—so it was a totally Republican conference report?

Mr. NELSON. Not only is that true, but it is also indicative of how ideologically driven and how partisan driven so much of the activity here in this Capitol building is, which is what is very distasteful to the American people.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask the Senator from Florida, through the Chair, is it also not true, based on the statements made by the Republican majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL of Kentucky, that he is going to give us one last chance in the next 48 hours to either take this partisan version of the bill, addressing this public health crisis, or do nothing for the next 7 weeks?

Mr. NELSON. That, of course, I say to the Senator from Illinois, is such a poor, poor choice.

Mr. DURBIN. I would ask the Senator from Florida my last question. I know my other colleagues are waiting to ask questions. Your State, the State of Florida, appears to be vulnerable—more vulnerable than most States—because of your proximity to Puerto Rico and other places and the number of travelers coming into the State of Florida from areas where we know for certain that the Zika virus is starting to be manifest. I ask the Senator from Florida: What are you hearing back in your State about the need for a timely, bipartisan effort in Congress to deal with the public health crisis of the Zika virus?

Mr. NELSON. I say to the Senator from Illinois, with 276 cases of infection, with 43 pregnant women that we know of just in the State of Florida, is it any wonder that 5 months ago, when we filed the \$1.9 billion request of the administration, my colleague from Florida, my friend who I get along with, the junior Senator, Mr. RUBIO, cosponsored the bill with me.

Mr. DURBIN. Well, I said it was the last question. I will ask one more, if I may, through the Chair. I would ask the Senator from Florida this: So you have Senator RUBIO, a well-known Republican from Florida, and Senator BILL NELSON, maybe the best known Democrat from Florida, agreeing that this is an emergency that needs to be dealt with on a timely basis, that the President's request for \$1.9 billion is a reasonable request, that we pass a bipartisan measure—Senate Democrats and Senate Republicans—and that we are moving toward solving this problem and responding to it. Is it not true that this measure fell apart or broke down when it ended up in the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, where they did not take a bipartisan approach to the issue?

Mr. NELSON. Not only is that true, I say to the Senator, but there is the fact that this is an emergency, which has always been dealt with in the history of this Senate as a bipartisan thing to meet the situation of the emergency, and now this has been used—because it is so urgent to get the appropriations—as a political message and ideological, partisan-driven bill.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator.  
Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from Florida for his leadership on this issue and the Senators from Nevada and Illinois for their great questions illuminating us.

I am just going to sum up here in a minute. If the Republican leader wants to get something done, instead of putting this bill on the floor again, he would go over to the House and tell them to vote for the bipartisan bill that he voted for and we all voted for of \$1.1 billion. I say something else to my friend from Kentucky. When he was in the minority, he kept saying to us: Leadership means working together.

Well, he is in charge now. We have a crisis. Instead of working together, he is putting a bill on the floor that had no input from our side and that doesn't do the job and is loaded with poison pills. Is that leadership? Does that show that the Senate is working again? He is back to the old ways when we have a crisis. Again, if the majority leader of this body wanted to get something done about Zika, he would ask the House to pass our bipartisan bill.

Instead, he puts the same political document on the floor that shows no leadership, that shows no bipartisanship, and that will not pass. So there is no drama. There is no suspense. I don't even know why he is doing it again, but probably because he knows there is a crisis and he is unwilling, reluctant, afraid, to confront the House with their gamesmanship that was driven by 40 Freedom Caucus members who don't believe the government should spend money on anything.

The only way he could get the votes was to put in all these poison pills which he knew would kill the bill to begin with. So the bottom line is very simple. If the House would put our bipartisan bill on the floor of the House it would pass right now. We would get something done. Instead, the very bipartisanship that the majority leader is trying to make as a hallmark of his leadership is being made a joke of by his putting a partisan bill that has failed once on the floor once again in the closing days of this session.

I would urge the majority leader—it is really on his shoulders—to reconsider. I would urge him to make a good faith effort to get something done. I would urge him not to play the game of putting this bill, laden with poison pills, not doing the job, on the floor, and, instead, go call Speaker RYAN and

say: We have to get something done. Let's do something in a bipartisan way.

I yield the floor.  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I too want to thank the Senator from Florida for his strong effort to get this done. I thank my colleagues who are here speaking as well. There are just a few days left in this legislative session. I am so frustrated that instead of finally coming out of their partisan corner and getting to work to fight the Zika virus, Republican leaders, as we just saw, have doubled down on their politics-first approach.

It has been more than 5 months since President Obama first put forward a strong emergency funding proposal to respond to Zika. Rather than giving that proposal a serious consideration, Republicans simply refused to even consider it. Instead, they found excuse after excuse, delay after delay, and refused to listen to public health experts and women and families who made it clear that Congress needed to act.

They tried to jam a partisan, political bill through Congress on the way out of town on the Fourth of July. Now, look, as we just heard, it was a bill that included harmful, political provisions on everything from women's health to the Confederate flag to the environment.

Now, as this Republican-controlled Congress is headed out of town again, Republicans are somehow trying to claim that they have done everything they need to do when it comes to Zika. They are saying that by putting forward now a partisan bill full of harmful and unnecessary policy riders, they can throw up their hands and go home.

Well, that might be how Republicans in Congress want it to work, but the women and families I talk to could not disagree more. They are worried about what this virus could mean to their families. They want Congress to take action. Republicans should know that Democrats are going to keep pushing until that happens. It is especially frustrating that, despite all of the partisanship and tea party pandering we have seen from the other side of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats in this Senate did reach an agreement on Zika 2 months ago that got the support of every Democrat and nearly half of the Republicans—89 votes.

It did not provide the full amount President Obama requested, but it would have been a strong down payment. It would have helped to accelerate the development of a vaccine. It would strengthen vector control in communities across the United States and the territories and critically expand access to desperately needed family planning and other health care services.

Had Republicans been willing to stay the bipartisan course that we set and push aside the extreme members who insist on using women's health every time as a political football, that agreement would now have been signed into



law, and it would be on its way to communities, as we speak. I am deeply frustrated that has not happened.

This is truly urgent. In fact, just last week, the Puerto Rico Department of Health noted a 40-percent increase in the number of pregnant women with Zika on the island. So, frankly, it is appalling that given what we know about the impacts of this virus, Republicans would put an ideological, partisan bill in front of us and say: My way or the highway. That is why today Democrats are here giving Republicans another chance to do the right thing. We are urging them to support women and families instead of the tea party and Heritage Action and join us to get a strong bipartisan emergency funding package to communities at risk because of the Zika virus.

This bill has already passed the Senate, as we know, with 89 votes. Democrats supported it. Most Republicans supported it. So we are here to urge Republican leaders: Don't waste another minute. Join us in moving a bipartisan bill forward. Women and families across the country have waited long enough for action on Zika. Let's not make them wait any longer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

#### TRAGEDY IN DALLAS

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I rise today to offer my thoughts and prayers to the five Dallas police officers and their families who were killed in the line of duty on July 7, 2016. I want to recognize them on the Senate floor for the sacrifices they have made, for their heroic service to protect the people of Dallas, and also to recognize our law enforcement officers for what they do every single day on our behalf.

On July 7, 2016, unfortunately, killed in the line of duty—adding to the roll-call, and whose names will be added to the Law Enforcement Memorial in Washington—are Sergeant Michael Smith, a former Army Ranger who also served our Nation and who had been with the department since 1989; Senior Corporal Lorne Ahrens, 48, who had been with the department since 2002; Officer Michael Krol, 40, who had been with the department since 2007; Officer Patrick Zamarripa, 32, a former Navy Seal and Iraq war veteran, who had been with the department since 2011; DART Officer Bart Thompson, 43, a former marine who had been with the department since 2009. Thompson was the first DART officer who was killed in the line of duty since the department's inception in 1989.

Having served as attorney general for the State of New Hampshire, we have, unfortunately, been through this with our law enforcement officers in New Hampshire when we lose an officer in the line of duty. This is such a tragedy for the Dallas community, but it is a tragedy for our country. So, today, we stand with those mourning in Dallas. We stand with the law enforcement community. We stand with all of those

who serve our Nation because they go out every single day when we are home with our families and on holidays.

When we are home late at night, when we are sleeping, they are out in the streets patrolling, keeping us safe, the "Thin Blue Line" between us and those who want to do us harm.

So, as we look at what is happening around our Nation, law enforcement is the solution to bringing us together. They work in our communities every single day. I have seen the phenomenal work that our law enforcement community does in New Hampshire. I have been to the Police Athletic League and seen what they are doing with the youth in our community. I have seen the outreach they do every day on this horrible drug epidemic that we are facing in the State of New Hampshire. I have seen the difficult situations they face with those struggling with mental illness—every single challenge they are taking on in our communities.

So, today, let's remember those five brave officers who gave their lives in the line of duty, and let's remember all those who have given their lives in the line of duty to keep us safe every single day. Without our brave law enforcement officers, we would not be able to enjoy the freedoms we have and not be able to enjoy our own families and our way of life. So we are grateful to all of those who serve. We stand with you. We thank you for what you do every single day on our behalf.

To your family members, we say to you as well, thank you, because families do serve as well. And when your loved ones go out on our streets to keep us safe, we know you worry about their safe return. So we stand with you as well, and we say thank you for your service and sacrifice to keep the rest of us safe.

Mr. President, I would also like to speak today about a very important piece of legislation that I hope we will be considering on the Senate floor this week. I rise in support of the conference report for a critical piece of legislation called the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, otherwise known as CARA. I have now been working on this piece of legislation with Senators PORTMAN, WHITEHOUSE, and KLOBUCHAR for about 2 years, and I thank them for their leadership on this legislation and their partnership in the work we have done, along with hundreds of coalition groups that have helped us put this legislation together.

CARA passed this body in March by a vote of 94 to 1. Not much passes the Senate with a vote of 94 to 1. Numbers like that speak volumes to the fact that every community is facing a heroin and opioid epidemic right now, and we need to take national action. And after conferencing the Senate version with a package of House bills related to opioid abuse, just this past Friday the House of Representatives passed the conference report by an overwhelming vote of 407 to 5—407 to 5 in the House of Representatives.

Those are very powerful numbers in support of this legislation, but I want to touch on the numbers that matter the most and why we need to act on this legislation—numbers like 129, the number of people who die each day in our country from a drug overdose; or 248, the number of stakeholder groups who have endorsed the final version of CARA because they know it takes the right legislative approach to fighting back against this public health crisis. That number includes some groups from my home State of New Hampshire whom I have had the honor of working with. I appreciate so much their phenomenal work on the frontlines in helping those struggling with addiction, including HOPE for New Hampshire Recovery; Hope on Haven Hill; the Kingston Lions Club in Kingston, NH; and Project Recovery in Newton, NH. And I know there are many other individuals and groups on the frontlines in New Hampshire who are making a difference.

CARA is also supported by nearly 40 chiefs of police from across our State, the New Hampshire Association of Chiefs of Police, and the National Fraternal Order of Police because our law enforcement knows we need a comprehensive response. I have heard so many times from our police officers that we cannot arrest our way out of this public health crisis.

Another number never far from my mind is 439—the number of individuals in my home State of New Hampshire who died from a drug overdose last year. And just this year alone, 2016, 161 have died. So unfortunately we are looking at even greater numbers with what we see happening on the streets of New Hampshire.

I will never forget those numbers because they are so much more than numbers; they are the lives of loved ones we have lost, and they represent the overwhelming heartbreak felt by too many families.

Every time I am out in New Hampshire, I have another family, unfortunately, whom I meet and who tells me about their story of losing someone they loved or a loved one they are trying to get help for who is struggling with addiction. That is why in this debate we must give a voice to those who no longer have a voice of their own. We must put faces, names, and stories to this epidemic because it is affecting families and communities all across our country.

I want to share some stories from those in New Hampshire who are driving us to take action. In passing CARA, we are remembering them, and we are honoring them and making a change that can help save lives. We are making sure we have the right legislative framework in place as we push for more funding to get to the States to address this epidemic. I am spurred to action by these stories, and it is my hope that by sharing this here today, my colleagues will join me in passing this legislation.

I just spoke to a woman yesterday from Plaistow, NH—Kathy. Kathy's son Thomas was a hero in his local community. He was compassionate and caring to his peers and even helped a fellow student who was living alone in the woods rededicate himself to studying and eventually graduate. He literally went out in the woods to find a homeless student and brought him into his home.

Around 7 years ago, this bright young man became addicted to painkillers. This is a story we hear all too often. He had an injury, he became addicted to painkillers, and his family was shocked at how many pills he was legally prescribed for his back pain. It wasn't long before he turned to something else—heroin.

In fact, the national data shows that four out of five people who turn to heroin actually started with misusing or overusing prescription drugs.

Thomas's life, unfortunately, took a turn for the worse, and he spent time in jail before eventually passing away from an overdose.

When I spoke with Kathy, she told me that more needs to be done to help others struggling with a substance use disorder. She wants to see more resources for early education. She wants to fight back against the stigma associated with addiction.

In having this debate on the Senate floor, that is something we need to turn around—the stigma. This is a public health crisis. This is a disease, and we need to get help for those struggling with addiction.

But Kathy is not alone. A woman in Goffstown wrote to me after losing her brother to a heroin overdose:

From here forward, we will never have another holiday where our family is complete. At Thanksgiving, when our close, loving family gathers, there will be an empty seat where he once sat. An unfilled stocking at Christmas will remind us of the void we feel each day. Come his 25th birthday this year, we will visit his grave site where he is buried instead of hugging him in our arms and wishing him another wonderful year.

A father in Brentwood, NH, lost his son to an overdose and told me:

I cannot describe the pain, feeling of helplessness and grave despair [my wife] and I went through upon finding our son dead. This has been a tragedy we in the end were not able to fix, and a war we were not able to win. Our son is now part of the statistics.

A woman in Wakefield wrote that her niece's dreams were crushed when she became addicted to heroin. She wrote:

Her death has left the family heartbroken, and we have chosen to tell everyone the truth in hopes that her death will not have been in vain.

A mother in Manchester said:

I wake up every morning with the fear of finding my son dead. I am crying out for help.

A mother from Greenville, NH, who spends her days helping people living with substance abuse disorders only to come home and see her own son struggling with using heroin, told me:

As I tried to comfort those who have been affected by this tragedy, I think that my son will be next.

In Laconia, a man helps those struggling to get treatment, but he feels helpless when he is faced with a 5-month waiting period to get into a facility. He wrote:

In 5 months, these individuals will be dead.

A parent from Salem contacted me and told me her son is struggling with heroin addiction, and she needed help finding a treatment program for him since she couldn't afford to pay for treatment herself, like the mother of these three children who had to revive her son from an overdose before the paramedics could arrive, or like the Griffin family, Pam and Doug and Shannon Griffin from Newton, NH, whom I have gotten to know well. The Griffin family lost their beautiful 20-year-old daughter Courtney to a fentanyl and heroin overdose. Courtney's father, Doug Griffin, and his wife, Pam, have made it their life's mission to raise awareness about this terrible epidemic to help save lives and help others going through the same difficulty and tragedy.

Doug and so many other dedicated people in New Hampshire are working tirelessly to turn the tide against this epidemic. Earlier this year, I met with families from New Hampshire who actually traveled to Washington to urge Congress to take up and pass CARA. If we don't act, what kind of message are we sending to these families who need our help and need us to act? That is why we need CARA and we need to ensure this framework is passed.

CARA authorizes resources for treatment, prevention, recovery, and first responders—critical facets of a comprehensive approach. And CARA is an authorizing vehicle. Some have made this argument around here: Why should we pass an authorization vehicle if the funding is not attached? Under that reasoning, we wouldn't have passed the Violence Against Women Act, we wouldn't have passed the Head Start Program, we wouldn't have passed a program for vaccines for children, we wouldn't have passed the Second Chance Act, and there are so many more. The reality is that in the appropriations bill there have been increases in funding for CARA, and we are going to fight for even more increases in funding. In fact, at the end of the day, the Senate appropriations bills include a 46-percent increase in spending on opioid addiction programs since last year. So we can do more, but if we don't pass CARA, then we will do a great disservice to the American people.

President Obama's Director of the Office of National Drug Policy, Michael Botticelli, told me at a hearing in New Hampshire last year: "Certainly the CARA Act, I think, highlights many of the issues and fills really critical gaps not only in terms of funding but in terms of policy around this issue."

Mr. President, I hope this is not a partisan issue. Unfortunately, we know, whether you are a Republican, a Democrat, or an Independent—it

doesn't matter what your political background is—we have so many families in New Hampshire and across this country who are struggling with addiction, and it is time for us to rise above the politics and pass this important legislation.

I again thank Senator PORTMAN. I thank Senator KLOBUCHAR and Senator WHITEHOUSE for the passion and leadership they have shown on this legislation.

There is an urgent and pressing need for this legislation, and I call on my colleagues to come together and make sure we duplicate what happened in the House of Representatives, where there was an overwhelming vote to pass this legislation, so we can get it to the President's desk and make sure this legislation is funded.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Hampshire leaves the floor, I just want to say again what I said previously. We wouldn't be where we are today on the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act without the Senator from New Hampshire, who made an extraordinary contribution to this early on and played an important leadership role. So on behalf of all Members of the Senate, Republicans and Democrats, I want to thank the Senator from New Hampshire for all she did to bring this forward.

#### ENERGY POLICY MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the House message accompanying S. 2012.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House insist upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2012) entitled "An Act to provide for the modernization of the energy policy of the United States, and for other purposes," and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

#### COMPOUND MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and the Presiding Officer appoint the following conferees: Senators MURKOWSKI, BARRASSO, RISCH, CORNYN, CANTWELL, WYDEN, and SANDERS.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby

move to bring to a close debate on the motion to disagree to the House amendment, agree to the request from the House for a conference, and the Presiding Officer appoint the following conferees: Senators Murkowski, Barrasso, Risch, Cornyn, Cantwell, Wyden, and Sanders with respect to S. 2012, an original bill to provide for the modernization of the energy policy of the United States, and for other purposes.

John McCain, John Cornyn, Marco Rubio, Deb Fischer, Rob Portman, Roger F. Wicker, Richard Burr, Joni Ernst, David Vitter, James M. Inhofe, Dean Heller, Pat Roberts, Lamar Alexander, Ron Johnson, Tom Cotton, Thom Tillis, Mitch McConnell.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that this cloture vote occur at 3:30 p.m. today, with the time from 2:15 p.m. until 2:30 p.m. controlled by Senator BOXER or her designee; further, that the time from 2:30 p.m. until 3 p.m. be controlled by the majority, and the time from 3 p.m. until 3:30 p.m. be equally divided between the two managers.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

#### RECENT TRAGEDIES IN MINNESOTA AND THE COUNTRY

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor today to remember those who have been affected by the tragic events in my State and across the country over the last week. I am here today to remember the loss, to share in the grief, and to stand with our community as we seek justice and healing and solutions together.

Last week was a tough week in Minnesota. There have been and there will be a lot of bleak moments, when all anyone can do is to hug their family and their friends and ask why. How can this happen? How can we make sense of the senseless? How can we go on as people and as a community that is hurting so badly?

But amidst all the horror, I also saw hope this weekend. Sunday, I spoke at Pilgrim Baptist Church in St. Paul, as well as Greater Friendship Missionary Baptist Church in Minneapolis. When I looked around that room, I saw the horror, the frustration, the anger, but I also saw the hope. Being there with the grieving members of our community gave me that hope because I knew that they supported one another, that their hearts must mend, that the neighborhoods must heal. I literally heard them talk about how the love they had within the walls of that church must go beyond to the greater community.

We have lost so many this week. What can you say to a mother whose precious baby boy—a 2-year-old—is killed in a drive-by shooting while sitting in his father's car in north Minneapolis? And what do you say to that same mother whose precious other child—the little boy's baby sister—was also injured by that gunfire?

What can you say to elementary school children who have suddenly lost that friendly face in the lunchroom who always gave them a smile, a kind word, a healthy snack? There are no words that can take away the pain of losing a beloved son, partner, and friend. Philando Castile was beloved—a “gentle soul,” in his mother's words. He loved the kids at his school, and they loved “Mr. Phil” right back. He knew all the kids' names. There were more than 500 of them. He learned who had allergies and who might need a little extra help. And, yes, with a little playful nagging, he got them to eat their vegetables. In short, he cared about them, and he let them know it. Everyone knew it. My State's outpouring of grief, especially from his school, and the love and support in the wake of his loss means something.

The loss of that little 2-year-old is also a powerful reminder that being a friend is never a wasted effort—that even the smallest kindness shown to the smallest person makes this world better.

Then there were the five officers lost in Dallas. Officer Brent Thompson had just gotten married a few weeks ago. His bride was a fellow transit officer. Officer Michael Smith served in the Dallas Police Department for 26 years and volunteered as a mentor to at-risk kids. Officer Patrick Zamarripa served three tours of duty in Iraq in the U.S. Navy. The only thing he loved more than the Texas Rangers and the Dallas Cowboys was his 2-year-old daughter, Lincoln.

How about the 21 police officers in St. Paul who were injured Saturday night? There were so many peaceful protests—and there continue to be peaceful protests—involving Black Lives Matter and other groups in our State over Philando Castile's death. That is part of our democracy. That is how we make change. But what happened on Saturday night on Highway 94 was far from a peaceful process. We cannot achieve justice through injustice.

So where do we go from here? We know that nothing we can say will take away the hurt, but here is what we can do to narrow the gap between us:

First, we must pursue justice. When I served for 8 years as Hennepin County attorney, which is the chief prosecutor of our county, the largest county in our State, I always believed that my job—and the principle we would use when we looked at a case—was to convict the guilty and protect the innocent. That is what justice calls us to do. That is why I have joined with other members of the Federal delegation—Senator FRANKEN, Congresswoman MCCOLLUM, and Congressman ELLISON—in calling for a Federal investigation into Philando Castile's death. We need to understand what happened and how we can prevent this from happening again. Philando, his family, and all those children who loved him deserve nothing less.

Second, we must fight for a criminal justice system that works for everyone. We all know people who have been caught up in a criminal justice system that can be harsh and unfair. It can do the right thing and it can protect victims, but it can also destroy individual people and it can pull families apart. That is why we must pass criminal justice reform. I have long supported important policy changes. My State was one of the first that videotaped interrogations, and that ended up being a good thing, not only for the defendants but actually for our police officers and those seeking convictions. I have supported reforms to the eyewitness process. I have supported body cameras, diversity in hiring, law enforcement resources and training—very important as we go ahead and look at what we should be focused on in the next year—and meaningful, meaningful work between law enforcement and our citizens.

What else do we need? In my mind, we need commonsense gun reform. I was proud to join my colleagues on the Senate floor demanding changes to make our communities safer. One of those changes, in addition to the terror watch list bill, was to make sure we find some kind of consensus on improving background checks. The Senate's failure to pass bipartisan background check legislation has been a big disappointment. Here we had two A-rated NRA Senators that came together. Senator TOOMEY as well as Senator MANCHIN came up with a bill that would have closed some loopholes that would have made it safer. We know that States that have those background checks in place have reduced rates of suicides by guns, and they also have reduced rates of domestic homicides. I still remember those Sandy Hook parents in my office advocating for that change in the bill. They knew that wouldn't have saved their babies, but they also knew it was one of the things that could best save lives going forward and could best bring consensus in this Chamber.

From my time as county attorney, I remember those little children lost to violence:

Byron Phillips was a little boy killed on his north Minneapolis front porch. We had to put up billboards in the community saying: If you know who killed me, come forward. Eventually, it worked, and we put the guy in jail.

Tyesha Edwards was killed by a bullet while doing her homework at her kitchen table. Her mom said: Get your homework done, and you can go out with us to the mall. That is how she died. Again, we put the guys that did it in jail, but that is not compensation for what happened to that family.

Americans from across the Nation and across the political spectrum support commonsense proposals. They support commonsense background checks closing the loophole at gun shows by wide margins. In honor of those we have lost in Charleston and Orlando,

San Bernardino, Newtown, Aurora, north Minneapolis, and cities across the Nation, I will continue to stand with my colleagues until we take action on these commonsense measures.

I am reminded of President Obama's beautiful words at a service remembering more Americans lost to gun violence—this time in Charleston, SC. He said this:

For too long, we've been blind to the unique mayhem that gun violence inflicts upon this nation. Sporadically, our eyes are open: When eight of our brothers and sisters are cut down in a church basement, 12 in a movie theater, 26 in an elementary school. But I hope we also see the 30 precious lives cut short by gun violence in this country every single day; the countless more whose lives are forever changed—the survivors crippled, the children traumatized and fearful every day as they walk to school, the husband who will never feel his wife's warm touch, the entire communities whose grief overflows every time they have to watch what happened to them happen to some other place.

My friends, we must stem the tide. But we also know that justice in our laws—which means the criminal justice reform that I noted earlier, which means commonsense gun reforms, which means making sure that these cases are investigated and the law is followed no matter what the victims' race or ethnic background or how much money they have—must happen to bring justice to these families. But the other part of this, as I look at our neighborhoods that are affected by this every single day, is economic justice. In the famous words of Dr. Martin Luther King:

We know that it isn't enough to integrate lunch counters. What does it profit a man to be able to eat at an integrated lunch counter if he doesn't earn enough money to buy a hamburger and a cup of coffee?

When we see lingering disparities—and “lingering” is kind of a nerdy word for what we are talking about here. When we see these disparities of economics, when we see health disparities, when we see far too many families working so hard but still struggling to get ahead, and stubborn achievement gaps in our schools, we know there is so much more work to do. The solutions here are a deep commitment to an economic future for the people that live in our cities, to make sure they have access to the jobs that are starting to open up all over this country, that they are trained—that we look at what is happening in their schools and make sure that the training they get matches jobs that are open. We have jobs all over our State now in technology, in science, in manufacturing and welding, and this is giving those kids hope—not just in community colleges and regular colleges, not just in high school, but in middle school—that they are going to be able to get one of these jobs. That is economic hope. It is about training our kids, keeping them in school, opening the doors of our businesses, big and small, to people of neighborhoods like the one that I was in yesterday in St. Paul.

Finally, we must all work to protect the innocents among us. That is what I started talking about—how we must convict the guilty and protect the innocent, especially our children. Two-year-olds should not be shot and killed on the streets of north Minneapolis. Four-year-olds should not watch a man die in the car seat right in front of them. Nobody should have to explain to a classroom of children why their beloved friend “Mr. Phil” doesn't feed them lunch anymore. We are better than this.

I recently visited a mosque in Minneapolis and heard the story of a Muslim family who had gone out to eat at a restaurant—two parents, two kids. The parents, by the way, had been through 9/11 and understood what had happened then but have been able to live in our community, where we have the largest Somali population in our country, without a lot of discrimination, without a lot of hateful words even after 9/11. But not this time. They were in the restaurant with their little kids, and a guy walked by and said: You four go home. You go home to where you came from.

The little girl looked up at her mom and said: Mom, I don't want to go home. You said we could eat dinner out tonight. I don't want to go home and eat dinner.

Those are the innocent words of a child. As sweet and funny as it is, think about this: She knows no other home. She didn't even know what that guy was talking about because she knows no other home, because Minnesota is her home, because the United States of America is her home.

America is better than angry words directed at strangers in a restaurant. America is better than babies being shot on the street in broad daylight. America is better than Philando Castile losing his life. And America is better than throwing concrete chunks at police officers in St. Paul and five Dallas cops being taken from their beat forever.

So I am here today to stand with the people who are not satisfied with how things are—the people who are ready to work to make things better, the people who are the helpers and the peace-makers. Together, we can make this world a better place, and more just.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senate will soon vote on the conference report for the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. The importance of this bill cannot be overstated. People are dying, families are suffering, communities are being torn apart. We can help, but we must do so now.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation, which passed in the House last week with only five votes in opposition. The bill is intended to address the growing national crisis with regard to opioid abuse and addiction.

The staggering statistics surrounding this issue are well known and are worth repeating. Every day, approximately 7,000 people show up in an emergency room for problems associated with opioid abuse. Every 30 minutes, on average, someone in our country dies from conditions that are opioid related.

My home State of Utah has been particularly hard hit. In 2014, 289 Utahans died due to opioid abuse. That is more than half of all drug overdose related deaths in the State. The CARA conference report represents a thoughtful set of policies that tackle the problems experienced by the real people—with families, children, and friends—who are represented by these statistics.

A letter signed by over 200 advocacy organizations supporting the conference report states that the report addresses the “six pillars” of a comprehensive response to drug addiction crises. These pillars are prevention, treatment, recovery support, criminal justice reform, overdose reversal, and law enforcement.

I am proud of the role I played in not only supporting the CARA effort but in helping to shape the conference report. As the chairman of the Finance Committee, it was important to me that the report include key improvements for Medicare in the fight against opioid abuse. I am glad to say we were successful in that regard. The legislation allows Medicare Part D prescription drug plans to identify only one physician to prescribe and one pharmacy to fill all of an at-risk patient's opioid prescriptions.

Senator TOOMEY, who has worked closely with Senator BROWN, has been an important leader on this policy. Both of them have been excellent. He should be commended for his work that, in the end, will improve patient care, reduce abuse, and give at-risk beneficiaries more opportunities to get the help they need.

Additionally, the conference report contains significant provisions related to medication-assisted treatment, or MAT, which has long been a priority for me. I have a long history of working to improve access to drugs like buprenorphine as a prescription treatment for opioid-use disorders, including heroin and prescription drug addiction.

I was the author, together with Senators LEVIN and BIDEN of the DATA 2000 law that first made it possible for patients to be prescribed buprenorphine. I would also like to note that colleagues like Senators MARKEY and PAUL have also been very able champions in our recent efforts to expand access to this effective drug treatment, including the introduction of legislation and our push to get the administration to use its regulatory authority to address this need.

Our efforts helped to encourage the drafting of an HHS rule that was finalized on July 6, the same day as the CARA conference meeting. This rule

raises an individual doctor's patient cap for buprenorphine from 100 patients to 275 patients. Thanks to these combined administrative and legislative efforts, patients will have greater access to the medication-assisted treatment they need in their recovery from substance abuse disorders.

I am pleased, as well, to see provisions included in this legislation that encourage the National Institutes of Health to intensify fundamental, translational, and clinical research on the understanding of pain. The hope is that this kind of research will lead to alternatives to opioids for effective pain treatment. These few lines within the legislation will have a significant influence on our understanding of how opioid abuse and chronic pain impact our families and communities.

Another set of highlights in the conference report are the provisions designed to protect infants born to mothers suffering from opioid addiction. Reuters reported that, roughly every 19 minutes, a child is born with an opioid dependency in the United States. That statistic is astounding.

My home State is not spared from this heartbreaking problem. A recent Utah Health Status Update indicated that, between 2009 and 2012, more than 100 babies each year tested positive for illicit drugs at birth. Once enacted, CARA will strengthen the existing plan of safe care for infants born and identified as affected by substance abuse or withdrawal symptoms, as well as fetal alcohol spectrum disorder. Hopefully, this will be an effective step to address what is a tragic problem for too many American children.

As you can see, these are issues that have been in need of sensible solutions for some time. As such, I wish to emphasize that the process that has brought us here to the precipice of passing CARA is nearly as impressive as the conference report itself.

Senator PORTMAN, from Ohio, long-time advocate on these issues, has worked tirelessly alongside Senator WHITEHOUSE, from Rhode Island, for roughly 3 years to shepherd this effort through the Senate. Those two gentlemen deserve a lot of credit and support, and I am glad that politics around this situation have been reduced so they can get this bill through.

Senator AYOTTE, who also deserves a tremendous amount of support and respect here, has also been a champion for those afflicted by these problems. Also, Senator AYOTTE deserves a lot of praise for all of her hard work. She understands this problem probably more than a lot of others, as her work in law enforcement helped her to do so. Senators PORTMAN, WHITEHOUSE, and AYOTTE heard from the individuals and families who are afflicted in dealing with these issues, and they did an outstanding job to craft policies to address these needs. All three of them deserve a great deal of respect and support.

Under Chairman GRASSLEY's leadership, CARA was reported out of the

Senate Judiciary Committee. He did a great job in committee. I was on the committee. The original bill then came to the Senate floor, where Senators were able to offer amendments. The Senate passed the amended version by a vote of 94 to 1.

A similar process played out in the House, with the House passing its opioid package by a vote of 400 to 5. I was pleased to serve on the conference committee that produced what should be the final draft of this report legislation. There were many similarities between the House and Senate bills, and we were able to resolve our few differences in a way that produced an improved CARA bill.

I want to commend Representative FRED UPTON, the chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee—he is a great friend of mine—who was instrumental to the House effort and who also very ably chaired the conference committee. FRED UPTON is one of the great people in this body, as are the others that I mentioned.

As I alluded to earlier, the House passed the conference report this past Friday by a vote of 407 to 5. In other words, over the past several months, there have been three major votes in the two congressional Chambers, and the support has been overwhelming. Counting every vote collectively, the bill has received around 900 yeas in Congress and less than a dozen nays. Do you know how many of those votes in opposition have been cast by a Democrat? One. A single House Democrat voted against passage of the original House opioid package. Every voting Democrat in the Senate voted in favor of our version of the bill. I commend them for that.

Last week, every House Democrat who was present voted in favor of the conference report. I commend them for that. I note these facts not to unduly inject partisanship into this discussion but because we have heard rumblings that a number of Senate Democrats may want to hold up the process in order to extract more concessions. Some have actually suggested that, despite regular order and the overwhelmingly bipartisan support this legislation has enjoyed thus far, Senate passage of the CARA conference report is in doubt. I find this hard to believe, and I hope it is not true.

A few weeks ago, the White House urged Democrats in Congress to "slow-down" the effort to finalize an opioid package. Thankfully, this was met appropriately with outrage. All of us, Republicans and Democrats, now have a tremendous opportunity to give vital assistance to many Americans in need and to do so with, hopefully, an almost unanimous voice. These days, we don't often get to do that around here. We should not let partisan politics get in the way of this pressing issue.

Like I said, more than 200 advocacy and stakeholder groups that have been involved throughout this process have urged passage of this conference report.

Individuals suffering from these afflictions, as well as their families and friends, are crying out for help. The House of Representatives heeded their call. The Senate must do the same.

I want to commend the majority leader for moving swiftly to bring this important legislation up for a vote. I think it is absolutely essential that we act before Congress breaks for the recess.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the CARA conference report. Let's send it to the President's desk this week and deliver results for those Americans who are depending on us.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

#### TRAGEDY IN DALLAS AND GUN POLICY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am coming to the floor once again to express my condolences to the families of those who were lost in Dallas—the families of Brent Thompson, Michael Krol, Patrick Zamarripa, Lorne Ahrens, and Michael Smith. In Connecticut, we know the ripples of loss that really never end in a community like Dallas and a community like Orlando. There is going to be a long period of healing. Our thoughts and our prayers and any help we can provide from those of us who represent Connecticut and Sandy Hook, specifically, extend to those in Dallas.

In the wake of another tragedy, I wanted to come down to the floor for a short period of time—I know my colleagues are waiting to speak—to talk about some of the very irresponsible rhetoric that gets tossed around when it comes to this debate over the future of gun policy in this country. I want to take 5 or 10 minutes to talk about what is the biggest lie used by the gun lobby in this debate, and it is this: The only thing that stops a bad guy with a gun, is a good guy with a gun.

This isn't true. It has never been true. It will never be true. It is, quite simply, an invention designed by the gun industry to sell more guns, to convince Americans that laws and rules cannot protect them, and that the only thing that can keep them safe from being shot is to buy expensive weapons and expensive ammunition that pad the profits of the big gun companies.

It is time we call this lie what it is. It is a marketing gimmick for gun companies, plain and simple: The only thing that stops a bad guy with a gun, is a good guy with a gun.

Let me be clear. I don't quarrel with anyone who decides to buy a weapon for self-defense. That is your decision. That is your call. Last week I met in my office with women from Connecticut who came to my office to tell me about their belief that owning a weapon is instrumental to their ability to protect themselves. One woman told me a story of repelling an attacker with a gun that was in her purse, and her sincere belief is she would not be alive today if it weren't for the weapon that was on her person.

I support the Second Amendment, and I accept that the Supreme Court has made it clear that this amendment protects the ability of anyone to buy a weapon for self-defense, subject to certain commonsense limitations. But if you are buying a weapon because you think that owning one makes you less likely to be killed by a gun, then you are wrong. If you are standing in the way of policies that crack down on illegal or dangerous weapons on our street because you believe in some kind of gun control Darwinism—a world in which the good guys with guns eventually shoot all the bad guys with guns—then you have it backwards because that is not how it works.

You know how I know this? Because study after study tells us that owning a gun makes you more likely to be killed by that gun than to use it to kill someone who threatens you. Studies show that in countries and States with more guns, there are generally not less gun deaths but more gun deaths, like the study in the *New England Journal of Medicine* that showed a gun in your house doesn't make you less likely to be killed. It isn't even risk neutral. Having a gun in your home actually increases your chance of getting killed by a gun by anywhere from 40 percent to 170 percent.

How about the study in the *American Journal of Epidemiology* that showed that people living in a house with a gun are 90 percent more likely to die from a homicide than a person who lives in a house without a gun.

What about the study from the Violence Policy Center that showed that instances of guns being used in self-defense are so rare that on average there are 44 criminal homicides with guns for every time a gun is used for protection in a justifiable homicide.

How about one more study. The Harvard Injury Control Research Center study showed that in States and communities with greater gun availability, gun homicide rates were higher, not lower, than in communities and States with lower gun availability. It is your decision whether or not to buy a gun. There are certainly instances where it may make sense, and I don't begrudge the individual who makes that decision, but the data tells us only one story. The actual real, live experience of living in a nation awash in guns shows that contrary to the gun lobby sloganeering, the opposite of their claim is actually true. The more good guys there are who have guns, the more good guys die from guns. We have no clear or more horrifying example of this truth than last weekend in Dallas, TX.

Texas is an open carry State, meaning that anyone who can legally buy a semiautomatic weapon can walk around the streets of Dallas or any other community with that weapon attached to them. Reports suggest that there were perhaps 30 people openly carrying AR-15-style weapons at Saturday's protest. Some were also wearing

camouflage, bulletproof vests, and gas masks. There were also dozens and dozens of police officers on hand, all of them expertly trained and heavily armed. Between the 30 heavily armed civilians and dozens of police officers, there were more good guys with guns in the vicinity of this one very bad guy with a gun than at nearly any other crime scene in recent memory, and it led to chaos.

Here is what Dallas Police Chief Brown said in the wake of the shooting:

We're trying as best we can as a law enforcement community to make it work so that citizens can express their Second Amendment rights, but it's increasingly challenging when people have AR-15s slung over their shoulder and they're in a crowd. We don't know who the good guy is versus the bad guy when everyone starts shooting.

All of those guns in the hands of good-hearted civilians and trained police officers—and what killed the sniper, Micah Johnson? It wasn't a gun. It was an explosive device attached to the end of a robot on wheels. Eleven brave police officers fired their weapons at Micah Johnson. Dozens of armed civilians theoretically had the opportunity to defend themselves and their fellow protesters, but one deranged man, armed with an antique rifle and 30-round magazines strategically positioned above his targets, was unharmed by all of those good guys with guns, just as Jared Lee Loughner was unharmed by a civilian with a gun in the parking lot of the supermarket where he shot Congresswoman Gabby Giffords in the head, and just as the armed security guard in Pulse nightclub couldn't do anything about Omar Matteen as he executed 49 young men and women. It is just like what happened to Nancy Lanza, who thought the guns in her home would protect her and her son from harm, only for them to be used by her son to murder her in her sleep and then massacre 20 first graders and 6 of their educators.

If you want to buy a gun for self-defense, that is your call, but before making that purchase, understand that the gun lobby is lying to you. If a bad guy has a gun and wants to kill, there is very little that can be done to stop him once the tragedy is in motion. The best policy is to stop madmen and killers from getting these dangerous weapons in the first place.

Dallas Police Chief Brown said to us:

Do your job. We are doing ours. We're putting our lives on the line. The other aspects of government need to step up and help us.

When Connecticut implemented a law requiring a permit to be issued before a gun is issued, gun homicides dropped by 40 percent. In States that require background checks for private handgun sales—listen to this—48 percent fewer law enforcement officers are shot to death by handguns, and in States with universal background checks, women are 46 percent less likely to be shot by their intimate partner than in States without universal checks.

This isn't conjecture. Good laws save lives. Concentrate on passing laws that keep dangerous weapons out of the hands of criminals and killers, and you will save lives. Load up your streets, schools, and shopping malls with weapons and just hope that the good guys will eventually outshoot the bad guys, and people will be killed.

People across this country have figured it out, and that is why they support expanded background checks by an astounding ratio of 90 percent to 10 percent. There is no public policy in this country that is supported by 90 percent of Americans. They know that smart firearms laws save lives, and so they support universal background checks by a ratio of 9 to 1. It is also why there are fewer and fewer American families buying guns. It makes sense for some people, and I am not denying that. A new CBS News poll shows that gun ownership is at a near 40-year low with only 36 percent of Americans reporting that they own a gun. That is down 17 points from its highest rate in 1994 and down a whopping 10 points from just 4 years ago, but be forewarned, this development will simply propel the gun lobby to be even bolder in spreading its lies about the effects of gun ownership.

Just two weekends ago the head of the NRA went on national TV and told Americans that the only way to protect themselves from terrorism is to have a personal defense plan. That means, if you didn't parse his words, to go out and buy a gun from a gun company and help the industry stem this tide of declining gun ownership all in the name of collective self-defense. Well, it is a lie. Good guys with guns generally don't stop bad guys with guns. They didn't in Dallas. Good laws that keep illegal and dangerous weapons off of our streets, that make sure that only law-abiding, peaceful citizens are obtaining weapons—those laws stop bad guys. When you strip away all of the rhetoric driven by the gun industry profit motivations, that is the truth.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. 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. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks.

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

FAA REAUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, over the past 4 months, the Islamic State has carried out two deadly terrorist attacks at airports. Taken together, these two attacks—one at Brussels Airport and one at Istanbul's Ataturk Airport—resulted in more than 500 injuries and more than 70 deaths.



Since September 11, airport security efforts have emphasized securing aircraft against hijackings, but the Brussels and Istanbul bombings highlight other airport security vulnerabilities. As these attacks demonstrate, it is not just planes that are vulnerable. Both the Brussels and Istanbul attacks sought to exploit the largely unprotected areas outside the principal security checkpoints where the attackers could detonate bombs outside of screening. The large crowds of people who congregate in nonsecured areas of an airport—like security checkpoints, check-in counters, and baggage claim—make appealing targets for terrorists who like nothing better than maximum loss of life with minimum effort.

This week, the Senate will take up the Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization bill, which will directly address the vulnerabilities exposed by these attacks. It will ensure that attacks like those that happened in Brussels and Istanbul don't happen at American airports.

While this bill has gained new urgency in the wake of the bombings in Istanbul and Brussels, the reforms in this bill are not a hasty response to these attacks. Instead, they are the product of months of Commerce Committee oversight of our Nation's transportation safety agencies and extensive Commerce Committee analysis of airport security vulnerabilities.

I am proud that the bill we are considering today is the most significant airport security reform bill that Congress has considered in a decade. As I have already mentioned, one problem that the Brussels and Istanbul attacks highlighted in great detail is the tempting terrorist target offered by large crowds of people in unsecured areas of airports. The FAA bill addresses that problem in a number of ways. For starters, this bill includes provisions to get more Americans enrolled in the TSA's PreCheck program. Expanding enrollment in PreCheck will reduce wait times at security, which will help reduce the size of crowds waiting in unsecured areas.

The bill also directs the TSA to more effectively deploy its personnel during high-volume travel times to speed up wait time at checkpoints. It also requires the TSA to develop and test new security systems that expedite the movement of passengers through security. Another important measure we can take to prevent attacks like those in Brussels and Istanbul is increasing the security presence in unsecured areas of airports.

The FAA bill adds more prevention and response security teams, which often include K-9 units, and expands training for local airport security personnel so the airports are better able to deter or respond to bombers or active shooter threats. Increasing security at our Nation's airports and expediting security checks will go a long way toward preventing terrorist attacks, but threats at U.S. airports are

not only threats facing U.S. airline passengers. Americans travel internationally on a regular basis, and on their return flights they depend on the quality of airport security in other countries. Part of protecting the traveling public is making sure that Americans traveling to other countries are safe when they return to the United States.

To increase security for Americans traveling abroad, the FAA bill that we will pass this week authorizes the TSA to donate unneeded screening equipment to foreign airports with direct flights to the United States. It will strengthen cooperation between U.S. security officials and security officials in other countries and authorize the TSA to support training for foreign airport security personnel. It requires the TSA to conduct assessments of security that have received less attention at foreign airports and foreign cargo security programs.

Another aspect of airport security that has received less attention but is equally important is the need to make sure that individuals who work behind the scenes at airports don't pose a threat. In October of 2015, terrorists killed 224 people when they brought down Russian Metrojet flight 9268 shortly after it departed Sharm el-Sheikh airport in Egypt. Many experts believe that the terrorists responsible had help from an airport worker. Ensuring that airport workers are trustworthy is essential to keeping passengers safe. However, at times the security badges that permit individuals to work behind the scenes at airports have been issued to individuals who have no business holding them. Right now in the United States individuals with convictions for crimes, including embezzlement, sabotage, racketeering, immigration violations, and assault with a deadly weapon can all obtain security badges granting them access to restricted sections of an airport.

While most criminals are not terrorists, there are too many criminals who, for the right price, would happily expand their criminal activities even if it involved assisting terrorists. In fact, in March of this year, an airline ramp agent was arrested in a Florida airport with \$282,400 in cash that he allegedly intended to hand off to an unknown individual. News reports indicated that he was aware the money was connected to illegal activity but knew little else. In other words, he could easily have been transporting money to terrorists without being any the wiser.

The FAA bill that we will pass this week tightens vetting of anyone with access to secure areas of an airport and expands the list of criminal convictions that could disqualify someone from holding a security badge. This bill also provides for an increase in random searches of behind-the-scenes airport workers who are not always subject to security screening the way passengers are.

I am very proud of everything this FAA bill achieves in terms of security.

This is the most comprehensive airport security package in a decade, and it will help us make real progress toward keeping airline passengers safer, and that is not all.

In addition to its robust security package, this bill puts in place a number of other important measures, among them new consumer protections. For example, this legislation will require airlines to refund package fees for lost or unreasonably delayed baggage so passengers will not have to spend a ton of time tracking down a refund when the airline doesn't deliver. It will also make sure airlines have policies that will help families traveling with children sit together on flights. It also takes steps to improve air travel for individuals with disabilities, and it ensures that Americans in rural areas will continue to have access to reliable air service.

The bill also takes measures to support the general aviation community. It streamlines the requirements for the third-class medical certificate for non-commercial pilots so private pilots don't face unnecessary bureaucracy when obtaining their medical qualification, and to reduce the risk of accidents for low-altitude fliers like agricultural applications, the bill requires highly visible markings on small towers that could impose a hazard to pilots.

On the aviation safety front, this bill updates current law to reflect the rapid advances in technology we have seen over the last few years—most notably drones. This bill includes provisions to deploy technology that will work to keep drones out of the path of airliners, which is particularly important given reports of near-miss collisions by airline pilots. It will also deter drone operators from interfering with emergency response efforts like wildfire suppression, and, in addition to fostering drone safety, this bill authorizes expanded research opportunities and operations that will further the integration of drones into our Nation's airspace.

Since we took control of the Senate in January of 2015, Republicans have focused on passing legislation to address the challenges facing the American people in our country. I am proud that with this bill, we have found a way to make our increasingly dangerous world a little safer for Americans. I am grateful to my colleagues who contributed to this bill, particularly my Democratic counterpart in the conference committee, Senator NELSON.

Senator AYOTTE also led numerous subcommittee hearings in the Aviation Subcommittee to get the bill on a path to success, and both of us appreciate the contributions of Senator CANTWELL, our Aviation Subcommittee ranking member.

This bill is an example of what can happen when Democrats and Republicans work together to get things done for the American people. I look forward

to sending our legislation to the President for his signature later this week.

UNITED STATES APPRECIATION FOR OLYMPIANS  
AND PARALYMPIANS BILL

Mr. President, I also wish to speak for just a moment, if I can today, about a bill that hopefully will pass the Senate later today as well.

In just a few weeks, our Olympic athletes will head to Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, for the 2016 Olympic games. The following month, America's Paralympic athletes will compete in the Rio Paralympic games. These athletes represent what is best about our country. They embody the timeless values of hard work, dedication, and sportsmanship.

Our Olympic and Paralympic athletes—and their families—have made innumerable sacrifices over the many years of training it takes to become a world-class competitor. Training is not cheap, and the vast majority of our amateur athletes put it all on the line without the help of sponsors or endorsement deals to subsidize their expenses.

Many of these athletes have spent virtually their entire lives training for this moment, and I have absolutely no doubt these brave young men and women will represent our Nation with great honor and distinction.

America's Olympic and Paralympic medal winners, in particular, will be greeted with much enthusiasm and great appreciation upon their return. Local communities across America will find ways to honor their returning hometown heroes. Unfortunately, one of the ways the Federal Government will welcome home our Olympic and Paralympic champions is by greeting them with a new tax bill. That is right. The Internal Revenue Service considers these medals to be income and will tax the value of any gold, silver, or bronze medal awarded in competition as well as any incentive award our athletes receive from the U.S. Olympic Committee.

I believe this tax penalty on our Olympic heroes is wrong, and that is why earlier this year I introduced S. 2650, the United States Appreciation for Olympians and Paralympians Act.

This legislation—introduced with Senators SCHUMER, GARDNER, GILLIBRAND, and ISAKSON—would ensure that America rewards the sacrifice and hard work of Team USA by exempting from Federal tax the medals and cash prizes they win at the Olympics and Paralympics.

I am pleased my legislation will pass the Senate later today, sending a strong signal to our athletes as they depart to the 2016 games that their Nation stands behind them. I urge the House of Representatives to take up and pass this legislation before the House adjourns for the August recess.

America's Olympic and Paralympic athletes deserve not only our admiration and respect but also a tax system that acknowledges the many years of training and sacrifice they have en-

ured. Because training for the Olympics is not considered a business enterprise, our athletes cannot deduct the substantial costs they incur over the years as they prepare to represent America on the world stage.

Most countries not only compensate their athletes but also subsidize their training expenses with taxpayer dollars. Our athletes make considerable financial sacrifices to train for the Olympics and Paralympics and as amateurs receive no compensation for their training. The very least we can do is ensure they don't receive a tax penalty when they successfully represent our Nation in the highest level of athletic competition.

Simply put, when it comes to our victorious Olympic and Paralympic athletes, we should celebrate their achievements rather than tax their success.

CONGRATULATING PAIGE MCPHERSON

Mr. President, I would also like to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations and best wishes to one of Team USA's shining stars; that is, South Dakota's own Paige McPherson.

Paige grew up in Sturgis, SD, graduating from Black Hills Classical Christian Academy in 2009. She will be competing in Taekwondo at the Rio games and will be striving for her second medal in a row, after claiming a bronze medal at the London Olympic Games in 2012.

I know Paige will represent America—and South Dakota—with great distinction next month, as will all of our Olympic and Paralympic competitors.

I wish to thank the original cosponsors of my legislation, whom I mentioned earlier, as well as Finance Committee Chairman HATCH and Senators SULLIVAN and MORAN for their support. I look forward to seeing our legislation enacted into law this year, and I wish all of our Olympians and Paralympians the very best of luck in Rio.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:53 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

ENERGY POLICY MODERNIZATION  
ACT OF 2015—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2:30 p.m. will be controlled by the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER, or her designee; the time from 2:30 p.m. to 3 p.m. will be controlled by the majority; and the time from 3 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. will be controlled by the two managers.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 15 minutes.

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

TRAGEDY OF VIOLENCE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I stand here as one of the two Senators from the largest State in the Union to recognize that there is a hole in the heart of America today as we cope with the tragedy of violence on all sides. I am working on comprehensive remarks because I am doing it more, in a way, for myself, and those are not prepared right now, but right now I want to send my deepest condolences to those who are suffering, who have lost loved ones, be those loved ones police officers or community members, and for that matter, so many Americans, so many American families who suffer losses because of violence every day. It is critical that we address this issue. I compliment the voices on all sides—the voices of compassion, reason, and love—and I hope I can add my voice to their voices.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. President, what several of us are doing on another topic is calling attention to the web of denial that is being peddled in our Nation by special interests and their think tanks and organizations that are working to undermine peer-reviewed climate science. Their goal is to create uncertainty and to delay action on the biggest environmental and public health threat we face today.

Climate change is real, human activities are the primary cause, and the warming planet poses a significant threat to our people and to our environment. That is not my opinion. I am the first one to say I am not a scientist. I rely on scientists, and 97 percent of them have said that climate change is real and human activity is the primary cause.

The level of scientific certainty on manmade climate change is about the same as the consensus among top scientists that cigarettes are deadly, but some of you may remember that up until the late 1990s, the tobacco industry scoffed at the best available science proving that tobacco is addictive and causes cancer. No one in today's world would argue with the fact that tobacco is addictive and causes cancer. In the 1990s, there was a campaign of denial, just as there is for climate change now. Year after year, the tobacco industry attacked the science that showed the link between cigarettes and the threat to human health, as well as the Surgeon General's warning that nicotine was as addictive as heroin and cocaine. Let me share a few of the statements made by or on behalf of the tobacco industry.

In 1970, the Tobacco Institute advertised that the scientific finding that proved a connection between cigarette smoking and lung cancer was wrong. They said: "The Tobacco Institute does not—and the public should not—accept these claims at face value."

In 1971, Joseph Cullman, the chairman of Philip Morris, said: "We do not

believe cigarettes are hazardous; we don't accept that."

In 1988, a lobbyist from the Tobacco Institute submitted written testimony for a congressional hearing stating: "In sum, there is no medical or scientific basis for viewing cigarette smoking as an 'addiction.' The effort to disparage cigarette smoking as an 'addiction' can only detract from our society's attempt to meet its serious drug problem." That was what the cigarette companies said.

At congressional hearings in 1994, executives from the seven biggest tobacco companies testified that they believed nicotine was not addictive. Do you remember the picture of them swearing to that fact?

A tobacco industry doctor said: "The proposed addiction warning and the assumption upon which it is founded are based neither in science nor fact and will have unintended harmful results." This is the tobacco company doctor saying that if you warn people, it will have unintended harmful results. Sure—for his bosses, the tobacco companies, who are paying his salary.

In 1998, Walker Merryman, vice president and chief spokesman for the Tobacco Institute, said: "We don't believe it has ever been established that smoking is the cause of disease."

The reason I spent so much time going through that painful history is that a lot of people died of cancer because the tobacco companies and their think tanks would not tell the truth to the American people. That is why a lot of people died.

At the end of the day, the tobacco companies failed, but there are so many bodies out there because of their heavily funded propaganda campaign. When the people knew the truth, America's smoking dropped from 42 percent in 1964 to 15 percent in 2015. To anybody out there who is still addicted, I pray God that they will get help. There are very few things where we know the cause and effect. We know the cause and effect of smoking—it is not good.

Investigative reporting has clearly shown that those who led the fight against health warnings on tobacco have been involved in the climate denial movement from the beginning. Just as Big Tobacco denied that smoking was dangerous to people's health, Big Oil and other special interests have tried to undermine scientists' warnings about harmful climate pollution by claiming that climate change does not exist.

So we had Big Tobacco spreading the big lie that smoking was non-addictive—they even said at one point that it was good for you—and Big Oil telling us that there is no climate change, that it is a hoax. But if we look at the 97 percent of scientists, what have they told us we are going to see? Higher temperatures, more extreme weather, severe droughts, increased wildfires, decreasing polar ice, and rising sea levels. That is what 97 percent of the scientists said would happen. Guess what. It is happening.

Don't take my word for it. Let me give specifics. Mr. President, 2015 was the hottest year on record. Every month of this year continues to set records. Sea levels are rising many times faster than they have in the last 2,800 years. The 2015 wildfire season was the costliest on record, with \$1.71 billion spent. California, my fantastic home State, is suffering from its worst drought in modern history, and scientists are predicting megadroughts. Rising temperatures are expected to worsen air quality and threaten public health.

The American public sees what is happening, and they understand the need to act. Seventy-one percent of Americans supported the historic Paris agreement to address climate change by reducing harmful carbon pollution. A March 2016 Gallup Poll shows that 64 percent of Americans—the highest percentage since 2008—are worried about climate change. Gallup also found that between 2009 and 2015, a decline in public concern about climate change was linked to a well-publicized campaign of misinformation about climate science.

The fossil fuel industry took a page right out of the tobacco company's playbook, supporting a network of organizations that create a false sense of uncertainty. So let me tell you that I have joined my colleagues on a resolution condemning the effort by the fossil fuel industry to discredit climate science, just as the tobacco industry worked to discredit science that proved tobacco causes cancer.

I want to work with my colleagues to call attention to this web of denial. There are organizations out there—they have beautiful names. They are funded by ExxonMobil, they are funded by the Koch brothers, and organizations like DonorsTrust, which hides the identities of funders and was called the Dark Money ATM in the press. Dark money is a good description because the deep pockets of Big Oil and other special interests have been misleading the American people for many years.

As I close my presentation, I want to talk to you briefly about three organizations based in my home State: the Reason Foundation, the Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy, and the Hoover Institution. These three organizations have been involved in efforts to undermine climate science.

The Reason Foundation has been churning out materials to raise uncertainty. The Hoover Institution, which is affiliated with Stanford University—which has so many wonderful things to commend it, but in my opinion not this—has been identified by the researchers as part of the climate countermovement. I have great respect for the work former Secretary of State George Shultz and others are doing at Hoover. However, I have to point out many articles published under Hoover's name have created uncertainty about climate science, trying to undermine the need for action.

The third organization is Pacific Research Institute, which is a free market think tank that published a number of anti-climate science materials, including the "Almanac of Environmental Trends." Just last month, 31 major scientific organizations basically said there is strong evidence that ongoing climate change is having broad negative impacts on society, including natural resources, the global economy, and human health.

For the United States, climate change impacts include greater threats of extreme weather, sea level rise, increased risk of regional water scarcity, heat waves, wildfires, disturbance of biological systems. We expect to see this increase. This is what the real scientists are saying, the ones who care about our people, our environment. They don't get their paychecks from Big Oil and those who stand to lose if we turn to clean energy.

So the scientists who work for that money from the Koch brothers, this is what they say: The world is warming far less quickly than we thought. A little warming will also extend growing seasons. Now consider the dire prediction regarding global warming and think of climate like golf. It is easy to see where the ball has landed but difficult to construct a model to predict with much confidence where the next ball will land.

We have many other comments by these sham groups that are funded by Big Oil, by the special interests, just like the tobacco industry had think tanks that supported them. You know, fool me once, OK. Fool me again, I am going to find out. We know about these organizations.

ExxonMobil gave a total of \$381,000 to Reason; \$295,000 to Hoover; \$615,000 to the Pacific Research Institute—ExxonMobil. Foundations associated with the Koch brothers provided more than \$1 million to the Reason Foundation and to the Pacific Research Institute. So we know what is going on here, but there is good news. The American people are not asleep at the wheel. They understand what happened with Big Tobacco. They understand the phony science that was put forward by Big Tobacco. Thanks to the leadership of my colleague SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, who has done an extraordinary job—he knows the truth. He knows the truth that these organizations are puppets of the big fossil fuel industry. You know what. They are going to be found out.

The people already do not, in any way, support them. That is why I am optimistic and came to the floor today. The truth will have its day. The people understand. They look out the window and they know.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy for 30 minutes with the Senators from Montana, North Carolina, and Iowa.

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS  
BILL

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, last week we had a lot going on in terms of national security and foreign policy facing our country and, most importantly, facing our troops, facing our military. The President, the Secretary of Defense, the top leaders in the military were asking a lot of our troops in 1 week. Let me just give you a little example of that.

Just yesterday, Secretary of Defense Ash Carter announced, from where he is in Iraq, that the United States will be deploying 560 more troops to Iraq in our fight against ISIS. Make no doubt about it, the White House might spin what we are doing over there, but our troops are definitely in combat, fighting to protect us.

At the NATO summit on Friday, President Obama announced that the United States will be deploying an additional 1,000 troops and a separate brigade headquarters to Poland. A lot of us—I think bipartisan—support what is going on at the NATO summit and congratulate the President for a successful summit.

On Wednesday, the President announced he plans to leave 8,400 American troops in Afghanistan—more than he originally planned, a number that a lot of us had been advocating for, maybe even more—to combat the Taliban; again, our troops in action.

On Saturday, we learned that North Korea launched a submarine ballistic missile off the coast of the eastern part of the country. Over the weekend, the Wall Street Journal reported that even after reaching the Iran nuclear deal, the Iranians continue to try to illegally procure nuclear equipment from Germany. Finally, just today, there was an important ruling from The Hague, the tribunal there, about what is going on in the South China Sea, in keeping sealanes open where we just recently had two carrier battle groups—two U.S. carrier battles groups, thousands of sailors in that part of the world.

So what did the Senate do with regard to all the activities facing our troops? What did the Senate do to support these troops whom the President and the Secretary of Defense are asking so much of? Well, a lot of Americans did not see it, but in the late night, on Thursday night, led by the minority leader, unfortunately our colleagues on the other side of the aisle filibustered defense spending, filibustered the Defense appropriations bill.

This is not the first time that has happened. Indeed, that is the bill the other side seems to like to target. Amazingly, they like to target funding for our troops and our military. That is not the first time. It is not the second time. It is not the third time. It is the fourth time, inside of a year, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle filibustered funding our troops, at a

time when national security challenges and what we are asking our military to do are at an alltime high.

What I want to do with my colleagues is talk about this, try to let the American people know this is not what we should be doing. Perhaps the media will talk about this and highlight this a little bit more because we are going to vote again on this appropriations bill, which, by the way, came out of committee unanimously. The Democrats on the committee voted for it.

Yet, somehow, when it comes to the floor, they are going to do another filibuster. They did it last Thursday. It is our hope—and one of the reasons we are on the floor right now—to convince our colleagues to change their ways. I am sure they don't want to have to go home after recess and have to explain to their constituents why they voted not once, not twice, not three times, not four times but five times to filibuster spending for our troops. I hope they don't have to do that. We are going to vote on that again this week.

I am honored to be on the floor with some distinguished Members of the Senate, some of the Members of the class of 2014. I am going to ask the junior Senator from Iowa—who knows a little bit about what she is talking about when it comes to the U.S. military, with 23 years of military service, having just retired as a lieutenant colonel in the Iowa National Guard. I am honored to have her open up and say some words about something that is remarkable that is going on, on the Senate floor—filibustering the spending for our troops at this dangerous time.

It is not what we should be doing. Our colleagues know it. I guarantee you the American people know it. If you ask people, Democratic or Republican: Should we be funding our troops at this moment, the answer, clearly, in every State and every part of the country, would be yes.

Senator ERNST.

Mrs. ERNST. I say thank you to Senator SULLIVAN, the distinguished Senator from Alaska. Thank you for your passion as well. You have served in the Marines, in the Marine Reserves. I thank you for that, for your dedication and your commitment to our United States of America through your service as a marine and now through your service in the Senate.

We are also joined by the Senators from Montana and from North Carolina. I would like to thank my colleagues for joining in a colloquy. The filibuster we have seen on the other side of the aisle sends a message to our troops that we don't care about their security, and we don't care about the Nation's security. We must fund our troops, at a time when, as you stated, the world is virtually imploding.

We see actions going on all around the globe, whether it is from North Africa into Iraq, Syria, North Korea, China, Iran, Afghanistan. We could go

on and on, where our troops are needed for safety and security, where they are needed to keep the fight away from our homeland.

So I thank everyone who is joining in today. I appreciate the thoughts we will be sharing with our constituents and with the audience we have. Hopefully, we will see this projected nationwide, with an outcry of outrage that the Democrats are blocking—are daring to block funding for our national security.

This is a bipartisan bill—a bipartisan bill. The Senate version cleared out of our Senate Appropriations Committee by a vote of 30 to 0, Democrats and Republicans. We came together, bipartisan, 30 to 0.

In total, this bill appropriates \$515.9 billion for our national security. Some \$900 million of this is funding for the National Guard, a critical arm to the security of the United States and where I ended my 23-plus-year career last November in the Iowa Army National Guard.

In fact, my old unit, the battalion I commanded in the Iowa Army National Guard, that battalion headquarters is currently forward-deployed. So the men and women I served alongside, they are out there protecting our freedoms. They are out there securing an area far away from home. They are doing it not just for me and not just for the Senators who are here, but they are doing that for all of you.

The fact that we would reject funding for our forward-deployed troops is appalling to me. Those are my brothers and sisters. These are my friends, my neighbors, my colleagues. They are fighting on behalf of the United States. The United States is now turning its back, with a filibuster, on these troops. So how dare our colleagues block a bill to fund our military, while our troops are forward-deployed. They are out on our frontlines.

I know my colleague from Montana has had some troops who have just recently returned. I know he would like to join us in this discussion as well.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Alaska. I also want to thank Lieutenant Colonel and Senator ERNST for her service to our Nation. Senator ERNST is the first female combat veteran to ever serve in the Senate. It is an honor to serve with her, and I thank her for her service to our country both as a soldier as well as a Senator.

As I speak today, my friends from across the aisle have already—not once, not twice, but three times—blocked consideration of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act of 2017, which will deny our troops the proper funding and support they deserve. I am proud to be standing here with some of my freshmen colleagues, imploring my friends on the other side of the aisle to stop the political games and get back to work, and that starts with funding our military.

We shouldn't be playing these petty political games on legislation that is

and should be historically bipartisan. In fact, this bill, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, passed the House of Representatives in June on a bipartisan vote of 282 to 138, and that included 48 Democrats. That is a very strong bipartisan vote. Over on the Senate side—as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I recall it clearly—it passed our committee 30 to 0. That is called running up the score—30 to 0 out of the Committee on Appropriations on May 26. Not one Democrat opposed this bill in committee. I ask my colleagues: What in the world has changed? Why did we go from 30 to 0 in the committee and now we are seeing a filibuster here on the floor of the Senate?

Just so we are all clear, when Senate Democrats vote no, here is what they are saying no to: 1.2 million military Active-Duty servicemembers and 800,000 reservists. They are saying no to 10,000 troops engaged in combat in Afghanistan and the additional military in harm's way in Iraq, Syria, and other places throughout the world.

We are seeing ISIS expanding into places like Libya. They are attacking Western targets like Paris, Brussels, and the homeland here, in places like San Bernardino and Orlando. We need to make sure our military forces have the tools they need to win. As Senator MARCO RUBIO once said: It is either we win or they win. There is no middle ground here. Let us give them the tools they need to win. I can tell you one thing: Our enemies are not waiting around for Senate Democrats to fund our military to make it a fair fight.

This bill provides money to replace the munitions and other consumable items being used to defend America against the likes of ISIS, Al Qaeda, and the Taliban. Passing this also gives confidence to our Eastern European allies.

Back in my home State of Montana, we have a rich legacy of service. I am the son of a U.S. marine. My dad served in the 50th Rifle Company in Billings, MT. In fact, our Nation's "peace through strength" strategy can be seen clearly at Montana's Malmstrom Air Force Base. You see, up in Montana, we have one-third of the Nation's intercontinental ballistic missiles. We play a critical role in meeting our Nation's security and military needs. In fact, I have the utmost faith—and always do—in the 1,200 defenders at Malmstrom that provide security for the missiles that silently sit across Montana. I know these airmen will not fail our Nation, but Washington, DC is failing them. Senate Democrats are failing them, and that is unacceptable.

At Malmstrom, the motto on the commander's coin says this: "Scaring the hell out of America's enemies since 1962." And they do so because this body chose duty over politics.

So how can Democrats continue to stand here and say no to our military when so much is at stake, when the House passed a bipartisan bill, when

this body passed a bill by a unanimous vote of 30 to 0 out of committee? We must say yes to our military who fight for us every day and say no to petty politics in Washington, DC. We must stand up for the rights and the freedoms we enjoy. Senate Democrats, stop saying no. Let us debate the DOD appropriations bill.

Finally, I urge my Senate colleagues across the aisle to have the courage to vote against the wishes of their leaders and help us move this legislation forward.

Again, I am proud to stand here with some of my Senate freshmen colleagues and the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, THOM TILLIS. I know Senator TILLIS has some real concerns about what is going on here on the Senate floor.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I want to thank my friends and colleagues from Montana, Alaska, and Iowa for being here. I particularly want to thank Lieutenant Colonel ERNST for her service. She is now a veteran, but she served bravely. I want to thank my friend from Alaska. He is a marine, and he still answers the call. He is doing the work here in the Senate, but he is prepared to go on a moment's notice wherever we have to go to defend freedom.

I come from North Carolina. This is almost getting personal with me. I am going to talk a little bit about that, but I want to explain to the people who may be watching this on television or to those in the Senate Gallery what we are talking about.

We use the word filibuster, and it is kind of hard to understand, but it is actually pretty straightforward. The Democratic conference has decided to say no to funding our troops. They have decided to say no to providing them a much deserved pay raise. They have decided to say no to funding important training that is necessary to make sure they can complete these highly dangerous and complex missions wherever a threat may occur.

Now, why is it personal to me in North Carolina? Because I have about 100,000 Active-Duty personnel in North Carolina. Fort Bragg in North Carolina is the home of the Global Response Force. That is the base that gets the call from the President when, on a moment's notice, we may have to send hundreds or thousands of men and women to drop out of airplanes anywhere in the world. It is not just jumping out with a parachute. It is jumping out with a hundred pounds of equipment attached to them, it is dropping earthmovers, weather stations, a small city operation anywhere in the world to support a relief effort or to support a combat mission. That takes training. That takes constant training. It takes hours and hours of training to make sure they can complete their mission but, even as important, to make sure they do it safely and that they themselves do not get injured or killed in the process.

Now, we have already heard it said multiple times before, but I think it bears repeating. Why on Earth would the minority leader prevent us from moving to a vote? A filibuster is nothing more than saying no to sending this bill to the President's desk, after 30 Democratic members in the Appropriations Committee said yes. We only need six of them to move this bill to the President's desk.

I guess the minority leader has a hammerlock on all of the Members who want to vote for this bill. They won't come to the floor and show the courage and commitment to the men and women in uniform to do the right thing. That is where we are. That is why it is personal to me.

What do I tell the 100,000 Active-Duty military in North Carolina when I go home? I am sorry, but the minority leader has decided you are not a priority, in spite of the fact that we go to Committee on Armed Services hearings weekly and we hear the threat level has never been greater and in spite of the fact that we see the rise of ISIS across all of the Middle East, now in Europe, and it is threatening our homeland.

In spite of all of these threats, we tell the men and women in uniform and their commanders that politics win over the principle of funding our troops and saving our Nation and protecting our Nation. I think that is despicable.

We know we have enough votes to send this bill to the President because they voted for it before. We only need a third of them to vote for this now and send it to the President's desk.

I could go on, and if we have time, I hope Senator SULLIVAN will ask me some questions because I have spent a lot of time down at Camp Lejeune and Fort Bragg. Ask me about whether or not the leader of FORSCOM and the leaders down there responsible for the 82nd Airborne Division and the XVIII Airborne Corps think they have enough money and they can keep our men and women safe. Ask them about the conditions at Camp Lejeune and the conditions we ask these men and women to serve in after we tell them we are not going to give you money to keep you safe so that you can complete your mission.

This is politics at its worst. We need to send this bill to the President's desk. We need to show respect for the men and women who have sworn an oath to lay down their life for the cause of freedom. This is a failure on the part of the minority leader and on the part of any other person who would sit there and refuse to move to a bill that every single one of them in the Appropriations Committee supported.

I appreciate Senator SULLIVAN's elevating this dialogue to the extent that he will, and we shouldn't stop until we fulfill the promise that is our first and foremost constitutional obligation, which is to protect this Nation. The



people voting against this bill and preventing it from getting to the President's desk, in my opinion, are failing to live up to their oath.

I want to thank Senator SULLIVAN and Senator ERNST again for their service, and I thank my colleague for bringing this to the attention of the American people.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I thank Senator TILLIS, and he put his finger on it when he said it is personal. I think it is personal to all of us.

Senator ERNST talked about it. She literally has her former colleagues, the troops she commanded, in Afghanistan right now. There is nothing more personal than that.

Just like Senator TILLIS and Senator DAINES, the great State of Alaska also has thousands and thousands of Active-Duty Army, Air Force, Coast Guard, and Marines servicemembers, reservists, and veterans, and they are wondering why. I get asked: Why would the minority leader filibuster spending for America's troops? Isn't that like the most important thing the Congress does—national defense? Why?

Why on Earth would they consider doing it a fifth time before we go home on recess? The one thing we should be doing before we take a 2-month recess—when, as Senator ERNST said, the whole world is imploding with national security challenges—is voting to fund our troops. So why? I really don't know the answer.

At one point, the minority leader came to the floor last year and said the bill was "a waste of time." I am not sure most Americans would agree with him on that. Then they made some kind of excuse: Well, we need to make sure the appropriations bill fits with the bipartisan budget agreement from last year. Well, it does. Nobody is making that argument. He was even recently quoted as saying he doesn't want his party to be "at the mercy of Republicans." In essence, that blocking our defense budget gives his political party leverage. Well, I will tell you who gets leverage from blocking this funding—our enemies and our adversaries, not our troops.

There is one other myth here, and I hear it a lot. When these procedural votes happen in the Senate, the troops don't really see it. They do not really understand it. Heck, this vote they took to block it last time on Thursday night was almost at midnight. Maybe nobody saw it. But I want to ask Senator ERNST: Do you think the troops see this? Do you think they understand what is going on? Do you think your troops in Afghanistan or in the Iowa National Guard or all the other military members we have gotten to know through our positions on the Committee on Armed Services see what is happening? How do you think that impacts morale?

Mrs. ERNST. I thank my colleague. Yes, of course, they pay attention. They see what is going on in the Senate. We track this. I tracked this when

I was a young captain serving in Kuwait and Iraq. We track this because it is so important that we have the funding necessary for our personnel—just basic funding of our human resources obligations to the U.S. Armed Forces.

As to our personnel, we have to have funding to update our equipment, and we have to have the funding for the training necessary so that our men and women are ready and able to forward deploy. Even when they are forward deployed—in Iraq, Afghanistan, or you name it—they pay attention.

It is vitally important that what we do here today is to vote on the DOD appropriations bill. We have to stop this filibuster. Our troops are paying attention. Their families are paying attention. Their families here in the United States want to know the Senate is doing the right thing by protecting our military, making sure we have the troops necessary, the equipment necessary, the training necessary to make sure that when they forward deploy, they come home safe again. That is No. 1—making sure they are properly trained, equipped, and manned so they come home safe.

So yes, Senator SULLIVAN, they do pay attention. As we are standing here debating the importance of this appropriations bill, we have almost 10,000 troops serving today—right now—in Afghanistan. We have almost 5,000 troops in Iraq. Our special operators are deployed throughout the world protecting our Nation.

Just last week I had the opportunity to visit a hospital and see one of those special operators, and I am going to come back to that special operator in just a second.

I stated before that the world is imploding, and we only have to look at the headlines over the past several days to see what a risk our globe is in. North Korea test fires a ballistic missile from a submarine on July 9. The Chinese Navy holds a live fire drill in the South China Sea—even after the international court has ruled against their claims in the region. Iran, which is now, oddly enough, being fueled by taxpayer dollars after the horrific nuclear deal our administration entered in, drove their boats dangerously close to ours once again. They came dangerously close to American ships. And U.S. intelligence reports come forward saying ISIS is "adapting" to our current efforts.

These are the things, folks, that keep me up at night. These are the things that keep many of us up at night. But what lets us rest a little more at ease is knowing that we have our airmen, marines, soldiers, and sailors who are forward-deployed guarding our homeland. What puts my mind at rest is knowing we have these brave men and women doing their job for us. They are not failing us.

Back to the special operator I visited in the hospital last week, this young man—forward-deployed into a theater in the Middle East—had been shot four

times. Two weeks ago when I went into his hospital room, he was standing up. This special operator was pretty proud to show me his wounds—standing up, shot four times. He didn't bemoan the fact that he had been injured severely; what he was bemoaning was the fact that he was not with his unit.

He said: Ma'am, I have no idea how long it is going to take me to heal, but I am ready to go back and serve with my unit. I am ready to go back.

These are the men and women we need to be funding, folks. They are our defense—our national defense. So I am asking that the filibuster end and that we take a vote on the DOD appropriations bill.

I know we would like to hear a little more from my colleagues—again, I thank them for coming to the floor—the Senator from Montana, the Senator from North Carolina. And I thank the Senator from Alaska for leading us in this discussion today.

I yield the floor to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, it is certainly an honor to think that we are standing here as Senators with two distinguished veterans: Lieutenant Colonel Ernst and Senator SULLIVAN, who served in the U.S. Marines. In fact, tonight I will be at the Iwo Jima memorial, at a parade, with my daughter, honoring my dad, a marine, and honoring the men and women who served and wore the great uniform of the U.S. military.

There is one group who is cheering right now, and that is our enemies. They are cheering the fact that this body cannot get a defense appropriations bill passed. Maybe we should tie congressional pay to this bill. You know what. We could ask the minority leader: Let's put congressional pay in here. Maybe that will get the body to act, to move forward, if we say: If we are not going to fund our military, let's not fund this body right here. If we can't pass the Defense appropriations bill, we shouldn't get a paycheck here in Washington, DC.

We ought to stand with the men and women who depend on the appropriations. What this body is saying no to—this filibuster is saying no to military personnel; it is saying no operations; it is saying no to the procuring we need to take the fight to the enemy; and it is saying no to research and development, testing and evaluation to make sure our men and women who wear the uniform of the U.S. military have the very best tools they need to defeat a very real enemy.

I thank my freshmen colleagues for coming to the floor today. I thank Senator SULLIVAN for leading this effort as we are discussing why we need to stop the filibuster and pass the Defense appropriations bill.

Mr. TILLIS. Senator SULLIVAN asked Senator ERNST whether people in uniform are watching. Let's talk about other people watching. What about the families of those men and women in



uniform, the ones whom Democrats have decided to say no to for a pay raise?

My wife and I have adopted Fort Bragg, where she started a program called Baby Bundles where we create these bundles to give to expectant families, E4s and below. These men and women have very little. They are serving their Nation and are not making a lot of money. We are trying to do our best to make up for that by providing them with these gifts as they bring a child into the world.

But what about the mother or father who is left behind as their loved one is somewhere in harm's way? What are they thinking about when they come home during training and say: You know, we are just not getting the jumps we were getting. We are not getting the equipment we were getting. And, sweetie, I am about to be deployed.

That is happening. That is what this "no" stands for. That is what this action on the part of the Democrats stands for.

We need to vote for this bill. We need to show military families and men and women in uniform that we support them. I encourage my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to move this bill to the President's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 minute to conclude this colloquy.

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

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues who bring honor to the Senate by coming down here and talking about this important issue.

Those watching at home should be calling their Senators and telling them: Fund our troops. Fund our troops.

When there are so many national security challenges out there, we need to make sure we do not go on a 2-month recess without funding our troops and moving forward on this bill. We should not move forward on a vote to have another filibuster vote, the fifth one in a year—the only bill that seems to get the focus of our colleagues and the minority leader to filibuster.

We need to do the right thing. We need to do the right thing by the American people, and we need to do the right thing by our troops. Fund the troops. Break the filibuster. We need to move forward.

I certainly hope my colleagues on the other side are going to finally see the light and vote to move forward funding for our military, national security, our troops, and our families.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time now will be controlled by the two managers.

The Senate minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what does the previous order say?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is equally divided until 3:30 p.m.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I will take some of that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

#### ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senate's work is that of legislating. The art of legislating is rooted in good faith, and, always, legislation by definition is the art of compromise. In order to accomplish things for the American people, the Senate must work together in good faith, but I am seeing very few good-faith efforts from the Republicans on Zika, among other things. What I am seeing is one cynical Republican ploy after another.

It is clear now that Republicans are not going to provide President Obama and the country with the \$1.9 billion in emergency Zika funds that public health officials need, but Democrats still want to get as much funding as the experts tell us they need in order to stop Zika. To that end, the President of the United States, Leader PELOSI, and I have made several entreaties to the Republican leaders—that is, Senator MCCONNELL and Speaker RYAN—pleading with them to work with us. Last Thursday, the administration tried to schedule a meeting with Speaker RYAN and Senator MCCONNELL in the same room with Health and Human Services Secretary Sylvia Burwell and Director Shaun Donovan, the leader of the Office of Management and Budget. This was an opportunity for Republicans in Congress and the administration to get on the same page about Zika and chart a path forward. Speaker RYAN and Senator MCCONNELL said no to me. They wouldn't even meet with two members of the President's Cabinet.

Democrats are disappointed, but we continue to look for solutions. The only solution at this point that would get doctors, researchers, and public health experts the immediate Zika funding they need is to pass the bipartisan Senate compromise as soon as possible. We were willing to do more, but the Senate compromise I just mentioned passed this body with 89 votes and could pass again today if it were brought up by the Republican leader for a vote.

I spoke with the Republican leader personally and asked him to consider this legislation as a stand-alone bill. And we would be willing to do even more. I told him that. He would not commit one way or the other. Yesterday, I had my staff reach out to the Republican leader's staff. We haven't heard back. Instead of getting back to my office with a substantive response, the Republican leader came to the floor this morning and made accusations that were wild and unfair about what we are proposing. I guess that was the Republican leader's response to our good-faith offer. I guess that was it. But that is not the way the Senate should operate.

Now it is clear that the Republican leader has been stringing us along. He

never had any intention of coming back to negotiate a deal. Republicans have no desire to work with us to get a bipartisan Zika funding bill to the President now or at any time in the near future. It has all been a charade. Republicans are interested in one thing only: attacking Planned Parenthood. Zika is the sideshow. What Republicans really show their interest in is undermining women's health by taking potshots at Planned Parenthood. They are good at this. They have been doing this for years, and they will use Zika, Ebola, and anything else to do it.

There is a frightening shortage of integrity in this body, and it is getting worse every day. It doesn't have to be that way. Democrats and Republicans can work together and should work together, and we should work in good faith.

The chair and ranking member of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee have an agreement that if Democrats agree to go to conference on this Energy bill, Senator MURKOWSKI has given her word to side with Senator CANTWELL in order to produce a consensus-based conference report they can both support. She made that same commitment to me personally. So Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL will work together to represent the Senate at the conference—not represent Democrats or Republicans but the Senate. That is terrific. Senators CANTWELL and MURKOWSKI have proven in the past that they can work on good, strong legislation without poison pills and with strong bipartisan support. So I look forward to them working with other conferees to complete a final energy bill that Democrats can support and the President will sign.

The basis of this legislation has been going on for 4 or 5 years—4 or 5 years. The effort was led by Senator SHAHEEN for years. We almost got it done, but we had Republican obstruction on it. So we are where we are now. We can't legislate for things done in the past, but the Republican leader should take a cue from the senior Senator from Alaska.

We still want to work together with Republicans to get something done on Zika. It is important to the American people. That would require a good-faith approach from our Republican colleagues. That is not here right now, and it is too bad.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time in the quorum call that I am about to suggest be charged equally against both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, in just a matter of minutes this afternoon, we will proceed to a motion to go to a formal conference on S. 2012, which is the Energy Policy Modernization Act of 2016. There is no doubt in my mind that we should agree to go to conference with the House on this broad bipartisan measure.

I want to begin my remarks with a reminder of both the process that we followed to reach this point and the many, many good provisions that the process has allowed the Senate to include within our Energy bill. From the very beginning, we have committed to the regular order, committee-oriented process.

I want to acknowledge the strong working relationship with my friend and colleague on the committee, the ranking member, Senator CANTWELL from Washington. We set out working this together. We set out with a view in mind that we needed to update our country's energy laws. In order to get a good product, we were going to have to work cooperatively and collaboratively and in an open, transparent, and inclusive process. That is what we did. That has been a goal that was worth working toward, and I think the effort that we made as a chair and as a ranking member brought in support from both sides of the aisle and allowed us to come to this place today.

Our Energy Policy Modernization Act is the result of listening sessions, legislative hearings, bipartisan negotiations, a multiday markup held last July, and a multimonth floor process earlier this year. That process concluded with an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote, as 85 Senators voted in favor of the first major Energy bill to pass this Chamber in nearly a decade.

After we passed our bill, it went over to the House. They responded with a series of measures that had already passed their Chamber. While what they sent back has been criticized by some, I certainly think the House was restrained in its process. They could have passed a highly partisan package that would have been more difficult to reconcile with our bill, but I think they developed a more measured response and chose by voice vote to ask the Senate to conference with them. Now it is our turn.

The very last procedural step is for the Senate to vote to proceed to go to a formal conference. After waiting more than a month—actually, I think we are probably at about 6 weeks now—we will have that vote in the next 10 minutes or so. In looking at all the significant provisions included within our bill, all of which are at stake today, I think this should be a very easy choice for all of us to make.

Our bill includes priorities from 80 different Members of the Senate, including 42 members of the Democratic caucus. When we vote to go to con-

ference, it is no exaggeration to say that at least 80 of us within this body will be voting on whether or not to advance our own ideas and our own policy suggestions.

Let me give you a couple of examples. Our bill contains a bipartisan provision from Senators BARRASSO and HEINRICH, as well as 16 others that would streamline the LNG export approval process. The bill contains an entire title on energy efficiency that was written by Senator PORTMAN and Senator SHAHEEN, as well as 13 other Members.

The resources title that I developed with the ranking member is a balanced package of some 30 lands and water bills, including a bipartisan sportsmen's provision that the Senate adopted by a vote of 97 to 0. We made innovation a key priority to promote the developing of promising technologies. We have Senators ALEXANDER, PETERS, CAPITO, MANCHIN, WYDEN, and many others to thank for that.

We also focused on grid modernization, cyber security, the National Park Centennial, and conservation policies. These are all bipartisan efforts. All of those are a part of this bill.

Now we have to vote to determine whether we will keep going in the last stretch of this legislative process or whether the Senate says: All that work that you did—we are not going to move forward with it. I don't think that is a good option, and I hope it is an option this Chamber will reject.

My very strong preference is that we keep going. I think we should agree to conference with the House of Representatives because I know the conference process can produce a worthy bill that becomes law. I think it is fair to say that it will not include everything that is on the table right now, but anyone who has looked at what each Chamber has passed knows there is plenty out there that we can agree on.

I have a few assurances from Members who may be a little bit hesitant to move forward this afternoon. First, I will reiterate my personal commitment to a final bill that can pass both Chambers and be signed into law by the President. That doesn't mean we are going to unilaterally disarm ourselves in conference negotiations, but my objective here is to deliver a law. That means it can't be the House product necessarily or the Senate product necessarily. It has to be something the Chambers can both agree on and the President can sign into law. I intend to lead the conference committee the way I led the Senate process—by looking for common ground, by being open, by being fair and inclusive, and by seeking consensus over partisan division.

You don't have to take just my word for it. A couple of weeks ago, the two House chairmen who will be most heavily involved in the Energy bill conference also released a joint statement that reinforces how we intend to proceed. Here is what the House Energy

and Commerce chair, FRED UPTON, as well as the House Natural Resources chairman, ROB BISHOP, said on June 20:

At the end of the day, our goal is to get something to the President that he will sign into law. From our perspective, a bill that the President will veto is a waste of time and effort and casts aside the hard work we've put in up to this point. We remain committed to working in a bicameral, bipartisan manner and remain hopeful that we can set aside our differences and move ahead with a formal conference between the two chambers.

In addition to my approach and the approach the two House chairmen have embraced, there are institutional protections that will help ensure that this process stays on track. If Members are part of the conference committee and decide at the end they don't want to sign the conference report, then they don't have to sign it. As we have seen in recent days, conference reports require 60 votes to end debate on them, meaning our bill will need to remain bipartisan in order to pass.

To me, the best argument for going to conference on an energy bill is still the one we started with; that is, it is way past time. It has been almost a decade now. The last time Congress passed a major energy bill was December of 2007. With almost a decade's worth of changes in technologies and markets taking place since then, our policies have simply become outdated.

There is a whole list of organizations and individuals that have urged us as a Chamber to get moving with a conference, whether it is the Alliance to Save Energy, the Bipartisan Policy Center, the Business Council for Sustainable Energy, the American Chemistry Council, the chamber of commerce. They go and on.

There is an urgent need to update and reform our Nation's energy policies. We are overdue. Our policies are deficient. We have advanced many, many good ideas, but we need to get this over the finish line. That is exactly what going to conference will allow us to do.

The Energy Policy Modernization Act gives us a chance to do all of that. We have a chance now to take that next step forward on this broad bipartisan bill—keep it going, proceed to conference, allow ourselves to write a good final bill that we can then send to the President's desk.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I join my colleague from Alaska, the chair of the Senate Energy Committee, to urge my colleagues today to move forward on going to conference on the Energy bill.

My colleagues will remember we passed a bill 85 to 12, I think it was, and included a great deal of provisions on—my colleague just said—modernizing the electricity grid, building next-generation investments in energy, smart buildings, advanced composite

materials, energy storage and improving cyber security, critical infrastructure, and the energy workforce for tomorrow.

This was a very worked-over process, both in committee and on the Senate floor, and it was a very collaborative effort among our colleagues on both sides of the aisle. It did take some discussion with our House colleagues because the package they passed was a very different product. I will say, it was a very less worked product on a bipartisan basis and certainly a product that had a lot of veto threats in it.

Our House colleagues have made some comments about that legislation that have made it helpful for us to move forward. We met with our colleagues, the Natural Resources and Energy Committee chairs, Mr. BISHOP and Mr. UPTON. They basically said: Look, they didn't want to waste time on things that would be vetoed by the President of the United States, so we took that as a good sign that they were willing to sit down and talk about legislation that could move forward in a positive fashion.

Senator MURKOWSKI's staff, my staff, and we together have rolled up our sleeves and tried to look at ways in which we could talk about how we move forward from here so that all of our colleagues could have confidence that we are going to work on something that would be a final product that really would get to the President's desk. I thank my colleague from Alaska for her indulgence in that process. I know she had conversations with Senator REID about no poison pills and wasn't going to sign off on those kinds of activities.

We are here to say to our colleagues: Let's continue the good bipartisan effort that existed in the Senate bill and work with our colleagues in the House to resolve these issues. As my colleagues know, there are many thorny issues that still need to be addressed. Even though the Senate worked out many of its issues, there are still several thorny issues that are in the House bill, such as water, fire, and a variety of other issues which will take some dialogue and give us an opportunity to talk. If we can reach a conclusion, great, but if we can't, I think we have all decided that moving forward on the basis of an energy policy we can agree to is a very important concept for all of us.

As my colleague from Alaska said, it is time to move forward on an energy policy, and I encourage my colleagues to vote yes on this motion. Let us continue to work to protect these key provisions and move forward so we can get a bill to the President's desk.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to disagree to the House amendment, agree to the request from the House for a conference, and the Presiding Officer appoint the following conferees: Senators Murkowski, Barrasso, Risch, Cornyn, Cantwell, Wyden, and Sanders with respect to S. 2012, an original bill to provide for the modernization of the energy policy of the United States, and for other purposes.

John McCain, John Cornyn, Marco Rubio, Deb Fischer, Rob Portman, Roger F. Wicker, Richard Burr, Joni Ernst, David Vitter, James M. Inhofe, Dean Heller, Pat Roberts, Lamar Alexander, Ron Johnson, Tom Cotton, Thom Tillis, Mitch McConnell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to disagree to the House amendment, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and to appoint conferees with respect to S. 2012, a bill to provide for the modernization of the energy policy of the United States, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 84, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 125 Leg.]

YEAS—84

Alexander	Corker	Hirono
Ayotte	Cotton	Hoeven
Baldwin	Crapo	Isakson
Bennet	Daines	Johnson
Blumenthal	Donnelly	Kaine
Blunt	Durbin	King
Booker	Enzi	Kirk
Boozman	Ernst	Klobuchar
Boxer	Feinstein	Lankford
Brown	Fischer	Leahy
Burr	Flake	Lee
Cantwell	Franken	Manchin
Capito	Gardner	Markey
Cardin	Gillibrand	McCain
Carper	Grassley	McCaskill
Casey	Hatch	McConnell
Cassidy	Heinrich	Menendez
Collins	Heitkamp	Merkley
Coons	Heller	Mikulski

Moran	Risch	Tester
Murkowski	Rubio	Thune
Murphy	Sasse	Tillis
Murray	Schatz	Toomey
Nelson	Schumer	Udall
Peters	Sessions	Warner
Portman	Shaheen	Warren
Reed	Stabenow	Whitehouse
Reid	Sullivan	Wyden

NAYS—3

Paul	Perdue	Scott
------	--------	-------

NOT VOTING—13

Barrasso	Graham	Shelby
Coats	Inhofe	Vitter
Cochran	Roberts	Wicker
Cornyn	Rounds	
Cruz	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 84, the nays are 3.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Cloture having been invoked, the question is on agreeing to the compound motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2016—CONFERENCE REPORT—Continued

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the conference report to accompany S. 524.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the conference report to accompany S. 524.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Conference report to accompany S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

(The remarks of Mr. ALEXANDER pertaining to the introduction of S. 3169 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

JUDICIAL VACANCIES

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the American public is well aware that there is a vacancy on our U.S. Supreme Court and, in addition, that there is obstruction going on in terms of our path to do what the Senate is supposed to do—confirm a President's nomination to the Supreme Court. Because it is the Supreme Court, because that term has come to an end and we have seen a number of 4-to-4 ties, because of the consequence and the gravity of what it is that the Supreme Court does, that has garnered a lot of attention. It has resulted in the calling for the Republicans in the Senate to do their job, to not obfuscate and declare that they won't hold hearings or won't schedule a vote on President Obama's nominee, Merrick Garland. As a consequence, that vacancy may persist for well over a year when all is said and done.

I rise today to draw attention to the fact that that is not the only judicial

vacancy we have here in the United States of America. We currently have 83 vacancies in the Federal courts, and 29 of those vacancies have been declared judicial emergencies, meaning that the continuing vacancy has caused serious problems and concerns, so they are deemed judicial emergencies.

Currently, because of the work that has been done by individual Senators, consulting with the President, and what the President has done in terms of forwarding nominees to the Senate so that we can exercise our role of advice and consent, so we can hold votes on confirmations, and because of the work of the Senate Judiciary Committee, currently there are 24 judicial nominees on the Executive Calendar. All of them—every one of them—have garnered majority support of the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee in order to advance to the Executive Calendar. Every one of them is deserving of a full Senate vote.

I rise to draw attention to one particular vacancy; that is, a vacancy on the Seventh Circuit Court. One of Wisconsin's seats on the Seventh Circuit has been vacant for more than 6½ years. Let me repeat that. It has been vacant for more than 6½ years. Currently, and not surprisingly, it is the longest Federal circuit court vacancy in the country. Today marks 2,378 days that this circuit court seat has been vacant.

The people of Wisconsin and our neighbors in Illinois and Indiana deserve a fully functioning appeals court. We have a highly qualified nominee who deserves a vote from this body.

Don Schott was nominated by the President on January 12 to fill this Seventh Circuit Court vacancy. He has strong bipartisan support. Both Senator JOHNSON and I have returned our blue slips. Bipartisan majorities of the Wisconsin judicial nominating commission have given their support to Don Schott and have voted to advance his nomination, a bipartisan group of the Senate Judiciary Committee voted to advance his nomination, and a bipartisan group of former Wisconsin bar presidents support him. Don Schott has the experience, qualifications, and temperament to be an outstanding Federal judge. He was rated unanimously "well qualified" by the American Bar Association. In talking to people in Wisconsin about this nomination, I have heard only tremendous praise for Don Schott.

This nomination deserves a vote. As such, I rise today to urge the majority leader, the Republican leader, to schedule a vote on Don Schott, as well as all of the other judicial nominees who are on the Executive Calendar. The American people deserve a fully functioning Federal judiciary.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

#### MINERS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today in defense of the bipartisan Min-

ers Protection Act. This is a little bit of a history class that is going to be rolled into the facts of what we are dealing with today.

Our coal miners are some of the hardest working people in America. Any of you who come from a family who had one as a relative—maybe your grandfather, father, uncle—you know those patriarchs are tough. They are hard-working but extremely patriotic. They basically dedicated their lives to powering our Nation. We would not be the Nation we are today if it had not been for the miners, who now seem to have been cast aside and forgotten about. They powered this Nation. They brought us into the Industrial Revolution, if you will, the industrial age, and created the middle class and one of the largest unions, the United Mine Workers of America. Back in the 1930s and 1940s, especially, if you were working in the mines, you were in the United Mine Workers union. That is just the way things were. But by the end of this year, tens of thousands of our miners are going to receive notices that they are going to lose their health benefits. They are going to lose their health benefits.

I have come to the floor again to answer the points that were called into question by my friend Senator ENZI from Wyoming. First, Senator ENZI specifically questioned the promise that was made to the miners in 1946. He questioned the promise that was made to them in 1946, saying that it was made between the coal companies and the unions, not the Federal Government, so therefore we should not have an obligation to be involved. He said there was never an agreement with the Federal Government.

I don't know how else to say this except that I believe my good friend was totally misinformed. That is not correct, not at all. Now I will give you the facts. This is a lesson.

In May of 1946, the United States was in the midst of a robust post-World War II economic recovery. I mean, everybody was working during the war. We were trying to survive as a nation, trying to defeat tyranny and basically save the world as we know it today. So everybody was working. Now the war is over. We were fearing a shutdown of our economy, and somehow we had to continue to keep this energy we needed to keep the country and the economy moving.

The United Mine Workers were actively negotiating. They were actively negotiating their contracts the way you do in a civil bargaining agreement. You sit down and you work through that. President Harry Truman knew the vital role the coal industry played in the economic recovery efforts, and he feared a prolonged strike. He issued an Executive order because he thought a strike would grind our recovery to a halt. He feared a prolonged strike, and he issued an Executive order directing the Secretary of the Interior to take possession of the bituminous coal

mines—can you believe that—take possession of all of the bituminous coal mines in the United States and negotiate with the unions. So basically he stepped in and started negotiating with the unions, taking over the mines.

Senator ENZI stated that this agreement was made between the members and the companies, not between the members and the American taxpayer. In fact, the first line of the Krug-Lewis agreement—this was the agreement that was signed, the historic document that created the promise of health benefits and retirement security for our Nation's miners. This agreement is between the Secretary of the Interior acting as Coal Mines Administrator under the authority of Executive Order No. 9728, dated May 21, 1946, and the United Mine Workers of America. The title of this agreement says "Executed at the White House, Washington, D.C., May 29 of 1946."

I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of this agreement printed in the RECORD, and I will be sending a copy to my dear friend.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL BITUMINOUS WAGE AGREEMENT  
EFFECTIVE MAY 29, 1946, DURING THE PERIOD OF  
GOVERNMENT OPERATION OF MINES EXECUTED  
AT THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY  
29, 1946

#### AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT between the Secretary of the Interior, acting as Coal Mines Administrator under the authority of Executive Order No. 9728 (dated May 21, 1946, 11 F. R. 5593), and the United Mine Workers of America, covers for the period of Government possession the terms and conditions of employment in respect to all mines in Government possession which were as of March 31, 1946, subject to the National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement, dated April 11, 1945.

#### 1. Provisions of National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement Preserved

Except as amended and supplemented herein, this Agreement carries forward and preserves the terms and conditions contained in all joint wage agreements effective April 1, 1941, through March 31, 1943, the supplemental agreement providing for the six (6) day work week, and all the various district agreements executed between the United Mine Workers and the various Coal Associations and Coal Companies (based upon the aforesaid basic agreement) as they existed on March 31, 1943, and the National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement, dated April 11, 1945.

#### 2. Mine Safety Program

##### (a) Federal Mine Safety Code

As soon as practicable and not later than 30 days from the date of the making of the Agreement, the Director of the Bureau of Mines after consultation with representatives of the United Mine Workers and such other persons as he deems appropriate, will issue a reasonable code of standards and rules pertaining to safety conditions and practices in the mines. The Coal Mines Administrator will put this code into effect at the mines. Inspectors of the Federal Bureau of Mines shall make periodic investigations of the mines and report to the Coal Mines Administrator any violations of the Federal Safety Code. In cases of violation the Coal Mines Administrator will take appropriate

action which may include disciplining or replacing the operating manager so that with all reasonable dispatch said violation will be corrected.

From time to time the Director of the Bureau of Mines may, upon request of the Coal Mines Administrator or the United Mine Workers, review and revise the Federal Mine Safety Code.

*(b) Mine Safety Committee*

At each mine there shall be a Mine Safety Committee selected by the Local Union. The Mine Safety Committee may inspect any mine development or equipment used in producing coal for the purpose of ascertaining whether compliance with the Federal Safety Code exists. The Committee members while engaged in the performance of their duties shall be paid by the Union, but shall be deemed to be acting within the scope of their employment in the mine within the meaning of the Workmen's Compensation Law of the state where such duties are performed.

If the Committee believes conditions found endanger the life and bodies of the mine workers, it shall report its findings and recommendations to the management. In those special instances where the Committee believes an immediate danger exists and the Committee recommends that the management remove all mine workers from the unsafe area, the operating manager or his managerial subordinate is required to follow the recommendation of the Committee, unless and until the Coal Mines Administrator, taking into account the inherently hazardous character of coal mining, determines that the authority of the Safety Committee is being misused and he cancels or modifies that authority.

The Safety Committee and the operating manager shall maintain such records concerning inspections, findings, recommendations and actions relating to this provision of the Agreement as the Coal Mines Administrator may require and shall supply such reports as he may request.

*3. Workmen's Compensation and Occupational Disease*

The Coal Mines Administrator undertakes to direct each operating manager to provide its employees with the protection and coverage of the benefits under Workmen's Compensation and Occupational Disease Laws, whether compulsory or elective, existing in the states in which the respective employees are employed. Refusal of any operating manager to carry out this direction shall be deemed a violation of his duties as operating manager. In the event of such refusal the Coal Mines Administrator will take appropriate action which may include disciplining or replacing the operating manager or shutting down the mine.

*4. Health and Welfare Program*

There is hereby provided a health and welfare program in broad outline—and it is recognized that many important details remain to be filled in—such program to consist of three parts, as follows:

*(a) A Welfare and Retirement Fund*

A welfare and retirement fund is hereby created and there shall be paid into said fund by the operating managers 5¢ per ton on each ton of coal produced for use or for sale. This fund shall be managed by three trustees, one appointed by the Coal Mines Administrator, one appointed by the President of the United Mine Workers, and the third chosen by the other two. The fund shall be used for making payments to miners, and their dependents and survivors, with respect to (i) wage loss not otherwise compensated at all or adequately under the provisions of Federal or State law and resulting from sickness (temporary disability), permanent disability,

death, or retirement, and (ii) other related welfare purposes, as determined by the trustees. Subject to the stated purposes of the fund, the trustees shall have full authority with respect to questions of coverage and eligibility, priorities among classes of benefits, amounts of benefits, methods of providing or arranging for provision of benefits, and all related matters.

The Coal Mines Administrator will instruct the operating managers that the obligation to make payments to the welfare and retirement fund becomes effective with reference to coal produced on and after June 1, 1946; the first actual payment is to be made on August 15, 1946, covering the period from June 1 to July 15; the second payment to be made on September 15, covering the period from July 15 to August 31; and thereafter payments are to be made on the 15th day of each month covering the preceding month.

*(b) A Medical and Hospital Fund*

There shall be created a medical and hospital fund, to be administered by trustees appointed by the President of the United Mine Workers. This fund shall be accumulated from the wage deductions presently being made and such as may hereafter be authorized by the Union and its members for medical, hospital and related purposes. The trustees shall administer this fund to provide, or to arrange for the availability of, medical, hospital, and related services for the miners and their dependents. The money in this fund shall be used for the indicated purposes at the discretion of the trustees of the fund; and the trustees shall provide for such regional or local variations and adjustments in wage deductions, benefits and other practices, and transfer of funds to local unions, as may be necessary and as are in accordance with agreements made within the framework of the Union's organization.

The Coal Mines Administrator agrees (after the trustees make arrangements satisfactory to the Coal Mines Administrator) to direct each operating manager to turn over to this fund, or to such local unions as the trustees of the fund may direct, all such wage deductions, beginning with a stated date to be agreed upon by the Administrator and the President of the United Mine Workers: Provided, however, that the United Mine Workers shall first obtain the consent of the affected employees to such turn-over. The Coal Mines Administrator will cooperate fully with the United Mine Workers to the end that there may be terminated as rapidly as may be practicable any existing agreements that earmark the expenditure of such wage deductions, except as the continuation of such agreements may be approved by the trustees of the fund.

Present practices with respect to wage deductions and their use for provisions of medical, hospital and related services shall continue until such date or dates as may be agreed upon by the Coal Mines Administrator and the President of the United Mine Workers.

*(c) Coordination of the Welfare and Retirement Fund and the Medical and Hospital Fund*

The Coal Mines Administrator and the United Mine Workers agree to use their good offices to assure that trustees of the two funds described above will cooperate in and coordinate the development of policies and working agreements necessary for the effective operation of each fund toward achieving the result that each fund will, to the maximum degree practicable, operate to complement the other.

*5. Survey of Medical and Sanitary Facilities*

The Coal Mines Administrator undertakes to have made a comprehensive survey and

study of the hospital and medical facilities, medical treatment, sanitary, and housing conditions in the coal mining areas. The purpose of this survey will be to determine the character and scope of improvements which should be made to provide the mine workers of the Nation with medical, housing and sanitary facilities conforming to recognized American standards.

*6. Wages*

(a) All mine workers, whether employed by the day, tonnage or footage rate, shall receive \$1.85 per day in addition to that provided for in the contract which expired March 31, 1946.

(b) Work performed on the sixth consecutive day is optional, but when performed shall be paid for at time and one-half or rate and one-half.

(c) Holidays, when worked, shall be paid for at time and one-half or rate and one-half. Holidays shall be computed in arriving at the sixth and seventh day in the week.

*7. Vacation Payment*

An annual vacation period shall be the rule of the industry. From Saturday, June 29, 1946, to Monday, July 8, 1946, inclusive, shall be a vacation period during which coal production shall cease. Day-men required to work during this period at coke plants and other necessarily continuous operations or on emergency or repair work shall have vacations of the same duration at other agreed periods.

All employees with a record of one year's standing (June 1, 1945, to May 31, 1946) shall receive as compensation for the above-mentioned vacation period the sum of One Hundred Dollars (\$100), with the following exception: Employees who entered the armed services and those who returned from the armed services to their jobs during the qualifying period shall receive the \$100 vacation payment.

All the terms and provisions of district agreements relating to vacation pay for sick and injured employees are carried forward to this Agreement and payments are to be made in the sum as provided herein.

Pro rata payments for the months they are on the payroll shall be provided for those mine workers who are given employment during the qualifying period and those who leave their employment.

The vacation payment of the 1946 period shall be made on the last pay day occurring in the month of June of that year.

*8. Settlement of Disputes*

Upon petition filed by the United Mine Workers with the Coal Mines Administrator showing that the procedure for the adjustment of grievances in any coal producing district is inequitable in relation to the generally prevailing standard of such procedures in the industry, the Coal Mines Administrator will direct the operating managers at mines in the district shown to have an inequitable grievance procedure to put into effect within a reasonable period of time the generally prevailing grievance procedure in the industry.

*9. Discharge Cases*

The Coal Mines Administrator will carry out the provision in agreements which were in effect on March 31, 1946, between coal mine operators and the United Mine Workers that cases involving the discharge of employees for cause shall be disposed of within 5 days.

*10. Fines and Penalties*

No fines or penalties shall be imposed unless authorized by the Coal Mines Administrator. In the event that such fines or penalties are imposed by the Coal Mines Administrator, the funds withheld for that reason

shall be turned over to the trustees of the fund provided for in Section 4 (b) hereof, to be used for the purpose stated therein.

#### 11. Supervisors

With respect to questions affecting the employment and bargaining status of foremen, supervisors, technical and clerical workers employed in the bituminous mining industry, the Coal Mines Administrator will be guided by the decisions and procedure laid down by the National Labor Relations Board.

#### 12. Safety

Nothing herein shall operate to nullify existing state statutes, but this Agreement is intended to supplement the aforesaid statutes in the interest of increased mine safety.

#### 13. Retroactive Wage Provisions

The wage provisions of this Agreement shall be retroactive to May 22, 1946.

#### 14. Effective Date

This Agreement is effective as of May 29, 1946, subject to approval of appropriate Government agencies.

Signed at Washington, D.C. on this 29th day of May, 1946.

J. A. KRUG,  
Coal Mines Administrator.  
JOHN L. LEWIS,  
President, United Mine Workers  
of America.

Mr. MANCHIN. I believe the Secretary of the Interior and the White House were representatives of the Federal Government back in 1946, just as they are today.

Second, my colleague from Wyoming stated: I worry about the claim that we are helping all coal miners with this proposal.

West Virginia coal miners—union and nonunion—continue to suffer from the devastating effects of the ongoing coal bankruptcies.

Senator, we are willing to help all miners. We truly are. Anybody who has been devastated in this downturn, if you will, of the industry, but we are focusing this particular effort on the United Mine Workers of America.

They try to make this: Well, you are picking union over nonunion. We are not picking union over nonunion. The agreement was made with the UMWA because everybody working in the mines during that period of time belonged to the UMWA. So we have to protect that promise that was made in that Executive order that was signed and made 70 years ago. So I invite the Presiding Officer and all of my colleagues to help us find a way to move forward and help put this to rest.

Also, Senator ENZI stated he wants America to remain financially solvent. Well, there is no one who wants that more than I do. I understand that if you can't get your financial house in order you can't do anything else.

In fact, let me tell you what happens if we do not pass the Miners Protection Act. The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, which we have in place, will shoulder the burden of the outstanding liabilities. In a January letter to Congressman MCKINLEY from West Virginia, one of my colleagues on the other side, the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation con-

firmed that if the UMWA becomes insolvent, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation of America will actually have to assume billions of dollars in liabilities causing negative ripple effects for many more and for the financial insolvency of our country.

Passing the Miners Protection Act now means covering \$3.5 billion in health and pension benefits. If we do not enact this law, the pension liability alone will carry a pricetag of over \$6 billion. So, along with my good friend from Wyoming, Senator ENZI, I do care about making prudent decisions. That is a savings of \$2.5 billion if we pass this legislation—\$2.5 billion in saving to the taxpayers.

The Miners Protection Act is important to my home State of West Virginia because West Virginia has more retired union miners than any other State in the Nation. Out of the 90,594 retired United Mine Workers in the country in 2014, more than 27,000 still live in my State.

I will say this. As to a lot of the devastation we have seen with the floods we have had in West Virginia over the last couple of weeks, it was horrific what happened. Every one of those little communities was a coal mining community that got hit. So you just add more tragedy on top of the already devastating tragedy that we have.

But the impact is going to be felt in every State in the Union, including Wyoming. In fact, the Miners Protection Act will help over 900 health beneficiaries and over 2,000 pension beneficiaries in the State of Wyoming. So I would just ask: What do my colleague who opposes this legislation or any of my colleagues who might not be for this legislation expect the widows and pensioners to do? First of all, they have an executive order by the President of the United States in 1946, over 70 years ago. On top of that, this pension plan was solvent and sound until 2008. It wasn't their fault the crash happened. The greed of Wall Street took down so many pension plans.

Most of these widows are making \$550 a month. That is their pension—\$550 a month. So we are not talking about large amounts of money, but if they lose that, it means the difference of whether they do certain things out of necessity. What do they give up? How do you explain to them that a 70-year-old commitment is now going to go unanswered? We didn't care. We didn't mean it.

It is our responsibility to keep the promise to our miners who answered the call whenever their country needed them. So I ask Senator ENZI and all my colleagues to work with me to keep our promise to these miners. Let us sit down and work together and make sure we all agree on the facts.

I have always said this, and it has been said to me many times, and we are all entitled to our opinions. We are just not entitled to our own facts. So the facts are very clear here. This is not only a promise, it is a commitment and

a responsibility we have to the United Mine Workers of America and all those people who gave us the greatest country on Earth, gave us the greatest amount of abundant energy—reliable, affordable, and dependable. There is a transition going on now, and we are working through this transition, but the bottom line is that to walk away from an obligation and a commitment we made 70 years ago, which helped us be the superpower of the world and the country we are today, would be a gross neglect of our responsibilities and an injustice to the United Mine Workers of America, the widows, and the families who still depend on this. We have a responsibility to oblige and make sure we take care of them.

With that, I hope the Chair will help me in moving forward on this. We hope to get a vote in September. We were promised a vote in the first part of September, when we come back, and that is one we are counting on to carry this forward. I am hoping we will have our colleagues supporting this.

With that, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I come to the floor today to speak on the issue of climate change. Before I do, I would like to read a quote.

What is a conservative after all but one who conserves, one who is committed to protecting and holding close the things by which we live . . . and we want to protect and conserve the land on which we live—our countryside, our rivers and mountains, our plains and meadows and forests. This is what we leave to our children. And our great moral responsibility is to leave it to them either as we found it or better than we found it.

These are the words of President Ronald Reagan, and I agree with those words. Climate change is one of the greatest threats to our planet Earth. When I look at my beautiful grandkids, I feel a moral responsibility to leave this world as well as I found it or even better.

We can't continue to ignore the problem of climate change. How will future generations judge us if we deny the reality of climate change and say that it is just too hard to do something that might leave them a safer, cleaner, better world? I don't think they will look on us kindly. Future generations actually count on us.

Climate change is no longer debatable. The facts are in. Climate change is real, and it is not some distant threat. From Hurricane Katrina to Superstorm Sandy, from severe flooding on the Mississippi River in 2011 in Illinois to the historic low water levels



just 1 year later and to the devastating drought and wildfires that are searing the West Coast, extreme weather is the new normal.

So why are there still so many in the Chamber who deny the threat of climate change, not to mention failing to do anything to solve the problem? I have said on the floor before, and I will say again, that there is only one major political party in the world today that denies climate change, only one—the Republican Party of the United States of America.

Well, part of the reason is because for decades the fossil fuel industry and those who cater to them have tried to blur this debate, to blur the science, to create divisions among us, instead of looking for what we have in common to try to solve this problem rationally and reasonably.

Make no mistake, there is a deliberate campaign, financed by the fossil fuel industry—a campaign that uses the pseudoscience of manufactured doubt. It is coordinated. I have seen the likes of it before.

In 2006, the major tobacco companies in the United States were found guilty of “a massive 50-year scheme to defraud the public.” Decades before, tobacco company research had already shown that tobacco was truly harmful and addictive. Instead of letting science and the moral imperative behind it promote public health, the companies launched an extensive campaign sowing seeds of doubt about the dangers of tobacco.

I know about this firsthand. I was a Member of the House of Representatives about 27 years ago. I introduced a bill to ban smoking on airplanes. It was opposed by the tobacco lobby, and the leadership in both political parties—Democratic and Republican elected leaders in the House of Representatives—opposed me. We called it for a vote, and to the amazement of everyone, it passed. It turns out Members of Congress are the largest frequent flyer club in the world, and they knew how outrageous it was to suggest there were smoking and nonsmoking sections on an airplane.

I led that initiative to ban smoking on airplanes, and I was joined by the late Senator Frank Lautenberg who took up the cause in the Senate, and 26 years ago we banned smoking. It made a difference. We had to fight the tobacco lobby all the way. They denied that nicotine was addictive. They denied there was a linkage between tobacco and cancer. They created a pseudoscience. They paid scientists to come up with theories that said tobacco really wasn't that dangerous.

Well, sadly, we are seeing that same thing today when it comes to climate change. Just as the tobacco industry created a campaign of manufactured doubt to protect their financial interests and profits, a web of fossil fuel industry groups, aided and abetted by one of the very groups that resisted anti-smoking laws, are behind this web of climate denial.

A 1998 American Petroleum Institute, or API, memo has become public. I just read it on my computer upstairs. At the time, the American Petroleum Institute consisted of a dozen lobbyists, think tank members, and public relations gurus. Science wasn't on their side in 1998, so the group decided that misleading the public about the reality of climate change—sowing seeds of doubt about whether there was really climate change underway—was the best way to go. The 1998 API memo claimed that “victory,” in their words, would be achieved when “uncertainties” about the science became part of the public's perception.

In the year 2000, influential Republican pollster Frank Luntz prepared a playbook for those who wanted to create doubt in the public's mind about climate change. Mr. Luntz wrote:

Should the public come to believe that the scientific issues are settled, their views about global warming will change accordingly. Therefore, you need to continue to make the lack of scientific certainty a primary issue in the debate.

So what is taking place right now with the effort of the fossil fuel industry is a deliberate campaign to mislead the American public.

Sadly, this web of denial that started in 1998 is alive and well today. Just last year, at an ExxonMobil-sponsored meeting of the notorious American Legislative Exchange Council, the president of the Heartland Institute stated:

There is no scientific consensus on the human role in climate change. There is no need to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and no point in attempting to do so.

This quote is in direct opposition to Earth scientists in one of the world's most highly respected Earth science organizations—the American Geophysical Union, or AGU.

This spring, a group of 254 Earth scientists cited these lies in a letter as one of the many reasons why the American Geophysical Union should decline to accept ExxonMobil's financial sponsorship of their group. The Earth scientists also made clear that ExxonMobil distributed scientifically false and misleading information, are members in or financially support other climate-denying organizations, and donated to climate-denying politicians and past misinformation campaigns.

ExxonMobil is not alone in spending money to influence elections and affect environmental policy. The oil and gas industry pours millions of dollars into election campaigns every year. In the 2012 election cycle, energy and natural resource corporations, their employees, and industry super PACs spent more than \$147 million to make sure the right people were elected in congressional seats, in Senate seats, and in the Presidential campaign. During the current election cycle, they have already spent more than \$101 million, and they will likely contribute millions more in the 4 months remaining. Experts esti-

mate that, in total, candidates, political parties, and interest groups, including those funded by companies such as ExxonMobil, may spend up to \$10 billion on Federal campaigns in 2016—\$10 billion.

A poll conducted by the New York Times last year found that 84 percent of Americans believe money has too much influence in American political campaigns. They are right. Our campaign finance system is a mess. America needs a system to elect its candidates that rewards those with good ideas and principles, not just the person who is the most talented in raising money.

I reintroduced a bill last year called the Fair Elections Now Act. This legislation would establish a voluntary, small-donor public financing system for Senate campaigns. We would finally break the back of Big Money's control over the American political system. The Fair Elections Now Act can't solve all the problems facing us, but the bill would allow us to fight back against deep-pocketed special interests by dramatically changing the way campaigns are funded, encouraging small donors and matches for those small donations.

As we grapple with important issues like climate change, we have to recognize the influence of money in our political system and why one major political party in the world today still denies climate change. Until we embrace campaign finance reform and ensure that politicians do not feel beholden to special interests like the oil and gas industry, climate-denying politicians will continue to prevent us from taking action.

It is unconscionable that some very powerful people put their profits ahead of the future of the planet we live on, but we know it is true. If we don't act on climate change, there is no backup plan.

Let me end on a hopeful note. When Pope Francis came to Washington, DC, last September, he called for action on addressing climate change and global warming. The Pope said:

All is not lost. Human beings, while capable of the worst, are also capable of rising above themselves, choosing again what is good, and making a new start.

Pope Francis is right. Let's not run away from our responsibility in the Senate or in life to our children and our grandchildren. Let's work toward solving the real challenges of climate change with both political parties. It is not too late to make a new start, to do the right thing, and to protect this planet that we call home.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, we all want safety, security, health and well-being for all of our fellow Americans. But it sometimes seems impossible for us to agree on how best to achieve them. So when Congress comes together to find solutions to an urgent crisis facing the country, we should

pause briefly, mark that achievement, and consider how we got there.

That is what I hope will happen this week when the Senate votes on the conference report for S. 524, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, or CARA.

CARA addresses the opioid crisis in a comprehensive way, by authorizing almost \$900 million over 5 years for prevention, education, treatment, recovery, and law enforcement efforts. Last week, the House of Representatives passed the report by an astounding margin of 407 to 5.

We have all heard the statistics about the epidemic of addiction to heroin and prescription opioids that is gripping our country. I won't belabor them today. When 129 Americans a day die from drug overdoses, we don't need statistics on a page to tell us about this catastrophe. We only need to listen to our constituents. I hear from Iowans all the time about real-life examples of how this epidemic is hitting home.

A few years ago, I heard the story of Kim Brown, a nurse from Davenport. In 2011, she lost her son Andy Lamp to an accidental heroin overdose. He was only 33. She now speaks out around my State about the need for expanded treatment options for those with substance abuse disorders. She also advocates for increased access to naloxone, an anti-overdose drug that can save lives.

I heard Kim Brown's plea—and the conference report helps fill these and other critical gaps. I urge the entire Senate to demonstrate that it has heard her, and thousands like her, by passing the conference report, and sending it to the President for his signature before we return home.

The Senate's vote this week will be the culmination of a process marked by hard work, bipartisanship, and a commitment to addressing this crisis in an all-encompassing way.

I convened a hearing on attacking the opioid epidemic in the Senate Judiciary Committee in January. The Committee heard from Federal and State officials in the law enforcement and public health communities. We also heard from a courageous young woman who lost her daughter to a heroin overdose and subsequently started a support group to assist those in recovery.

The hearing continued for well over 3 three hours. Senators who aren't even members of the Committee stopped in to listen, and learn. By that time, a bipartisan group of four Senators had already introduced CARA. Soon after the hearing, I sat down with Senators WHITEHOUSE, PORTMAN, KLOBUCHAR, and AYOTTE—two Democrats and two Republicans—to build on their outstanding work. The leadership of those four Senators on this issue has been indispensable.

We agreed on some changes to CARA that facilitated its movement through the Judiciary Committee. In particular, I worked to include my ac-

countability provisions, which help prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of grant funds, and ensure that resources go to those who need them most.

I also helped make sure that a fixed portion of the funds for first responder access to naloxone is set aside for rural areas, like much of Iowa, where access to emergency healthcare can be limited.

And finally, because methamphetamine remains such a problem in Iowa, I made sure that the community-based coalition enhancement grants created by the bill would also be available for communities suffering from high rates of meth abuse, in addition to opioid abuse. In fact, these enhancement grants are intended to supplement grants made to community coalitions under the Drug Free Communities Act of 1997. I am proud to have been the lead sponsor of that legislation in the Senate.

The CARA Grassley substitute, with these changes, passed the Judiciary Committee unanimously by voice vote in February. I then managed the bill on the Senate floor, where it was approved 94 to-1 in March. Tackling important problems in a bipartisan way is important to me. That is why, as Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I have moved eight bills through the Committee, CARA among them, for which the lead sponsor was a member of the Democratic minority. By way of comparison, last Congress the Committee didn't report a single bill for which the lead sponsor was a Republican in the minority. And every one of the 27 bills I have moved through the Committee this Congress has had bipartisan support. That isn't just talking the talk on bipartisanship, it is walking the walk.

After the Senate acted on CARA, the House of Representatives passed its own package of bills by a vote of 400 to 5 in May. And so the task fell to a bicameral, bipartisan committee to develop a conference report that would blend the best of the two approaches together. I led the Senate delegation that negotiated the report, along with Senator ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions. We concluded weeks of hard work and negotiations with a conference committee meeting on July 6. I voted for a number of improvements to the report during the meeting, offered by both Republicans and Democrats.

In particular, I was proud to support Senator MURRAY's amendment that will create an Office of Patient Advocacy at the Department of Veterans Affairs to help ensure our veterans receive the care they deserve.

I am also pleased that the CARA conference report includes a bill that I introduced with Senator KLOBUCHAR, the Kingpin Designation Improvement Act. This bill strengthens the ability of the Federal Government to freeze the assets of foreign drug kingpins, who traffic opioids, methamphetamine and

other illegal narcotics into the United States.

There are other parts of CARA that I feel passionately about as well. Many people who abuse prescription drugs get them from friends or relatives. CARA authorizes an expansion of the Federal initiative that allows patients to safely dispose of old or unused medications, so that these drugs don't fall into the hands of young people, potentially leading to addiction. I am proud to have helped start these "take back" programs by working with Senators KLOBUCHAR and CORNYN in 2010 to pass the Secure and Responsible Drug Disposal Act. It has been a highly successful effort. Since 2010, over 2,700 tons of drugs have been collected from medicine cabinets and disposed of safely. Iowa also has a similar "take back" program that is expanding rapidly. Anything we can do to encourage these programs is worthwhile.

CARA also authorizes funds for other valuable programs: those that encourage the use of medication assisted treatment, provide community-based support for those in recovery, and address the unique needs of pregnant and post-partum women who are addicted to opioids.

It is no wonder that the CARA conference report has been met with such widespread praise and support. The Addiction Policy Forum called it a "monumental step forward." Almost 250 advocacy organizations have written to Congress in support of the report, concluding that "this bill is the critical response we need." These organizations include many influential national ones, such as the Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America, the National Criminal Justice Association, and the National District Attorneys Association.

Iowa community organizations are well-represented in that group as well, including the Partnership for a Drug Free Iowa, Kossuth Connections, Siouxland Cares, the Iowa Alliance for Drug Endangered Children, Community Resources United to Stop Heroin of Eastern Iowa—Dubuque Chapter, Quad Cities Harm Reduction, which Kim Brown leads, and many more.

The National Fraternal Order of Police wrote in support of the conference report as well. The FOP explained that:

Law enforcement officers are almost always the first on the scene—even before the paramedics arrive. In these life and death situations, our officers are not looking to make an arrest, but to save a life. Many States and jurisdictions have successfully equipped their officers with [naloxone], trained them to recognize the symptoms of an overdose, and administer it on the scene. We believe that the final conference report on S. 524 will help expand the use of naloxone and give us one more tool to reduce the deaths from this epidemic.

It isn't every day we can say that legislation we pass could help save lives. But this is one of those times. I want to thank the Republican leader for moving this legislation on the floor, and providing the Senate the opportunity to pass it this week.

Indeed, heroin deaths spiked dramatically from 2010 through 2014, more than tripling, from 3,036 to 10,574. But sadly, during this entire time, the Democratic leader didn't make it a priority to move comprehensive, bipartisan legislation on the floor to address this epidemic.

Now, some of my colleagues have expressed concern that the conference report, an authorization bill, doesn't also appropriate money for this epidemic as well. But thankfully, under Republican leadership, the appropriations committees have been doing just that. The current Senate appropriations bills increase funding for this epidemic by 57 percent over fiscal year 2016 enacted levels, and by 115 percent over fiscal year 2015 enacted levels. So funding for this crisis is poised to more than double since Republicans took control of the Senate. As this funding continues to increase, the CARA conference report will be the blueprint for where this money is most effectively spent.

This bill is just the latest example of the productive, bipartisan work we have been doing on the Judiciary Committee this Congress. I want to thank all of the Members for their hard work and for our achievements together.

So I urge my colleagues to vote to send CARA to the President this week. And when we come back in September, let's roll up our sleeves and continue to build on this bipartisan success.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

TRAGEDIES IN MICHIGAN AND ACROSS THE COUNTRY

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I rise with a heavy heart to address devastating tragedies that have shaken communities in Michigan and across this country. Just yesterday, the community of St. Joseph, MI, suffered a tragic shooting that cost the lives of two dedicated public servants and injured several others.

I would like to extend my condolences to the families of bailiffs Joseph Zangaro and Ronald Kienzle, who were fatally shot yesterday in Berrien County, MI. Both Joseph and Ronald had distinguished careers as public safety officers prior to serving as bailiffs in the Berrien County Courthouse.

Joseph Zangaro retired from the Michigan State Police as post commander of the Bridgman Post and had worked for the Berrien County Trial Court for over 10 years.

Ronald Kienzle retired as a sergeant in road patrol with the Benton Charter Police Department in Benton Harbor, MI, and was a veteran of the U.S. Army.

I also want to wish Deputy James Atterbury and Kenya Ellis a speedy recovery for the wounds they received during this attack.

Yesterday's incident illustrates a very important fact. Whether as a member of a local police department, a rapid transit officer, or a court bailiff, public safety officers risk their lives

every day to keep our families and our communities safe. This is a fact we can never forget and a reality that confronts public safety officers and their families every day.

Across Michigan, our hearts have been shattered by senseless violence like this, and I know the grief of my fellow Michiganders because I feel this grief in my own heart as well. Unfortunately, this is not the first tragedy to strike West Michigan this year. We are still reeling from the mass shooting in Kalamazoo in February, where six people were killed and two were critically injured.

We are facing a very difficult time in our country's history. Last week's tragedies further demonstrate this point. Within just 48 hours, we saw two separate incidents where American citizens died at the hands of those who were sworn to protect them. Then, what started out as a peaceful protest in response to those deaths, suddenly morphed into an unrelated and horrific attack on law enforcement—an attack on officers who died to protect the rights of protesters to peacefully protest.

Let me be clear. Something is wrong when a hard-working and beloved cafeteria supervisor is killed during a routine traffic stop. Something is wrong when police officers, honorably serving and protecting their communities, are killed during a peaceful protest. Something is wrong when a salesman and a father of four dies while selling CDs. Something is wrong when a police officer is ambushed and shot while responding to a 911 call for help. Too many precious lives are being lost, not just in Michigan but in States all across our country.

I was heartbroken by the tragic shooting deaths of Philando Castile in Minnesota and Alton Sterling in Louisiana last week, only to wake up horrified on Friday morning to learn of five Dallas police officers, including Michigan native Michael Krol, who were struck down in the line of duty.

We have seen enough violence. Across our countries, our communities are outraged and heartbroken at the number of lives which have been lost. While the events of last week are almost too much to bear, the images from communities like Chicago, Staten Island, Ferguson, and Baltimore have gripped this Nation's attention as well.

We have seen tears of sadness, burning storefronts, and confrontations between police and young people, as well as peaceful protesters marching through the streets. It is clear there is a persistent and troubling problem in our country that is eroding away Americans' faith in our justice system. With each troubling incident, it becomes clear that justice in this country is sometimes neither fair nor equal, and we must act now to address this inequity.

This problem isn't isolated to our African-American communities or to our law enforcement communities. These

injustices undermine the very values our Nation was built upon. It is the responsibility of each and every one of us to acknowledge that too many Americans are needlessly dying, and we must come together to stop them.

More now than ever, it is time for us to unite as a country to encourage understanding and compassion for our fellow Americans. Now is the time for us to walk in another's shoes and acknowledge the experiences that have shaped their views. Now is the time for this body to come together to offer solutions. The American people need us.

It is crystal clear that the relationship between law enforcement and the communities they serve is strained, and an overhaul of our criminal justice system is long overdue. On top of these strained relations, we are continuing to see rising prison populations and unsustainable costs as public budgets remain tight.

We see too many at-risk youths being funneled out of our schools and into our prison systems, continuing a vicious cycle in many of our communities. We see too many people who have served their time only to find that once they get out of prison, they can't find a good job or a stable home.

We need a better understanding of the causes of these concerning trends, and we need to identify solutions that will help ensure we are administering justice in a fair and equitable way for every American—regardless of who they are, where they may live, or their income level. That is why I have introduced legislation with Republican Senators LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina and JOHN CORNYN of Texas to create a National Criminal Justice Commission. The Commission will be made up of experts on law enforcement, victims' rights, civil liberties, and social services who will be charged with undertaking an 18-month review of our criminal justice system from the top to the bottom. It is something that has not been done since 1965—more than 50 years ago during another very difficult time in our Nation's history.

The goal of this Commission is to identify commonsense solutions to the serious issues facing our criminal justice system, promote fairness in our laws, build stronger relationships between law enforcement and our communities, and strengthen faith—basic faith—in our criminal justice system.

The Commission will focus on transparency, issuing recommendations to the President and Congress, and making reports on its findings available to the public and entities within the criminal justice system. It will take a comprehensive approach to reviewing the criminal justice system and will look at numerous issues in light of our current climate.

When President Lyndon Johnson's 1965 Commission last conducted a comprehensive review over 50 years ago, it was the first time police, prosecution, defense, the courts and corrections were all examined as a whole. That

Commission made more than 200 recommendations to improve the criminal justice system, including creating the 9-1-1 emergency system that is so ingrained in our society today.

Our country has changed significantly over the last 50 years, and another top-to-bottom review of our criminal justice system is long overdue. In fact, the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, which was created after the troubling situation in Ferguson, strongly recommended the creation of a national commission to evaluate the entire criminal justice system.

The National Criminal Justice Commission that my legislation creates will shine a light on the whole scope of our criminal justice system, including police and community relations, our grand jury system, the right to counsel in misdemeanor cases, the lack of speedy trials, and the struggles ex-offenders face in finding housing, employment, and support services after leaving prison.

This Commission is one critical piece of a larger puzzle. We must also take swift action on our justice system, such as sentencing reform. The Commission also has the support of a wide range of groups, including the Fraternal Order of Police, the NAACP, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Urban League, and many other law enforcement and civil rights groups.

The National Criminal Justice Commission is vital to understanding the reforms and best practices that we need to reduce crime, help law enforcement do their jobs safely and effectively, protect our communities, and build a justice system that works for every American. These problems are not easy, and there are no quick answers. It is going to require all of us working together to make these vital changes a reality, but together we can achieve the promise of this great country—justice for every American, no matter who you are, where you live, or how much money you may have in your pocket.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I hate conspiracy theories. I believe most of the suspicious, confusing, frustrating, or unknowable things in the world are the way they are not because there are 12 people in a room wringing their hands trying to figure out how to trick all of us but because the world is complicated, often unfair, sometimes illogical, and we all operate with incomplete information. So even as a climate hawk, I came to the idea of an organized misinformation campaign with real hesitation. I didn't want to be that guy who believes there is an evil empire that lies for a living. But here is the thing: I have studied this, and I have learned that there really is an organized, well-financed disinformation

and misinformation campaign on the subject of climate change. It is straight out of a bad movie about politics, complete with PR guys, dark campaign money, fake scientists, politicians in the mix, and a weakened media. It is like Raymond Tusk actually exists.

I rise today to join my colleagues in combating a pervasive and highly damaging campaign of misinformation, disinformation, and outright lies. For decades, the same hired guns that tried to convince the American people that there was no link between smoking and lung cancer have been following the same playbook on manmade climate change. They want to sow doubt where no doubt exists. Just like the tobacco companies profited from denial, so too have the fossil fuel companies profited by propping up front groups and sham think tanks that try to convince us that the science on climate change isn't settled and that no consensus exists between mainstream scientists, but of course that is not true.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science said:

The science linking human activities to climate change is analogous to the science linking smoking to lung and cardiovascular diseases. Physicians, cardiovascular scientists, public health experts, and others all agree that smoking causes cancer, and this consensus among the health community has convinced most Americans that the health risks from smoking are real. A similar consensus now exists among climate scientists, a consensus that maintains climate change is happening and human activity is the cause.

It is worth pausing here to make two basic points. The first is one I mentioned earlier, and that is that the same techniques which were used to block science and prevent action on tobacco are now being deployed to prevent action on climate. That stands to reason. If you are looking for public relations techniques to essentially mislead the public so you can squeeze additional years and decades of profitability, then you would be wise to use the techniques, methods, and procedures that worked in the past, so that sort of stands to reason. It shocks the conscience, but it shouldn't shock us that this is happening. The really shocking part is this. Of course they would use the same techniques to mislead the public regardless of the issue, but the real shock is that it is literally the same people. It is not the same type of person or the same category of person, it is the same human beings and the same professionals. They are the same PR firms, and they have replicated the machinery of the Tobacco Institute, sharing processes, procedures, personnel, and funding sources. But just as we did against Big Tobacco, we are going to win the war of ideas against Big Oil and Big Coal.

The truth is on our side, but the truth is not guaranteed to come out. We actually have to expose their ecosystem of misinformation to make real progress on climate, and so for a moment I will talk a little bit about the

media, which has played an unfortunate role.

Generally speaking, people in the U.S. media like to get "both sides of the story" just to be fair, which under many circumstances works just fine. After all, the definition of a bad story in a lot of reporters' minds is to be one-sided. What happens when one side of the story is factual and the other side is a house of cards? Many in the media still report it as though, on the one hand, scientists say climate change is real, and on the other hand, some say it is not. To be fair, this has improved over the last year or so, but that was the foundational weakness of the American media—their credulity when reporting on deniers—that the climate denial apparatus took full advantage of.

There are not two sides to every issue. Sometimes there are just facts on one side and bull on the other. We don't argue about the existence of gravity or whether the Earth is round or, thankfully, whether smoking causes lung cancer. We have known since the 19th century that carbon dioxide traps heat much like a greenhouse. We know that burning fossil fuels releases stored carbon into the atmosphere. We have seen the evidence of increasing temperatures and rising sea levels for decades. The correlation between levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and global temperatures is absolutely undeniable. To deny the reality of manmade climate change in this context requires willful ignorance.

How is this happening? Academics from Yale and Drexel Universities, among others, have researched and exposed the many sources of dark money that are fueling the climate denial machine. My colleagues are speaking today—and spoke yesterday as well—about some of the greatest offenders, and I will focus my remarks on just two. One is a small organization that most people haven't heard of, and another is an organization that I think a lot of people who work in politics have heard of. The first is the Center for Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, and the other is the Heartland Institute.

The Center for Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change is a family project out of Tempe, AZ, that claims that global warming will be beneficial to humanity. The center does not disclose funding information because they believe doing so would bias the way people perceive their purpose and publications, and that may be the only thing they say that is true.

Transparency is crucial in the world of science because it allows the scientific community and the general public to determine whether there might be a conflict of interest. In this instance, there is a conflict of interest. We know that at the very least, ExxonMobil and Peabody coal have given significant sums of money to the center. When two companies with a

long history of climate denial are paying you to deny the scientific consensus on climate change, it is fair to point out that something smells a little fishy.

Better known than the Center for Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change is the Heartland Institute, which gained national attention after putting up a billboard comparing those who believed in manmade global warming to the Unabomber, Ted Kaczynski. This tasteless stunt rightfully cost Heartland \$825,000 in corporate donations, but Heartland still receives millions of dollars a year from fossil fuel companies and others with a vested interest in continuing the status quo. They still have an outside impact in the national conversation by insinuating that the science on climate change is not settled.

Not surprisingly, Heartland follows the tobacco playbook to a T. Their reliance on dark money means that Heartland's funding is notoriously difficult to track. According to the watchdog group Conservative Transparency, Heartland has received more than \$14 million from the Koch-initiated Donors Trust and Donors Capital groups, which shield donors' identities. We know that ExxonMobil has contributed at least \$675,000 since 1998, and the Union of Concerned Scientists found that 40 percent of those funds were specifically designated for climate change projects. The money from these organizations, among others, allowed Heartland to publish nearly 3,000 documents toward climate change skepticism between 1998 and 2013. Heartland also organizes gatherings of climate skeptics and defends fossil fuel funding experts who continue to deny the reality of the changing climate we are already seeing today. We have seen this movie before.

What is happening this week is historic. We are no longer going to allow these front groups to pose as on-the-level think tanks. We have a moral obligation to not only solve this problem but to also fix our politics. We should all be making decisions about how best to solve this problem.

Let's have this great debate. Let the two major political parties have an argument about the best way to tackle climate change because this isn't just a climate thing at this point, this is an integrity thing.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

(The remarks of Mr. GARDNER pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 526 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Minnesota.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues to expose those who continue to deny the science of climate change and try to deceive the American people. This is important because climate change is an existen-

tial threat to our planet and to future generations. By denying climate science and lobbying against efforts to address climate change, these deniers are subjecting the planet and everybody on it to great risk.

Climate change will have significant adverse impacts on all of our States, including my State of Minnesota. Just look at our agriculture sector, which is responsible for one out of every five jobs in Minnesota. Warmer temperatures and more intensive droughts are going to negatively impact this important rural economic engine. In fact, a recent study estimates that with no adaptation efforts against climate change, Midwest crop production could decrease by more than 60 percent by the end of the century.

Climate change will also impact our waters, and that is important to my State—the Land of 10,000 Lakes—which includes Lake Superior. Lake Superior alone contains about 10 percent of the world's fresh surface water, and it is warming by two degrees per decade. Because of this warming, we are seeing more evaporation and lower water levels in the lake. Plus, rising temperatures allow for more favorable conditions for invasive species and hazardous algal blooms. Warmer temperatures could also have severe consequences for fish like walleye pike and trout that are so important to Minnesota fisheries and ecosystems.

And let's not forget the threat of climate change to our forests. As in our lakes, warmer temperatures elevate the threat of invasive species such as the emerald ash borer and gypsy moth that are rapidly changing the composition of our forests—or the bark beetle in Colorado, the State the Presiding Officer represents. They destroy trees and cost economies and money and jobs.

So we can see that climate change poses a very serious threat to Minnesota and to our country. I believe it is the defining issue of our generation—an issue that demands immediate action. But, unfortunately, there are some groups that have been trying to prevent action. These groups have spent many millions of dollars muddying the water, distorting the science, deceiving the American people, and, ultimately, delaying the response that we desperately need.

Over the last two days, my colleagues have come to the floor to expose this web of denial—the extensive network of groups and individuals who are spreading lies about climate change—and I am here today to expose one of the worst actors of all: the Heritage Foundation.

The Heritage Foundation is a right-wing ideological organization known for advocating for discriminatory social and economic policy—things like attacking voting rights, privatizing Social Security, and favoring tax breaks for the rich to the detriment of the middle class. They are also a mouthpiece for climate denial.

If you go to the Heritage Foundation web site, you will find that it says that climate change is “used too often as a vehicle to advance special interests and politically driven agendas.” That is rich, coming from an ideological organization devoted to promoting a partisan agenda. No one can deny that.

The Heritage Foundation is notorious for trying to undermine the science on climate change. Their favorite claim is that “the only consensus over the threat of climate change that seems to exist these days is that there is no consensus.”

Even as recently as April, a report that the Heritage Foundation issued referred to climate scientists as “a field that is a mere few decades old” and that “no overwhelming consensus exists among climatologists.”

While these statements may grab headlines, they are utterly false.

Climate change science actually dates back to the 1800s—before Henry Ford sold his first car, before Thomas Edison invented the light bulb, and even before the first oil well was drilled in the United States. In 1824, French scientist Joseph Fourier proposed that the atmosphere keeps the Earth warm—what we know today as the greenhouse effect.

In 1859, an Irish scientist, John Tyndall, attributed this warming to several gases, including carbon dioxide. In 1896, a Swedish scientist, Svante Arrhenius published the first calculation of global warming from human emissions of carbon dioxide. In the more than 100 years since, scientists all around the world have studied, debated, and researched different aspects of the issue.

So when staff from the Heritage Foundation, none of whom actually have advanced scientific degrees, write a report that claims climate science is a new field that has little scientific consensus, they are ignoring the nearly 200 years of research—a scientific body of research that has led to 97 percent of climate scientists agreeing that humans are causing global warming.

But every now and then, even the Heritage Foundation admits that climate change is in fact real. But when they admit it, they pretend that climate change isn't a big deal and that it is not worth our time to combat it. In 2010, a senior policy analyst at the Heritage Foundation—with a degree in law, not climate science, mind you—declared that “none of the scary stuff about global warming is true, and what is true about global warming, what the science actually tells us about man's role in changing the climate, is far from terrifying.”

Now all of this science denial and false propaganda might not be such a big deal if climate change wasn't such a serious problem, but when you look at the scope of the problem you quickly realize how the Heritage Foundation is acting in an incredibly and deliberately irresponsible way.

Last year, I traveled to the climate change conference in Paris and met

with a delegation of leaders from Bangladesh, a country that has contributed little to industrial air pollution but is one of the most vulnerable to the negative impacts of climate change. It is estimated that unless we act, rising sea levels will inundate 17 percent of Bangladesh, displacing about 18 million people in this low-lying nation by the end of this century. Even now, rising sea levels are impacting Bangladesh through salt water intrusion, reducing agricultural yields and ruining drinking water supplies. It is already having a profound effect.

We are talking about a very poor country that doesn't have the resources to deal with climate change. Bangladeshis will be uprooted and turned into climate refugees without a home. I would bet these individuals would disagree with the Heritage Foundation that the impacts of climate change are "far from terrifying."

If you think the Syrian refugee crisis is difficult to deal with, just think of the magnitude of what we will see if we do not address climate change. For a lawyer at the Heritage Foundation to make this claim is not only irresponsible but, frankly, dangerous to the welfare of people around the world.

These are just a few examples of the falsehoods that the Heritage Foundation spreads about climate change. If I had the time, I could go on for hours—maybe, even, days—quoting more of those lies. In fact, from 1998 to 2013, the Heritage Foundation published more than 1,600 documents contributing to climate skepticism, and they have published many more since. So I think we can say the Heritage Foundation is deliberate and unwavering in its fraud and deceit.

One might ask: Why would the Heritage Foundation work to deceive the American people in such a way? What do they get out of it?

Well, I will tell you. It is because they are being paid to do so by self-interested fossil fuel companies like ExxonMobil and people with major investments in fossil fuel companies, like the Koch brothers. Perhaps you have heard of them. The Heritage Foundation's work to espouse lies and prevent action on climate change directly benefits the bottom line of the companies and brothers who are funding them. We know this because over the past two decades ExxonMobil donated nearly \$1 million to the Heritage Foundation; and the Koch brothers, the owners of the fossil fuel conglomerate Koch Industries, contributed nearly \$6 million. These companies and brothers are worried that if people knew what their products were doing to the planet, they would stop buying their products or transition to other renewable energy or public policy would drive the markets away from their products. So in order to protect their bottom line, they set out to misinform the public. That is what they do for a living, and Heritage and many other similar organizations, are helping them to spread their false-

hoods. That is what they do at the Heritage Foundation for a living.

The money paid to Heritage goes to supposed experts whose jobs are to release thousands of bogus reports about climate change. These experts are not climate scientists. They are lawyers and economists serving as puppets for the fossil fuel industry. These same so-called experts publish op-eds and do interviews in media outlets around the country—talk radio—helping to spread disinformation or misinformation or what we sometimes call lies. They also brief Congress and serve as trusted authorities for staff in many Republican offices. So it shouldn't surprise us that my Republican colleagues deny climate change when they rely on these experts.

Despite the best efforts of the Koch brothers, the Heritage Foundation, and other deniers, people around the country are not fooled. In Minnesota we are seeing changes to our crops, lakes, and forests. Instead of sticking their heads in the sand, Minnesotans are taking action.

In 2007, under a Republican Governor, my home State established a renewable energy standard to produce 25 percent of our power from renewable sources by 2025. That same year, Minnesota passed an energy efficiency standard to require utilities to become a little more efficient every year. To top things off, Minnesota established an aggressive goal to reduce greenhouse gases 80 percent by 2050. These are the kinds of policies that we need to combat climate change, and these are also the kinds of policies that the Heritage Foundation is fighting tooth and nail to prevent.

It is not just the Minnesota legislature that is taking action. Minnesota businesses also recognize the importance of fighting climate change. Last year I joined Dave MacLennan, the CEO of Cargill, in penning an op-ed in the Minneapolis StarTribune to highlight the threat of climate change to agriculture, especially considering that global population will reach 9 billion by midcentury. As the CEO of a food company focused on agriculture, Dave is concerned about what climate change is going to do to our food supply. He is not alone. We have businesses all over our State that are installing wind turbines and solar panels and manufacturing cutting-edge energy efficiency technologies.

Minnesotans aren't fooled by the Heritage Foundation. On the contrary, to them, climate change represents a Sputnik moment—an opportunity to rise to the challenge and defeat that threat. In response to Sputnik, we ended up not just winning the space race and sending a man to the moon, we did all sorts of good things for the American economy and society.

We did it before, and we can do it again. By rising to the challenge of climate change, we will not just clean our air, but also drive innovation and create jobs, and not only in the clean energy sector.

I have two grandchildren, and I am expecting my third later this year. God willing, they will live through this century and into the next, and in 50 years I don't want my grandson Joe to turn to me and say: Grandpa, you were in the Senate, and you knew about the severity of climate change. Why didn't you do anything to stop it? And also, why are you still alive? You are 115 years old.

I will say it was all investments we made in our age. I want my grandson to know that when we had the opportunity to put the planet on a safer path, we seized the moment.

So let's not allow the Heritage Foundation and all of these different members of this web to slow us down. Let's not let the selfish motivations of shadowy donors with ties to the fossil fuel industry prevent us from making the planet a safer and more habitable place for our children, our grandchildren, and future generations.

It really is time to stand up to ignorance and denial. It is time for all of us on both sides of the aisle to do what is right for future generations.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at 11 a.m., Wednesday, July 13, the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the conference report to accompany S. 524. I further ask that following the cloture vote, the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany H.R. 636, the FAA bill; that the majority leader or his designee be recognized to make a motion to concur in the House amendments to the Senate amendments; and that the time until 1:45 p.m. be equally divided between the leaders or their designees. I ask that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the motion to concur in the House amendments to the Senate amendments with no intervening action or debate and that all time allocated for consideration of H.R. 636 count postcloture on S. 524, if cloture is invoked.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. For the information of all Senators, the cloture vote on the CARA conference report will occur at 11 a.m. tomorrow, with the vote on the FAA bill scheduled at 1:45 p.m. Senators should expect a vote on adoption of the CARA conference report during tomorrow's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from Louisiana.

#### ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I come as a Senator, but actually I come wearing two different hats right now—two more hats aside from being a Senator. One of them is a teacher. I still teach at the LSU Medical School and have for the last 30 years, so I decided to do



a presentation on something wearing my next hat.

In my life as a physician, I have done much work in public health and have learned, by the way, that if you head off illness early, you save a lot of money. You save a lot of money after that. I call it the balloon theory. If you put a balloon up to helium and you squeeze the nozzle, it inflates quickly, but if you pull it off the nozzle, it remains deflated.

Right now, we have something at risk with Zika that will be like that helium balloon—inflating rapidly unless we do that initial thing that pulls the balloon off the helium so that it works.

I am a teacher, so I decided to do something different. If anybody in the audience so chooses, they can put their phone and their QR code reader up to the television or the computer monitor and they can scan this barcode, and they will see the slides we are about to go over. So if you are watching at home and you wish to follow, then you can download these slides, and if you think them important, you can forward these slides to another person. Again, that is my effort as a teacher to try to speak about the spread of Zika.

This is Jose Wesley, born to a Brazilian mother who contracted Zika probably in her first 3 months of pregnancy. When Zika went through the momma's blood when Jose was in her womb, into the amniotic fluid or through the placenta, it entered Jose's body and went to his brain. That virus stayed inside his brain and terribly affected his brain.

Jose was born with microcephaly. You cannot really see from this angle what microcephaly is, but what "microcephaly" means is "small brain." Here is a profile of a child with microcephaly. You can see that—unlike the big head babies normally have—this is a very small head. This is associated with severe neurologic deficits and early death. This is a tragedy and potentially a preventable tragedy.

Again, the teacher in me wants to talk a little bit about Zika. The spread of Zika historically gives us insight as to what we must fear now. Zika was first discovered back in 1951 in Africa, Uganda. Then, at some point in the three decades that followed, it spread quickly to Asia, and then from Asia to Yap Island in 2007, which is in the Pacific. In 2013 and 2014, it went to more Pacific islands. In 2015 and 2016, it entered the Americas. At some point, it began to spread rapidly. This is important because it is now in the Americas threatening Americans.

These are States which have cases of Zika. Here is the U.S. Virgin Islands. Here is Puerto Rico. They have the most, but almost every State is affected. Most folks have contracted it elsewhere and brought it back to their State, but there are some folks who received it sexually. So their partner contracted it, perhaps in Brazil, and came back to Texas or Florida or Lou-

isiana, where I am from, and they contracted it sexually.

Nonetheless, the virus is in the United States. It is particularly a problem in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. These are American citizens. These Puerto Ricans, if they wish, can board a plane and travel anywhere they wish in the continental United States. That is their right as Americans. Similarly, these folks who are infected in these States can travel anywhere they wish.

Why is that important? Well, theoretically, it is important because these are the areas where the mosquitos that carry the Zika virus live in the United States. So theoretically, wherever these mosquitos are—and Hawaii should be on here someplace—the virus can enter and the virus can be transmitted by the mosquitos to many other Americans.

By the way, though, it is not just that you have to live where the mosquitos are. The first person to die from Zika in the continental United States just died in Utah. She contracted it elsewhere but then died in Utah. So the risk to our country is at least this. I will be perfectly honest. It is particularly a risk for those on the gulf coast because we have the sort of subtropical climate in which Zika flourishes. That is why I am particularly concerned.

But wearing my other hat as a public health doctor, I know we have this moment in time. Either we pull that balloon off so it does not inflate with Zika, damaging our country, creating more Joses here in the United States, or not.

Some of you may have seen the barcode that I held up initially. You may have downloaded that. We will hold up that barcode again if you wish to download these slides, but all of these are on the PowerPoint presentation that you may download should you wish.

Public health emergencies are inevitable. Let's talk about the response to this one. Mr. President, \$600 million that was left over from the Ebola fund has been released to CDC and other agencies to mount a response against Zika. Now, \$600 million was left over, and only one-fifth of it has been spent. So there are still substantial dollars available, but the CDC and other Federal agencies say they need more.

Republicans have supported \$1.2 billion in additional funding to fight Zika. My colleagues on the Democratic side—we have a difference over this. They are opposing this \$1.2 billion to fight Zika because they say the Republican bill discriminates against Planned Parenthood.

Planned Parenthood is not mentioned in the bill, and the way it discriminates—I have been in Washington—in the Senate, at least—for 2 years, and sometimes you have to kind of figure out why people are taking offense at something. Even though Planned Parenthood is not mentioned, the reason they object is because we

specify that the money needs to go to a public agency, one that sees Medicaid patients, the State or territory Federal program that takes care of the uninsured. Planned Parenthood is not a Medicaid provider.

So it is not that they are not mentioned; it is that they are a private entity that, in Puerto Rico, does not accept Medicaid. So we could carve in and say: If you are a private entity, you can also receive these Federal dollars to provide family planning. It just so happens that in Puerto Rico, Planned Parenthood does not.

So Republicans are trying to release \$1.2 billion to pull the balloon off the helium so it does not inflate with all kinds of cases, and one more case of a Jose would be one case too many. But we are caught up in this snafu about Planned Parenthood. It is the craziest thing in the world, but unfortunately it is how Washington, DC, sometimes works.

As a public health physician, I find that incredibly offensive. As a doctor who understands the critical nature of this, I am asking folks on the other side of the aisle to accept that this bill may not be exactly what they want—it is not exactly what I want—but it is something that would give additional resources to the Centers for Disease Control and others to begin to fight the Zika virus before it comes more extensively to our Nation's shores.

We can anticipate that public health emergencies in the future are inevitable. For example, we recently had Ebola. We had the West Nile virus. We have already spoken about Zika. So aside from hoping that my Democratic colleagues will agree to release the \$1.2 billion to fight Zika now, there is also something else I am proposing, but I don't want to sound overly partisan because I am doing this particular bill with my Democrats—with Senator BRIAN SCHATZ from Hawaii. We are putting forward the Public Health Emergency Response and Accountability Act.

I am from Louisiana. We have had hurricanes. Hurricane Katrina is the one that is the most famous. If there is a hurricane or another natural disaster that hits an American State, then FEMA has a budget that is automatically triggered. It does not have to go through this appropriations process. We don't tie it down in discussions of extraneous matters. It is something that immediately comes to bear to bring relief to those affected by natural disasters.

The other thing that is done is that normal Federal contracting processes are waived. So instead of having to get 10 different signatures—which literally might be the case—for someone to travel from Washington, DC, to Louisiana or Kansas or Florida, it is waived and that emergency response coordinator may immediately go. There is oversight, so this is not *carte blanche*, but it is a more effective way

to bring Federal resources, in partnership with local resources, to bring relief to those affected. We bring that flexibility in the use of funds while retaining accountability.

We call this the Public Health Emergency Response and Accountability Act, and we anticipate entering this in very soon. Senator SCHATZ has been wonderful to work with in terms of this aspect of what we are doing.

So there are two issues. The \$1.2 billion that we should release now, that would immediately go—it is not a perfect bill, but we have to prevent more cases of these children who are tragically born with microcephaly, as well as more deaths, like the woman who recently died in Utah. Then, No. 2, we need to have the response and accountability act, which gets rid of this process we struggle through in order to release those funds to bring the relief we need.

Let me summarize by saying this: This is a baby with microcephaly. I think there have been three children born in the United States already—not conceived here but born here—who have microcephaly. This child's life is limited. She will most likely die at an early age, with severe neurological deficits. If you just want to look at it in a dollars-and-cents approach, this child will be a ward of the State for the entirety of her life and will cost the Federal taxpayer millions of dollars.

We have already had these babies born in Puerto Rico, New Jersey, and Hawaii. There are two pregnant women in Illinois who tested positive for Zika, and we had a death in Utah and Puerto Rico—not children but adults. The question is, Will the Senate work to stop this? And again, if you are watching and you wish, you can scan this barcode, you can download this presentation.

Let me finish by saying this. I just said the Senate should work to stop the spread of Zika. You can do something. We are a representative democracy and we respond to you, the people, and if we don't, by golly, you should vote us out. So I am asking you, if you are watching at home and you think there needs to be a response quickly and efficiently and effectively to combat the spread of Zika, you can either barcode this or not, but whatever you do, call your Senator. Ask your Senator—ask her or him—to support efforts to stop the spread of Zika, to release the \$1.2 billion, and to also support the bill Senator SCHATZ and I are putting forward, the Public Health Emergency Response and Accountability Fund.

Ultimately, we answer to you, the people. That is a good thing. I ask you to perhaps use this tool to help us, to encourage us to answer to you, as we should.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues from the Senate

Climate Action Task Force on the floor to bring attention to the well-funded network of organizations that are deliberately misleading the public on climate change. My colleagues have called them the web of denial. We all gathered on the floor yesterday and today to bring attention to these political front groups that are acting as major roadblocks to the actions we must take as a nation and as a global community to address the difficult and disruptive but absolute and unequivocal scientific reality of climate change.

This web of denial is made up of dozens of organizations propped up by dark money. These political front groups for wealthy and self-interested donors like the Koch brothers—you may have heard of them—peddle bogus theories that climate change isn't real or, at the very least, the American public should doubt the overwhelming scientific evidence and fear what might happen if we enact policies that move us toward cleaner energy solutions. These organizations are promoting policies that are completely counterproductive at a time when we urgently need to take decisive action to combat climate change and to protect the health of our children and future generations.

As many of my constituents know well, climate change has already had a very real and costly impact in my home State of New Mexico, as it has across our Nation and around the world. In New Mexico, we are already seeing more extreme and prolonged drought conditions, larger wildfires, shrinking forests, and increased flooding. This is the reality now, not some far-off date in the future, and the longer we wait to act, the more difficult and the more expensive the solutions will be.

That is why the fictitious narratives spun by this web of denial and their organizations are so dangerous and why we, as policymakers, need to stand and refute their lies. We need to disclose who they really are and discredit their campaigns.

I am focusing this evening on the American Legislative Exchange Council, or ALEC. ALEC is an organization made up of State legislators across the Nation, and ALEC claims that nearly one-quarter of our country's State legislators are affiliated with the organization. ALEC calls itself a nonpartisan organization that promotes an exchange of ideas to help create State-based policies that promote economic growth.

Sounds like motherhood and apple pie, doesn't it? But when you take a look at who is behind ALEC's operations and you take a look at the types of policy they are pushing in State capitols across this Nation, you get a sense for their real agenda, and you can tell they are part of the coordinated and well-funded campaign to peddle doubt and skepticism about the settled science of climate change.

ALEC has been described as "a dating service between politicians at the

State level, local elected politicians, and many of America's biggest companies." ALEC writes "model policy"—thousands of cookie cutter, anti-conservation bills that legislators can introduce under their own name, in their own States, in hopes of turning them into law.

Specifically, in the area of energy policy, ALEC pushes a concerted legislative agenda that is in line with the rest of the Koch network to promote climate skepticism and roll back laws that protect clean air and water. ALEC's "model bills" read like they were written by the biggest polluters in our country because they probably were.

There are resolutions condemning the Clean Power Plan, calling for States to withdraw from regional climate initiatives and to reconsider national environmental standards such as rules that reduce ozone pollution—and, I might add, save lives. ALEC also pushes bills that call for repealing renewable fuel standards that are moving our electric grid toward cleaner energy sources.

ALEC has also written model resolutions that call for selling off or turning over public lands, such as our national forests in Western States like New Mexico and across our country. The current ALEC State chair in my home State of New Mexico introduced legislation at the Roundhouse in recent years called the Transfer of Public Land Act, which would call on the Federal Government to turn our public lands over to State management.

The only way Western States like mine could foot the bill for administering America's public lands would be to raise taxes dramatically or—and this is much more likely—sell off large expanses to developers and other private interests. Over time, it would mean public lands that New Mexicans go to every summer to hike and camp and barbecue with their families, the national forests where they go to chase elk and mule deer during hunting season would be closed off behind no trespassing signs.

I have long believed public lands are an equalizer in America, where access to public lands ensure you don't need to be a millionaire to enjoy the great outdoors or to introduce your family, your children to hunting and fishing and hiking. This land-grab idea is just as ludicrous as denying climate change, just as detached from reality, and similarly comes at the expense of our public health and protection of our public lands and resources.

Frankly, you don't have to do a deep-dive investigation to figure out what is going on. The so-called policy experts and leaders that make up ALEC's board of directors are on the record as climate skeptics. ALEC's CEO, Lisa Nelson, said: "I don't know the science on that," when she was asked if CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are the primary driver of climate change. Texas State representative Phil King, the national board

chair for ALEC in 2015, said: “I think the global warming theory is bad science.” And Connecticut State representative John Piscopo, ALEC’s national board chairman in 2013, said: “The public has been hoodwinked. . . . I have serious doubts about whether [climate change] is manmade.”

We all know the reason ALEC’s members and leaders say things like this and promote these kinds of bills. It is because so much of the funding for ALEC’s operations comes from sources other than membership dues. Over 98 percent of ALEC’s revenues comes from corporations and trade groups and corporate foundations. That is how ALEC works, by sewing uninformed seeds of doubt to move the needle at the State and local level toward anti-science, anti-climate action policies that benefit their funders’ bottom line.

ALEC is just one piece of a large web of similar dark money organizations that promote climate skepticism and are dangerous fronts for corporate interests to deliberately mislead the public and influence lawmakers. To see just one other recent example of this in my home State of New Mexico, I would like to take a moment to look at a letter to the editor published last week in the Las Cruces Sun-News by the Environmental Policy Alliance.

This is another one of those web-of-denial political front groups. In the letter to the editor, they claim that conservation and monument designations are really “federal land grabs” and the work of “radical environmental groups” trying to stop economic development. These “radical groups” and “green decoys” are, according to the letter, such dangerous groups as Trout Unlimited, the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, the Izaak Walton League, and Backcountry Hunters & Anglers, groups that all stand up for the interests of sportsmen and hunters and anglers—certainly not what most of my constituents would consider radical.

A close look shows who the real decoy is. The Environmental Policy Alliance is funded by the Western Fuels Association, another organization in the web of denial, and it is a pet project of lobbyist Rick Berman, who has also led deceptive public campaigns on behalf of cigarette and alcohol companies and now dirty energy. This organization doesn’t care about the best way to manage our publicly owned lands or preserving the ability of Americans—no matter what their stake in life is, how much money they make—to experience our country’s rich outdoor heritage. Instead, the Environmental Policy Alliance wants to put our public lands up for sale so the corporate elite can develop them for their own use and their own profit.

The Environmental Policy Alliance has published similar letters in dozens of small to mid-sized city newspapers all across our country in recent years—canned letters with no connection to local sentiment.

The reality is, the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monument in Southern New Mexico, which this group has slandered, serves as a national example of community-driven, landscape-scale conservation. In fact, independent polling shows overwhelming local support for this monument, and I am proud of my close work with the region’s diverse coalition and stakeholders that worked so hard for so many years to make that monument a reality.

Two years into the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks designation, local businesses in the Las Cruces area are attracting major tourism dollars and economic benefits. The Lonely Planet guidebook has named Southern New Mexico as a top 10 “Best in the U.S.” for 2016 destination, and highlights the national monument as a reason to visit.

The tax revenues of the town of Mesilla have jumped over 20 percent since the monument’s creation, and Las Cruces’ lodgers tax revenues are up since 2015, in part because of new conferences and meetings attracted to the area by the monument.

You can see how out of touch these groups are that want to instead sell off this public land. The organizations that make up this web of denial are promoting dishonest and deceptive campaigns that frankly run directly counter to the public interest.

At a time when we desperately need to move our State and national energy and conservation policies forward, we should be taking the overwhelming and indisputable scientific fact of climate change seriously, and we should make smart and forward-looking investments in the sustainable, low-carbon fuels of the future.

I am convinced advances in energy efficiency and generation and transmission of clean power offer us a roadmap that not only allows us to combat climate change but to do it in a way that will create thousands of new jobs and much needed economic activity in New Mexico and all across our country.

That is the reality, just like climate change. Climate change is not theoretical. It is one of those stubborn facts that doesn’t go away just because we choose to ignore it or if we listen to the company line from self-interested Koch donor networks and organizations like ALEC.

I think it is time to call these “Astroturf” groups out for who they really are and, frankly, who they really answer to. More importantly, it is time to take action on the moral challenge of our time—addressing climate change—so that our children can inherit the future they truly deserve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues in speaking out against what I believe is the misleading and dangerous campaign of some in the fossil fuel industry to un-

dermine this Nation’s efforts to combat global climate change.

The science on climate change is beyond rational dispute. Climate change is real. It is a clear and present threat to our planet, and it must be addressed robustly and urgently.

Scientists have proven unequivocally that CO<sub>2</sub> and other greenhouse gases we release into the atmosphere when we burn fossil fuels act to trap heat and form an invisible blanket to warm the planet. Over the last century, the Earth’s average temperature has continued to rise, with 9 of the 10 warmest years on record occurring since the year 2000.

True to form, 2015 was the Earth’s warmest year on record. Rising global temperatures have led to extreme changes in weather events and in our environment. No country is insulated and no State is insulated from the escalating effects of climate change.

In the United States, we are seeing it in this every region of the country, and we are witnessing its effects very dramatically in my State of New Hampshire. Rising temperatures are affecting our tourism, our outdoor recreation, and our agriculture industries. We are experiencing an onset of negative health impacts and increases of insect-borne diseases—Lyme disease is one—all of which can be tied to the effects of climate change.

In the United States and throughout the world, people acknowledge that global warming is an existential threat that requires immediate action to slow its pace and mitigate its effects, even while those climate deniers are still out there, making noise.

According to the Pew Research Center, two-thirds of all Americans acknowledge that climate change is real and that action must be taken to address it. But there are some, an extreme but influential minority, who argue that climate change is a hoax; that it lacks scientific consensus; that the changes we observe are not due to CO<sub>2</sub> and other greenhouse gas emissions, but they are due instead to variations in the sun or cosmic rays; and that policies to limit greenhouse gas emissions will ruin our economy.

Not surprisingly, these climate deniers are not scientists, though they may pretend to be. They are front groups funded by the fossil fuel industry, generally, and the Koch brothers, in particular. These front groups are paid to spin a web of denial wrapped in ideology with the aim of purposely deceiving the public about the dangers of climate change. This is deceitful and it is wrong, and we are here on the floor this afternoon to call out these groups by name so that the public knows what to watch for and there is some transparency about what is being said.

One of those groups is the Competitive Enterprise Institute, or CEI, based in Washington, DC. This group describes itself as “a public policy organization committed to advancing the principles of free enterprise and limited government.” But if we look more

closely, we find that CEI is not an independent organization. It is funded by powerful corporations designed to spread untruths and disinformation on behalf of its corporate sponsors.

In recent years, CEI has taken up the issue of climate change. It has been outspoken in disputing scientific evidence that human-produced greenhouse gas emissions are driving global warming.

Some may recognize CEI not for its work on climate denial but for its prominent role in misleading the public about the scientific evidence linking smoking to lung cancer and heart disease. Legal documents from major tobacco companies exposed the fact that CEI received more than \$800,000 from Philip Morris to launch coordinated media campaigns to attack the Food and Drug Administration's efforts to regulate tobacco.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a series of these documents be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WRO EFFORTS

Beginning last fall, the assistance of the Washington Legal Foundation, Citizens for a Sound Economy and the Competitiveness Enterprise Institute was sought to define the FDA as an agency out of control and one failing to live up to its Congressional mandate regarding regulation of drugs and medical devices.

Beginning in December, those groups conducted an aggressive media campaign toward those goals, incorporating the issuance of policy papers, conducting symposia, filing petitions with FDA and taking other steps to keep the public and media focus on the agency.

On the legislative front, a group of southern Democrats began negotiating with the White House early this year on behalf of the industry seeking to eliminate any role for the FDA in the regulation of tobacco.

The quid pro quo in these negotiations would be voluntary concessions on the part of the industry on the issue of youth access to cigarettes. Leading the negotiations were Sen. Wendell Ford and Rep. L.F. Payne. After nearly eight months of discussion, the WH rejected the compromise.

Beginning in January, members of Congress—at the urging of several outside groups including Citizens for a Sound Economy—began taking a much closer look at the FDA appropriations request. That scrutiny led to the successful effort to eliminate \$300 million sought by FDA to consolidate its offices in a new federal campus, by any measure a major setback for Kessler.

Meanwhile, Congress also was scrutinizing the regular appropriations and voted to freeze the agency's budget, effectively decreasing the level of funding for next year when adjusted for inflation.

Language was inserted in that legislation to restrict Kessler's authority to assign employees to various projects and a list of questions was submitted to Kessler regarding his investigation into tobacco, including what resources and personnel were being devoted to the effort.

Congress has not been satisfied with his responses to date, raising the issue of whether Kessler has been evasive or even engaged in obstruction of Congress in this area.

Congress also initiated a series of oversight hearings regarding the agency, con-

ducted in the House by Rep. Thomas Bliley and in the Senate by Sen. Nancy Kassebaum. Those hearings focused on whether the FDA was fulfilling its mission and included several demands by Congress for documents and deposition.

At the Senate oversight hearing, former FDA Commissioner Charlie Edwards testified, raising further questions of whether the FDA was acting legally and responsibly in pursuing a course that would lead to tobacco regulation.

As a result of the growing focus on FDA from inside and outside Congress and the groundwork laid through the oversight and investigations committee work, legislation to reform the FDA was proposed earlier this year and is expected to be formally introduced in September. A key provision in the reform legislation will be to restrict FDA's regulatory authority.

The House Agriculture Committee also requested that Kessler supply all documents he was using in consideration of his tobacco regulations. Kessler has resisted, and that effort continues.

In recognition that Kessler ultimately would play some regulatory role regarding tobacco, an aggressive campaign was conducted over the past six months to educate members of Congress and their staffs regarding the issue of regulation.

One result of that campaign was a July 15 press bipartisan press conference led by Reps. L.F. Payne and Richard Burr as a result of media reports that Kessler had sent his regulatory proposal to the White House. Participants circulated Dear Colleague letters throughout Congress and submitted Op-Ed pieces to their hometown newspapers challenging the need for FDA regulation.

Also, as a result of those education efforts, delegations of elected officials met with White House officials in an effort to derail federal intervention in tobacco regulation.

The groundwork that has been laid legislatively has been designed to create a receptive atmosphere in Congress for legislation that will be introduced to eliminate FDA's role in tobacco regulation. The timing and specifics of such legislation are under consideration.

Efforts in Congress also were made to identify unlikely allies—those who generally are more concerned with the politics of regulation rather than the substance—and resulted in meetings with the WH with Sen. Chris Dodd and Rep. Dick Gephardt. Labor also presented opposition to Kessler's role in regulation.

Recognizing that legislators weren't the only point of White House access, a conference of tobacco growers held this summer focused on the ramifications of FDA regulation. Both Sen. Ford and Rep. Payne spoke to growers, and efforts continue to mobilize the agricultural community in opposition to the proposed regulation.

The support of Administration political advisors was enlisted to discuss the ramifications of FDA regulation, and those efforts also continue.

#### STATE ACTIVITIES

Efforts focused primarily on defining the issue of youth smoking as one that properly should be addressed at the state and local level, rather than having FDA intervene with any regulatory scheme.

In all 50 states, the stated goal was to endorse or pass reasonable marketing laws which stop minors from purchasing cigarettes, with a minimum of government interference in the marketing of the cigarettes to adult smokers.

State elected officials also were contacted to intervene with the White House to stress the point that there was no need for FDA

regulation. In addition to the states' rights issues, economic and political arguments were incorporated in the discussions with Administration officials.

Support of the American Legislative Exchange Council—a public/private consortium of conservative state legislators—took a stand against FDA regulation, as did the Southern Legislative Congerence, a group affiliated with the Council of State Governments.

Meetings were held with the Southland Corp., one of the nation's largest cigarette retailers, and with the Food Marketing Institute and National Association of Convenience Stores to brief those groups on potential adverse impacts of FDA regulation and to enlist their opposition.

A working group was formed by the Tobacco Institute to bring together industry representatives and the retail and wholesale trade communities to join together and work toward the common goal of compliance with laws prohibiting sales of tobacco products to minors. Much of the focus centered on employee education regarding underage sales. Covington and Burling also was given the assignment of drafting appropriate state legislation that could be used as a model in state legislatures.

A blueprint was established to enable the company to contact and mobilize legislative and retail association allies to participate in the 90-day comment period once the Kessler regulations were released and to support appropriate Congressional action on the issue.

Third-party spokespeople were identified in each state to address the issues of FDA regulation with local media, and a state elected official in each state has been identified to enlist his or her colleagues in upcoming legislative sessions on youth access issues.

#### INTERNAL ACTIVITIES/MEDIA RELATIONS

Work began last year to formulate a PM program that would address the issue of youth access, with a decision made in December to hold those proposals in abeyance.

Company employees and outside consultants involved in the issue were formally assigned roles as the FDA response team, and efforts began in January to incorporate the various elements into a comprehensive program addressing all conceivable actions that could be taken by the Clinton Administration or the FDA regarding tobacco regulation.

These efforts encompassed both public affairs campaigns and potential legal filings. Press releases, statements, fact sheets, video news releases, background video and other materials necessary to convey the company's position were drafted and taped for each of the options considered.

PM representatives with scientific credentials were assigned the task of meeting with various "think tanks" to discuss the issue of FDA regulation and generate guest editorials and comments to the media.

Those team members who were identified as taking a public role in PM's response were given media/communications training, focusing on the effective delivery of company messages.

In late spring, the proposed youth access program was resurrected and the company subsequently announced Action Against Access, incorporating voluntary and proposed legislative steps to address the issue of youth smoking.

The announcement of AAA was made at a New York press conference and was accompanied by an aggressive media outreach campaign, including the use of VNRs, background video feeds, letters to elected officials and coordination with third-party allies.

In early July, those involved in the FDA working group participated in a simulation geared to measure company response to an announcement by the FDA of full or partial regulation of tobacco.

That exercise envisioned several different actions Kessler could take on tobacco regulation, and measured the company's response to an FDA announcement. Based on the results of that exercise, the action plan was fine-tuned to deal with various options Kessler was believed to have available.

By the time of Kessler's announcement of regulatory intent, the company mobilized to battle the Administration proposal on both the legal and public affairs fronts.

A lawsuit was filed as soon as the FDA notice of intent to regulate was published in the Federal Register, and two hours before President Clinton's afternoon press conference announcing the action, PM held a press conference to announce the lawsuit and register its objections to the FDA action.

By the time Clinton made his announcement, a video news release and background video was fed by way of satellite to television news departments throughout the country, and satellite time was booked to provide those stations an opportunity to interview PM spokespersons for local broadcasts.

With assistance from Burson-Marsteller, PM press kits were sent to all major Washington-area media in anticipation of stories generated by those reporters.

While World Regulatory Affairs was dealing with the public affairs aspects of the FDA announcement, the Washington Relations Office mobilized its plans to reach legislative supporters in Washington and in key southern states to mount criticism of the President's decision.

All materials disseminated to the press also were circulated on Capitol Hill to provide legislators with the PM's position and rationale for filing suit. With information in hand, several southern legislators were able to react and respond quickly to media inquiries.

The PM briefings on Kessler's actions extended to conservative columnists and think tanks, enabling them to provide third-party views of the Administration's action.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. CEI lobbied politicians, conducted symposia, and published policy papers and op-eds with titles such as "Safety Is a Relative Thing for Cars: Why Not for Cigarettes?" CEI's then-policy analyst, Alexander Volokh, even went so far as to describe the act of smoking as a civic duty.

As the documents that we have just submitted for the record detail, CEI's mission was to portray the FDA as "an agency out of control and one failing to live up to its congressional mandate." For a time, CEI was successful. Congress took a closer look at FDA's appropriations requests, and lawmakers slashed agency funding and passed language to restrict FDA's authority to regulate tobacco. In fact, at one oversight hearing, Members of Congress even questioned whether the FDA was acting legally and responsibly in pursuing a course that would lead to tobacco regulation.

If this sounds like *deja vu*, that is because it is. CEI and other front groups are using the same playbook, the same tactics to deny climate change that they used to deny a link between tobacco use and fatal disease. CEI is now

on a new mission to confuse and mislead the public on climate change. It is financing and directing ad hoc groups like the so-called Cooler Heads Coalition, which claims that global warming is a myth and that many scientists are skeptical of climate change. CEI has also produced two television ads that allege that the polar ice caps are thickening, not shrinking, and that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are good for the environment.

CEI's ads sound more like something that Saturday Night Live might come up with. For instance, this is their tagline about CO<sub>2</sub>:

They call it pollution. We call it life.

Of course, we all know that CO<sub>2</sub> is necessary for plant growth. But what that ad fails to mention is that too much CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere can cause global temperatures to rise, and that there is more of it in the atmosphere today than at any time during the last 420,000 years. So there is more carbon, more CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere than at any time during the last 420,000 years.

Just as in the case of Big Tobacco, one need only to look at who funds CEI to see how they determine their messaging. We have a chart here to show where their funding comes from. I would just point out that this is data all compiled from publicly available records. We see ExxonMobil Foundation. Then we see the Koch family and their foundation. Then we see Philip Morris. So there is significant funding from people who have an agenda about climate change.

My staff has determined that between 1985 and 2015, CEI has received almost \$15 million from rightwing organizations like the Donors Trust and the Dunn's Foundation for the Advancement of Right Thinking. CEI has also received more than \$2 million, as we see here, from ExxonMobil, and more than \$1 million from the Koch foundations and the Koch brothers personally. The strong ties between CEI's message denying climate change and the interests of coal, oil, and gas companies are clear and obvious. So it seems that while CEI has changed its client, it is still in the exact same business of selling lies and selling out the health and the future of ordinary Americans.

Another industry front group I wanted to talk about this afternoon has been exceptionally loud in denying climate change. It is the so-called Energy & Environment Legal Institute, or E&E Legal. E&E Legal has several different aliases—the American Tradition Institute, George Mason Environmental Law Clinic, and Free Market Environmental Law Clinic—but its MO is one and the same. Like CEI, E&E Legal has a core mission of discrediting climate science and dismantling regulations that protect the environment. However, instead of rolling out ad campaigns, E&E Legal has a different approach. Its specialty is harassing individual climate scientists and researchers with the aim of per-

suading the public that human-caused global warming is a scientific fraud. Of course, the group's lawsuits are frivolous and baseless. But this doesn't matter because the entire point of the lawsuits is to disrupt important academic research that may help us anticipate, avoid, or mitigate the impacts of global warming.

Once again, if we look at the funding behind E&E Legal, we understand exactly why this group is attacking climate scientists and their work. E&E Legal does not publicly disclose its donors. We have seen that before. However, bankruptcy proceedings have identified that the group is funded by Arch Coal and Peabody Energy, and that E&E's senior lawyer has received funds directly from Alpha Natural Resources. These are some of the largest coal producers in the United States. It is shameful and dishonorable that these coal companies are funding the harassment and intimidation of scientists. They are putting profits ahead of people, and their disinformation threatens the scientific inquiry and transparency we need in order to make smart climate policy decisions to protect our Earth.

In conclusion, big corporations are using organizations that claim to be independent to spread misleading messages to the American people, knowing that people would be quick to discount these messages if they actually knew they were coming directly from coal companies and from Koch Industries. This campaign of disinformation and propaganda endangers the health, environment, and economic well-being of people in the United States and across the world. That is why Senators who acknowledge the science of climate change, Senators who understand the urgency of action to combat climate change are speaking up this afternoon and for many days to come.

By coming to the floor, we want to expose groups like CEI and E&E Legal for what they are—front groups whose role is to spin a web of denial. By championing clean energy policies, we want to ensure that the United States reduces its dependence on fossil fuels while creating millions of jobs to support our economy in alternative energy and green energy sources.

By supporting our country's leadership in negotiating the international climate agreement concluded last year in Paris, we are doing our part to slow global warming and help poorer nations most affected by it. This is just the beginning. We will continue to come to the floor to advocate for policies to reduce carbon emissions, to strengthen our economy, and to protect our environment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I join many of my colleagues here in encouraging the Senate to continue working on solutions to protect our planet from the growing threats of climate change.

First, I would like to thank Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE for his leadership and tireless work on these issues. We both represent the great State of Rhode Island, the Ocean State, and I am lucky to have such a strong partner to work with to improve the health of our oceans and fight sea level rise, beach erosion, and ocean warming and acidification. I am proud to work alongside him as we respond to the serious challenges of climate change. Indeed, he is the leader in this effort in the Senate, throughout my State, and throughout the country. I applaud his commitment to this endeavor and his efforts to organize all of us to come here and to speak out on this growing danger.

We are already shouldering the costs of climate change as Americans, and these costs are increasing. Climate change is driving severe drought and wildfires in the West, larger and more frequent floods in the Midwest, and sea level rise and greater storm damage along our coasts. Vulnerable populations, like children with asthma and the elderly, are suffering from higher levels of smog in our cities and longer and more severe heat waves. Farmers and ranchers are struggling with crop and livestock losses from drought. Increasingly, acidic oceans are harming shellfish populations and threatening fisheries. Communities are struggling to pay for infrastructure damaged by fires, more extreme storms, and coastal erosion.

In the face of this evidence, as my colleagues have all pointed out, there is a systematic and organized effort to discredit, dismiss it, ignore it, but Americans are sensing dramatically the effects in their own lives, and they understand this.

One area I think is important to emphasize is that climate change is not just a local issue or an issue that is associated with domestic policy. It has profound national security ramifications. Indeed, to the military, climate change acts as a threat multiplier, exacerbating threats in already unstable regions of the world. Climate change creates chokepoints for oil distribution lines and exacerbates our dependence on foreign oil to fuel ships, tanks, aircraft, and tactical vehicles.

To protect our national security, we must take action based on scientific evidence presented by our Nation's best climate scientists. Such experts have overwhelmingly warned us that the increasingly warmer temperatures will mean oppressive heat in already hot areas. This translates not only to geopolitical issues, but it translates down to the individual soldier. For our infantry personnel, this means carrying several pounds of additional gear across dry and arid regions. And supplying these troops with fuel and water is becoming a difficult challenge for our military leaders. Warmer temperatures also lead to glacial melt, causing sea level rise and ocean acidification, affecting our seafaring vessels and air-

craft carriers, and increasing the complexity for our Navy.

One of the more interesting moments I had on the Committee on Armed Services was to listen several years ago to an admiral describe to me that transit to the Arctic Ocean will become commonplace in just a few years. To someone who was brought up in the 1950s and 1960s and served in the military in the 1970s, that seemed completely implausible, but that is happening. Yet there are groups that are organized that are trying to make that disappear.

It is not disappearing for our military. They have to cope with it, plan for it, and, indeed, ensure that our security is protected from the ramifications.

In national security, decisions are made by a careful evaluation of risk. Given the preponderance of scientific evidence, it only makes sense that we address the major risks caused by climate change. National security and foreign policy leaders across the political spectrum issued a statement last year urging the highest levels of American government and business to take domestic and international action to fight climate change. These are the national security experts. They are a bipartisan group of Americans who have dedicated their lives to this Nation. They are not a self-interested group of people who are profiting from a certain position. They include former Secretaries of Defense, Chuck Hagel, William Cohen, and Leon Panetta; Secretaries of State Madeleine Albright and George Shultz; National Security Advisors Zbigniew Brzezinski and Robert "Bud" McFarlane; Senators Olympia Snowe, Carl Levin, and Richard Lugar; New Jersey Governor and Chair of the 9/11 Commission Thomas Kean; and retired U.S. Army Chief of Staff, GEN Gordon R. Sullivan. These and many others agree that climate change is a threat to national security and have called for U.S. leadership in the global effort to tackle the urgent and complex problem of climate change. And yet, even these wise and selfless Americans are being dismissed, if you will, by the organized effort to undercut scientific evidence.

We took steps and have taken steps. Last December, in Paris, we took a step forward with an international agreement. More than 150 countries pledged to develop plans to tackle climate change domestically, including countries once reluctant to act, such as China and India. American leadership has been the key to getting these countries on board and agreeing to do their fair share. These countries are also acting because it is in their self-interest to do so—for their own health and for their national security.

It is clear that no country can avoid the impacts of climate change, and no country can meet this challenge alone. As a nation that has contributed more than a quarter of all global carbon pollution, it is our responsibility to lead,

not to deny. As a nation already feeling the effects and costs of climate change, it is also in our national interest to do so. As we have seen time and again, other countries would join us if America leads the way—not by denial but by dedication to pragmatic solutions that can be achieved.

American companies must also do a better job in addressing climate change. It is not enough just for America's government and military to take action; the private sector also needs to step up to the plate. Companies need to be transparent and provide fuller disclosure of the impacts their industries have on our climate and environment and must take full responsibility for their actions. Some companies have improved their sustainability practices and have made strides to inform consumers about their carbon footprint, and more need to join them. In fact, many companies concluded it is in their economic self-interest to do so, not just in the national or public interest to do so.

Information about the risks posed by climate change is also something that is critical to investors, some of whom are demanding greater disclosures. For example, Allianz Global Investors, which is a global diversified active investment management with nearly \$500 billion in assets under manager has specifically called for "achieving better disclosure of the effects of carbon costs on the Oil & Gas companies." This is why I have introduced legislation to enhance climate-related disclosures by publicly-traded companies to ensure that these companies are providing investors with the information necessary to make informed investment decisions.

These companies not only have an obligation, as we all do, to the greater welfare of the country and indeed the world, but they owe a very direct and fiduciary responsibility to their investors. Many of these companies have information—I would suspect at least—that should be disclosed, and we have to ensure that they do this so that the market operates appropriately.

It is not just about broad statements of protecting the climate. It is not just about feeling good. It is about making concrete information available to the public, to investors, to the country as a whole—not to deny, obfuscate, or ignore this information.

I urge my colleagues to support legislation that protects our air, water, natural resources, and environment. The health of our oceans and environment must be preserved for now and for future generations. Indeed, in this effort, I can think of no one who is taking a more forceful and constructive role than my colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE. Again, I salute him.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, as ranking member on the Subcommittee on Space, Science and Competitiveness, I



know how important it is for our country to invest in scientific research and to make informed decisions based on those findings.

Sound science has played a critical role in the United States' becoming a leader in fields like space exploration, medical research, advanced manufacturing, and other high-tech industries. So when 97 percent of scientists in a particular field agree on a serious problem, it is wise for our policymakers to listen.

The scientific community is sounding the alarm about the urgent need to address the causes of global climate change. Scientists here in the United States and across the world overwhelmingly agree that the weight of evidence is clear: Global temperatures are rising, dramatic changes in weather and climate have accompanied this warming, and humans are largely responsible due to our emissions of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere.

Military leaders, doctors, economists, and biologists are among the experts warning us about global climate change and the fact that it is major threat to national security, public health, our economy, and our natural resources.

Unfortunately, powerful special interests, led by some organizations and companies in the fossil fuel industry, are deliberately spreading false information about climate change to influence public opinion and to muddle the truth. The strategy to confuse the public about climate change science and delay policy action has many parallels to the strategy used by Big Tobacco to mislead the public about scientific evidence linking smoking to lung cancer and heart disease.

The corporations spreading disinformation on climate change are the very same interests that have the most to gain financially by stopping meaningful action to reduce greenhouse gases, protect our clean air, and address global warming for future generations.

The Koch brothers are a prime example of this fact. Charles and David Koch made their vast fortunes from owning companies that profit from a range of dirty industries. Much of their wealth is funneled into activist groups that produce questionable information and the spin necessary to support their own interests. The web of denial they have created is a threat to sound science-based decisionmaking.

While some big polluters seek to confuse and cloud the judgment of decisionmakers and the public, the American people continue to suffer the consequences of our dependence on fossil fuels. These consequences are not just limited to rising global temperatures. The people of Michigan are paying for the costs of coal and oil pollution in many ways, but I would like to focus on just a couple of them.

A few years ago, three-story, high piles of petroleum coke, or pet coke, lined the banks of the Detroit River in

the open air. Pet coke is essentially the industrial byproduct that is produced during the oil refining process. These particular piles were owned by Koch Carbon, a company controlled by the Koch brothers.

Usually pet coke is shipped off to other countries, where it is burned as fuel, worsening terrible air quality problems in places like China and contributing to global climate change. In this case, the banks of the Detroit River were being treated as a dumping ground to store these mountains of pet coke. The wind would blow the pet coke dust everywhere, including into the homes and lungs of those living in the neighborhoods nearby. It was even documented blowing across the river into Windsor, Ontario.

Not only was the air being contaminated, the pet coke was fouling the Great Lakes, a source of drinking water for nearly 40 million people. When it rained, pollution would run off from the piles into the Detroit River, which is part of the Great Lakes system.

I joined residents in Detroit to call for these pet coke piles to be moved, and only through a community-wide effort were they eventually successful. I have also introduced legislation to study the health and environmental impacts of this pet coke but, unfortunately, this same area of Detroit that has had to deal with mountains of particulate matter blowing into the air already had the distinction of having some of the worst air quality in the Nation.

Research shows that exposure to air pollution at a young age can lead to health problems like asthma, and air pollution can worsen asthma symptoms. Detroit has the highest rate of asthma in young children among the 18 largest cities in the United States. Over 12 percent of Detroit children have asthma; the national rate is around 8 percent.

Most air pollution comes from burning of fossil fuels, and parts of Detroit are dealing with high pollutant levels as a result. I wrote a letter, along with Senator STABENOW, calling for a plan to reduce sulfur dioxide levels in Southwest Detroit and comply with Federal clean air standards. The Michigan Department of Environmental Quality finally just submitted their plan to comply—over a year past the initial deadline.

These examples in Detroit show how protecting clean air and clean water are often environmental justice issues. Those that are most affected by pollution are often from low-income and minority households. Addressing climate change will also improve the air quality of these affected areas.

While these communities bear the brunt of fossil fuel pollution, the Koch brothers and others pour hundreds of millions and even billions of dollars into activities to avoid regulation of their dirty industries. One of the tactics that powerful corporate industries

use is to bankroll numerous front groups to spread misinformation. The idea behind this strategy is to use seemingly independent organizations, such as think tanks, to deliver misleading messages that the public might rightfully dismiss if they had heard them directly from industry.

They have calculated that it is better for business to mislead the American public, rather than acknowledge the scientific evidence and their role in climate change and join the effort to combat this growing threat to our planet. It is a page taken right out of Big Tobacco's playbook. By creating their own scientific studies and policy papers from a network of surrogates, it gives the appearance that there is a legitimate debate over the fundamentals of climate change science.

One example is the Cato Institute. For years, the organization has received funding from fossil fuel interests such as ExxonMobil and the Koch family. At the same time, Cato spreads climate skepticism. Over a span of 15 years, the Cato Institute published 773,000 words and 768 documents expressing climate skepticism.

The web of denial is intended to manufacture doubt among the American public in order to delay action, but the spending efforts by the same corporations also specifically target elected officials and other key decisionmakers to prevent meaningful action on global warming.

The Koch brothers have poured vast sums of money into election ads, lobbying efforts, and campaign donations often funneled through other organizations to hide the source of the funding. As a result, I have heard many climate myths repeated in the Halls of Congress that were carefully crafted by the network of climate denial front groups.

Late last year, the Senate Subcommittee on Space, Science, and Competitiveness held a hearing that was specifically designed to cast doubt on the scientific evidence of climate change. The witness panel was stacked by the majority with prominent climate deniers. As the ranking member, the one witness I was able to invite was RADM David Titley, who, as the U.S. Navy's chief meteorologist, initiated and led the Navy's task force on climate change. At the hearing, Dr. Titley outlined how climate change is a serious threat to national security. Admiral Titley explained that the military makes decisions based on known information and calculations of risk. Often they must act on less than perfect intelligence, but they understand risks and will take action to prevent threats when given the chance. The admiral applied this to the broad agreement among climate scientists, saying that any military commander would take action "in a heartbeat" if there was a consensus among 97 percent of the intelligence community about a particular scenario. In fact, the military has already started taking action

to anticipate vulnerabilities and mitigate the impacts related to climate change.

The brightest, most experienced minds in our U.S. military realize that reliance on fossil fuel leaves our troops and citizens exposed to more risks at home, as well as abroad. Unfortunately, Congress has not been as quick to act. Efforts to pass meaningful legislation to address climate change have been blocked. Existing administrative efforts to reduce admissions or invest in clean energy have also been repeatedly attacked.

We can and must pass legislative solutions to address global climate change. Transitioning away from fossil fuels and investing in renewable energy will create sustainable jobs and good-paying jobs here in the United States. Taking bold action on climate change will strengthen our public health, economy, and national security.

We must wake up and realize that those attempting to mislead and confuse must not be successful. I am confident that we will overcome this web of denial and use peer-reviewed, sound scientific information to guide our decisionmaking in order to create a resilient future for our children and grandchildren.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES  
CHIEF PETTY OFFICER ADAM BROWN

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the Senate will pass legislation renaming Post Office 620 Central Avenue in Hot Springs National Park after CPO Adam Brown.

I have visited that post office many times as a child, as a Congressman, and as a Senator. I can't say there is all that much remarkable about it, but it will be remarkable after this law is passed.

I didn't know Adam Brown, but Adam was about my age. Adam was a great warrior and a hero. Three years ago on Memorial Day in Hot Springs, a gentleman came up to me after I spoke and handed me a book titled "Fearless" by Eric William. It is a New York Times bestseller. It tells the story of Adam Brown. That title captures his spirit. He was fearless, relentless, and also a joyful and Godly man. As a child in Hot Springs, he was the one who always lined up to hit the biggest kid in football. He would jump off a bridge into the local lake and jump out of trucks. Adam was an all-American boy.

During his teenaged years, Adam succumbed to addiction. He began to drink, started to use marijuana, became addicted to cocaine, and that led to many crimes. At one point, he had 16 outstanding felonies.

Larry and his mother Janice didn't know what to do, so they told the sheriff where he was, and he was arrested. Adam went to Teen Challenge, a Christian ministry dedicated to helping youth overcome addiction. Through his faith in God, love of his parents, and

the love of his wife Kelly, he was able to fight back his addiction, although he continued to struggle with it.

With the help of a good recruiter and out of a sense of deep and abiding patriotism for his country, Adam cleaned up his life by enlisting in the Navy. He didn't just enlist to do any job, though, he enlisted to be a Navy SEAL. It entails some of the hardest training our military has. Adam, of course, got his golden trident and went on to display the same kind of fearlessness and relentlessness but also the same joyfulness that so many people in Hot Springs and in Arkansas had known.

As anyone who has been in the military knows, there are always some guys in the unit who are downers, looking on the dark side of things, wondering what was going to go wrong next, and Adam was the antidote to that. He always looked on the bright side, always had a sunny outlook, and always had a helpful word for a friend or buddy. He was always ready to help the unit accomplish the mission.

Adam went through multiple deployments as a Navy SEAL, and there was never any quit in him. In 2003, he was injured in a simulation round during a training exercise with a miniature paint ball that the military uses. Somehow it got underneath his eye protection and hit him in the eye, and as a result he lost his eye, but, as he always did, he looked on the bright side. He got a glass eye with an Arkansas Razorback on it, and he would put on a pirate patch and play pirate with his two little kids, Nathan and Savannah. It didn't stop him from continuing to deploy as a Navy SEAL.

He was later involved in a multicar accident while deployed. His hand was crushed and three fingers were severed. The doctors were able to reattach it, but it could no longer be used. Of course, he was eligible to leave the military because of his combat injury, but he didn't do that. He learned to shoot with the other hand and use his other eye when shooting. In fact, he went on to become a member of SEAL Team Six, the most elite element of the Navy SEAL community.

He continued to deploy and fight but also showed deep compassion. In Afghanistan, he noticed that many of the poor, little Afghan children didn't even have shoes on their feet on the darkest, coldest days of winter, so he arranged for a local pastor in his community to send shoes that he could give to them.

On March 17, 2010, Adam was on a mission high up in the mountains in Afghanistan. His unit came under intense enemy fire. Adam helped to save the lives of his fellow SEALs, taking multiple rounds himself, and he ultimately perished as a result of his wounds. Adam received a hero's welcome in Hot Springs, where he rests today.

Adam's story is about faith, redemption, service, and love. When little boys and little girls drive by that post office in Hot Springs in the future, I hope

they ask their parents who Adam Brown was. I hope their parents can tell them his story and inspire them with his example.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak, along with a number of my colleagues, about groups that have spun a web of denial and to fight back against the regressive, fallacious, and dangerous rhetoric of climate change deniers. They would disavow the overwhelming evidence of one of our most significant environmental crises. It is not only a quality-of-life challenge, it is a national security crisis in our world today.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I know from our military leaders how seriously they take this crisis, which is causing droughts as well as unrest, and the challenges it creates when our military needs to access certain parts of the world. Those consequences are among the national security threats that climate change raises, and deniers do no great service to our national defense.

Connecticut knows firsthand the visible impacts of climate change because we see the mammoth storms that threaten to become the new normal in our world, causing rising tides, destroying homes, literally changing the nature of our shoreline and impacting our quality of life.

No one State can address climate change effectively, and that is why we need the Nation to act together and why climate change denial is so dangerous to our national security, not only in military terms but also in the very real terms of how we conduct our lives in this country. We need a coordinated, comprehensive approach, and yet some groups would have you believe that no action is necessary—none at all. They say that any measures are a waste of time and resources. They say that any measures to stop food supplies from disappearing, forest fires from spreading, and storms from raging are simply unnecessary. They have no evidence to support their claims, but, indeed, they have to distort the evidence that exists even to make those claims.

Just last year, we discovered that Exxon projects into its planning a model that it described for itself as "too murky to warrant action." They planned for themselves but not for the people, including their own customers. They would be ready for climate change but would make sure that no one else could be by adopting a model and making it their business model—or part of it—that implicitly, internally, they felt they could not reveal publicly.

Some groups have adopted more covert efforts to sabotage science. The American Legislative Exchange Council, better known by its acronym

ALEC, denies that its policy denied climate change. ALEC commits to fighting science in the shadows because it has no facts to bring into the sun. Indeed, its proposed bill, the Environmental Literacy Improvement Act—a very innocuous bill—actually seeks to serve as a stamp of approval on teaching climate change denial in science classrooms.

These tactics exist because when groups like ALEC or Americans for Prosperity stand ready to deny the truth, some part of our people will believe it.

One leader of the Americans for Prosperity group, when asked about the science of climate change, responded: “I don’t even want to argue the point. To me, it’s not that important.”

This web of denial has consequences. It delays and distorts common awareness and consciousness about the truth and the need to act.

One of my colleagues compared this web of denial to actions of tobacco companies decades ago denying that smoking and tobacco could cause cancer or heart disease or any of the other serious illnesses that tobacco use causes, in addition to the lifetime addiction to nicotine that inevitably was a consequence to so many people who believed those tobacco companies. That web of denial was similar to this one. The tobacco companies knew the truth. They denied it. These deniers also know the truth. Our purpose in being here today is to make sure the American people know it as well.

Groups like ALEC and Americans for Prosperity may receive support from the economic interests that have a stake in hiding the truth, but ultimately the American people need to know it, they need to act on it, and they need to appreciate the motives and interests of the web of denial that is spun so artfully and relentlessly by these groups and the special interests that underlie them and support them.

I wish to thank my colleagues who have come to the floor today, particularly Senator WHITEHOUSE, who has been so instrumental in organizing this group.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator Arkansas.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### TRIBUTE TO JUDGE TOM EMBERTON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a good friend and mentor of mine who is receiving a great honor from his alma mater of Western Kentucky University. Judge

Tom Emberton, former chief judge of the Kentucky Court of Appeals and a man with a long career of renowned service, will be honored as a member of WKU’s Hall of Distinguished Alumni this October. It is the highest award the university can bestow upon an alumnus.

Judge Emberton recalls that his great aunt began the family tradition of attending WKU, and his mother attended also. Tom met his wife at WKU, and their two children and all but one of their grandchildren attended as well.

Tom was an active member of the WKU community during his time on campus. He was named business manager of the College Heights Herald, elected president of his sophomore and junior classes, and president of his fraternity. He temporarily interrupted his studies to serve in the U.S. Air Force, where he was part of the Strategic Air Command under Gen. Curtis LeMay.

After graduation in 1958, Tom began a long history of public service to the people of Kentucky. In 1965, he was elected county attorney. In 1967, he worked on the winning campaign for Louie Nunn for Governor, the first Republican Governor to be elected in the Bluegrass State in 20 years. After the campaign, Governor Nunn asked Tom to serve as his chief administrative aide.

Tom then became the Republican nominee for Governor himself in 1971. I remember the campaign well, as I worked on it for Tom. I had left my position as a legislative aide here in the U.S. Senate for Kentucky Senator Marlow Cook to go back to Kentucky to work for Tom’s campaign because I believed in him and in what he could do for the Commonwealth. Unfortunately, Tom did not win that race, but he certainly emerged from it as a man who had earned admiration and respect around the State. We all knew great things were in store for Tom.

Tom continued to practice law in Barren and Metcalfe counties. Then in the late 1980s, he was appointed by then-Governor Wallace Wilkinson to the Kentucky Court of Appeals. He was reelected to that panel repeatedly and had a long and distinguished career, capped off by being elected chief judge by his fellow judges after several years of service. He held that chief judge slot until his retirement from the bench in 2004.

To this day, Tom is still active in his community with many volunteer and philanthropic activities. He is also an avid reader, and I know one of his favorite places to relax is in his office surrounded by books.

Western Kentucky University has certainly made the right choice in selecting Judge Tom Emberton as a distinguished alumni. My friend Tom is highly deserving of this honor, and I am sure his family is very proud of him and all he has accomplished. I know my U.S. Senate colleagues join me in congratulating Judge Emberton for this recognition and wishing him the very best in his future life endeavors.

Mr. President, area publication the Herald News recently published an article detailing Judge Emberton’s life and career. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Herald News, June 29, 2016]

JUDGE EMBERTON HONORED BY WKU  
(By Shirley Mayrand)

Every couple of years we’re reminded of why we’re so proud of Judge Tom Emberton. In 2014 he received the Jim C. Coleman Community Service Award, and in October he will join WKU’s Hall of Distinguished Alumni during WKU’s 2016 Homecomings Celebration at the Sloan Convention Center. It brings back some fond memories.

“Western has always been a part of my life,” Tom said, “even from a small first grader. My mother went to Western.” His mom finished a year of college and then got a teaching job at a Monroe County school where they lived at the time. Tom recalls how she told him as a first grader he could continue to have fun when he got to Western.

The family moved to Metcalfe County right after World War II ended and Tom graduated from Edmonson High School. He attended one semester at Western before going into the U.S. Air Force where he was part of the Strategic Air Command under General Curtis LeMay. “His mission,” Tom explained, “was that if Russia could get an atomic bomb off in this country, that we could respond to that in 15 minutes.”

In 1955, Tom returned home to resume his education at Western. He credits his great aunt with starting the family tradition of attending WKU. She enrolled in 1909, just three years after it opened. (H.H. Cherry purchased full ownership of the school in 1899 and the Southern Normal School part of the institution became Western Kentucky State Normal School in 1906.)

Tom met his wife, Julia there, their two children attended and all but one of their grandchildren.

Tom believes that his active role at WKU was what earned him the honor of being selected for the Hall of Distinguished Alumni. As a student he was named business manager of the College Heights Herald, elected president of his sophomore and junior classes and president of his fraternity.

Continuing on to the University of Louisville to pursue a law degree, he continued student leadership activities. He was the president of the Delta Theta Phi fraternity and president of the Student Bar Association. “It’s those things that the alumni association looked at to see what you’d done, rather than just walk into class.” Tom got his law degree in 1962 and was elected as county attorney in 1965.

In 1967, Tom was tapped by Louis Nunn to assist in his campaign for governor. When Nunn won the election he asked Tom to move to Frankfort and be his chief administrative aide. At that time a governor could only serve one four-year term. Tom’s own bid for the governorship ended after winning the Republican primary, and he returned to the farm at Cave Ridge to practice law in Barren and Metcalfe counties, where he brought Jim C. Coleman in as a law partner.

Around 1976, Tom opened the Southern Mineral coal mine in Hyden (Lesley County), KY. Coal was very lucrative at the time, but within a few years the bottom dropped out and he returned to law once again.

Over his long, successful career, his greatest satisfaction came while serving as a Kentucky Court of Appeals Judge. He was first

appointed around 1988 to fill a vacancy, then was re-elected to the 14-judge panel repeatedly until he retired in 2004 after being elected Chief Judge in 2001. From 2004 to 2009 he was required to substitute as necessary.

"I made the mistake of buying a bunch of cattle. I've been an avid reader all my life, and I made plans that when I retired I was just going to sit up here (in my office) and read. I haven't gotten through ten percent of them and I'm 84 years old."

Reminiscing once more on WKU, Tom concluded, "I worked at a filling station greasing cars and changing tires during high school. If it had not been for Western; if Dr. Cherry had decided not to set a building in Bowling Green . . . I'd probably still be doing that today."

#### NATIONAL BIOENGINEERED FOOD DISCLOSURE STANDARD

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleague from Michigan, the ranking member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, Senator STABENOW, in a colloquy regarding the scope of the products that could be labeled under the GMO labeling legislation.

Does the Senator from Michigan believe that the definition of GMO included in this bill prohibits the labeling of highly refined products derived from GMO crops, including soybean oil made from GMO soybeans, high fructose corn syrup made from GMO corn, and sugar made from GMO sugar beets?

Ms. STABENOW. I thank the Senator from Vermont for joining me in this colloquy for the purpose of bringing greater clarity to the definition included in this bill and the scope of GMO products that could be labeled.

The intent of this legislation is to create a national mandatory disclosure standard for GMO foods. This bill gives USDA broad authority to determine, through rulemaking and with important input from the public and scientific community and after review of both State and international laws, what foods will be subject to this bill's mandatory disclosure standard, including highly refined products derived from GMO crops and products developed using gene editing techniques. The USDA general counsel, in a response letter dated July 1, stated that the Department has broad authority under this bill to require labels on GMO foods and products, including all commercially available GMO corn, soybeans, sugar beets, and canola crops used in food today.

To answer your specific question, no, this bill does not prohibit the labeling of highly refined products derived from GMO crops including soybean oil made from GMO soybeans, high fructose corn syrup made from GMO corn, and sugar made from GMO sugar beets.

Mr. LEAHY. Does the Senator from Michigan also believe that the definition of GMO food included in this bill prohibits the labeling of ingredients from plants genetically modified through new and yet to be developed gene editing techniques in addition to the recombinant DNA editing technique mentioned in the bill?

Ms. STABENOW. No, the bill does not prohibit the labeling of products developed using gene editing techniques, including RNAi and CRISPR. Additionally, the bill gives the USDA broad authority to periodically amend its labeling regulations to ensure that there are no new scientific biotechnology methods that may escape any overly prescriptive statutory definition of biotechnology.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Senator from Michigan for joining me in this colloquy for the purpose of bringing greater clarity to the congressional intent regarding the definition of GMO products contained in this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the USDA general counsel's response letter dated July 1, 2016, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT  
OF AGRICULTURE,  
July 1, 2016.

Hon. DEBBIE STABENOW,  
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR STABENOW, Thank you for your letter of June 29, 2016, inquiring as to the scope and applicability of the GMO labeling legislation currently pending before the U.S. Senate. The United States Department of Agriculture, as the lead implementing agency, has carefully studied this legislation from legal, program policy, and scientific aspects. I will respond in turn below to the questions raised in your letter.

(1) Please explain whether the GMO Labeling Law provides authority to the USDA to require labeling of food products that contain widely used commodity crops, like corn, soybeans, sugar, and canola, which have been genetically modified, as defined by Section 291(1)?

Section 291(1) of the Senate bill provides authority to include food in the national disclosure program, including all of the commercially grown GMO corn, soybeans, sugar, and canola crops used in food today and reviewed and approved by USDA's Biotechnology Regulatory Service.

(2) Please explain whether the GMO Labeling Law provides authority to the USDA to require labeling of food products that contain genetically modified material, which result from gene editing techniques?

Section 291(1) of the Senate bill provides authority to include food in the national disclosure program, including products of certain gene editing techniques. This would include novel gene editing techniques such as CRISPR when they are used to produce plants or seeds with traits that could not be created with conventional breeding techniques. In addition, the definition provides authority to include RNAi techniques that have been used on products such as the non-browning apple and potato.

(3) Please explain whether the GMO Labeling Law provides authority to the USDA to require labeling of food products, which may or may not contain highly refined oils, sugars, or high fructose corn syrup that have been produced or developed from genetic modification techniques, as defined by Section 291(1)?

Section 291(1) of the Senate bill provides authority to include food in the national disclosure program, including products which may or may not contain highly refined oils,

sugars, or high fructose corn syrup that have been produced or developed from genetic modification techniques. As a practical matter of implementation, the Department would look not only at the definition in Section 291(1) regarding the genetically modified crops used to produce the refined or extracted materials, but also consider authority provided under Section 293(b)(2)(B) and Section 293(b)(2)(C) with respect to the amount of a bioengineered substance present and other factors and considerations which might deem the product to be considered bioengineered food.

If needed, my team and our USDA programmatic and scientific experts are available to discuss any aspects of the legislation in greater detail at your request. Please do not hesitate to reach out.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY M. PRIETO,  
General Counsel.

#### ASSASSINATIONS OF ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVISTS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it has been 4 months and 8 days since Berta Caceres, an internationally respected indigenous Honduran environmental activist, was shot and killed in her home. Ms. Caceres had led her Lenca community in a campaign over several years against the Agua Zarca hydroelectric project financed in part by a Honduran company, Desarrollos Energeticos, DESA, on the Gualcarque River, which the Lenca people consider to be sacred.

Honduran police officers tampered with the crime scene, and they and some Honduran government officials sought early on to falsely depict the killing as a crime of passion. But that dishonest strategy failed, and five individuals were subsequently arrested, including a DESA employee and active duty and retired army officers, for which Honduran Attorney General Oscar Fernando Chinchilla and investigators provided by the U.S. Embassy deserve credit.

It is widely believed, however, that the intellectual authors of that horrific crime remain at large. While the attorney general's investigation is continuing, as it should, I and others have repeatedly called on the Honduran Government to also support a thorough, independent, international investigation of the Caceres case under the auspices of the Inter-American Human Rights Commission. Given Honduras's history of impunity for such crimes and the public's understandable distrust of the justice system, it is imperative that such an inquiry be conducted expeditiously.

Ms. Caceres' death was one of scores of killings in the past decade of environmental activists, journalists, human rights defenders, and other social activists in Honduras. Hardly anyone has been punished for any of those crimes. In fact, the rate of conviction for homicide in Honduras is less than 5 percent.

If that were not bad enough, just 2 weeks after Ms. Caceres's death, Nelson Garcia, another indigenous environmental activist, was fatally shot in Rio

Chiquito after helping dozens of residents move their belongings when government authorities evicted them from land they had occupied.

And on July 6, 2016, Lesbia Janeth Urquia, also a member of the indigenous rights organization COPINH, Civic Council of Popular and Indigenous Organizations of Honduras, which Ms. Caceres led, was found stabbed to death. Her body was left at a municipal garbage dump in the town of Marcala in the western department of La Paz. It is shocking that her death was reportedly one of four murders in a period of 5 days in that town alone, which tragically illustrates the appalling extent of lawlessness in Honduras today.

No one has been arrested for Ms. Urquia's assassination, and it is too soon to assign a motive, but there are disturbing similarities with the Caceres case.

In the first place, before conducting an investigation, the police speculated publicly, without citing any credible evidence, that the crime was the result of a robbery, a family dispute, or extortion. This is what we have come to expect of some members of the Honduran police.

Beyond that, Ms. Urquia had reportedly been at the forefront of a community struggle against a privatized hydroelectric project along the Chinacla River in Marcalas, La Paz. Like Agua Zarca, the Chinacla project has the support of top Honduran Government officials and was being implemented without the consent of the local communities whose lives will be most disrupted by it.

Last year the Congress, with my support, provided \$750 million to help El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras address the poverty, violence, injustice, and other factors that contribute to the flood of unaccompanied minors to the United States. On June 29, 2016, the Senate Appropriations Committee, again with my support, approved another \$650 million for these countries.

A portion of these funds is for direct assistance for their central governments and is subject to the Secretary of State certifying that they have met certain conditions. In the case of Honduras, how that government resolves conflicts with local communities over the exploitation of natural resources, such as the Agua Zarca and Chinacla hydro projects and others like them, and its investigations of the killings of Berta Caceres, Nelson Garcia, Lesbia Urdia, and other activists will factor heavily in whether I will support the release of those funds.

The government's efforts to protect civil society activists and journalists, who for years Honduran Government officials and law enforcement officers have treated as criminals and legitimate targets for threats and attacks, will also be a factor.

I have followed events in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras since the 1980s. I have watched governments in those countries come and go. They

have all shared a tolerance for corruption and impunity, and I regret to say that, despite this, they were supported by the United States. Top officials and their families have gotten rich, while the vast majority of the population is trapped in poverty and struggle to survive.

During those years the United States spent billions of dollars on programs purportedly to raise living standards, reform the police, and improve governance. The results have been disappointing. While there are many explanations, I believe the lack of political will on the part of those governments and the willingness of successive U.S. administrations to ignore or excuse the corruption and abuses played a big part. We owe it to the people of those countries and to American taxpayers to not repeat those costly mistakes.

Finally, it is important to note that the persecution and killings of environmental activists is a worldwide phenomenon, as documented by Global Witness in its June 2016 report "On Dangerous Ground." More than three people were killed each week in 2015 defending their land, forests, and rivers against destructive industries.

The report lists 185 killings in 16 countries—the highest annual death toll on record and more than double the number of journalists killed in the same period. In Brazil alone, 50 such activists died. Just last week, we learned of the assassination of Ms. Gloria Capitan, an environmental activist who opposed the construction and presence of coal stockpile facilities in Lucanin, Bataan province of the Philippines.

So in this regard, Honduras is not unique, but its government is seeking substantial economic and security assistance from the United States. In order for us to justify that assistance, the Honduran Government needs to demonstrate that it has met the conditions in our law and is taking the necessary steps to bring those responsible for these crimes to justice.

#### NATIONAL GASTROPARSIS AWARENESS MONTH

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I would like to bring attention to the estimated 5 million Americans suffering from gastroparesis in observance of National Gastroparesis Awareness Month in August.

Gastroparesis is a chronic medical condition in which the stomach cannot empty properly in the absence of any observable blockage. The condition can affect people of all ages, but it is four times more likely to affect women than men. The symptoms of gastroparesis, which include nausea, vomiting, and inability to finish a normal-sized meal, can be debilitating and sometimes life threatening. The condition can lead to malnutrition, severe dehydration, and difficulty managing blood glucose levels.

While there is no cure for gastroparesis, some treatments, such as dietary measures, medications, procedures to maintain nutrition, and surgery, can help reduce symptoms. Unfortunately, gastroparesis is a poorly understood condition, and so patients often suffer from delayed diagnosis, treatment, and management of this disorder. As such, further research and education are needed to improve quality of life for this patient population.

I want to recognize the important efforts of the International Foundation for Functional Gastrointestinal Disorders, IFFGD, an international organization based in my home State of Wisconsin, as well as other patient organizations, in providing education and support to help those affected by gastroparesis.

I urge my fellow colleagues to join me in recognizing August as National Gastroparesis Awareness Month in an effort to improve our understanding and awareness of this condition, as well as support increased research for effective treatments for gastroparesis. Furthermore, I encourage the Department of Health and Human Services to recognize and include Gastroparesis Awareness Month in their list of National Health Observances.

Thank you.

#### TRIBUTE TO GENERAL LLOYD J. AUSTIN III

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today I honor an exceptional military leader and warrior. After nearly 41 years—a lifetime of service to our Nation—GEN Lloyd J. Austin III retired from the U.S. Army, having served most recently as the commander of U.S. Central Command. On this occasion, I believe it is fitting to recognize General Austin's many years of uniformed service to our Nation.

Over the course of his military career spanning more than four decades, General Austin took on many of the toughest assignments; he led troops in combat. Most recently, he served as the combined forces commander, overseeing the military campaign to defeat ISIL in Iraq and Syria. General Austin's stellar career was also filled with a number of firsts. He was the first African American to command an Army division in combat, the first to command an Army corps in combat, the first to command an entire theater of war, and the first African-American Vice Chief of Staff of the Army and commander of U.S. Central Command. But this quiet warrior does not focus on his own accomplishments, and he never takes his eyes away from the mission.

General Austin is a soldier's soldier. He earned a well-deserved reputation as a leader others wanted to follow into battle. On many occasions, they did. Many soldiers have talked about General Austin's inspiring leadership, particularly under demanding conditions, including combat. He was gifted with

the ability to inspire confidence in his troops and young leaders. He always led them from the front, and he ensured they were successful in any and all endeavors. We saw this at the outset of the Iraq war in 2003 when, as the assistant division commander for maneuver for the 3rd Infantry Division, he helped to spearhead the invasion, maneuvering the division from Kuwait to Baghdad in a record 22 days. We saw it in Afghanistan in 2003–2004, when he was the commander of Combined Joint Task Force-180. We saw it again in Iraq in 2008 when, as the commander of Multi-National Corps-Iraq during the period when the surge forces were drawing down, he helped to achieve greater stability in the country. We saw it once more in Iraq in 2010–2011 when, as commander of U.S. Forces-Iraq, he oversaw the successful completion of Operations Iraqi Freedom and New Dawn.

In an age of tweets and blogs, General Austin never seeks the limelight, preferring to let his actions speak for themselves. He is a consummate professional, and our Nation and its Armed Services will feel the loss of this distinguished officer, gifted leader, and highly decorated warrior. I join my fellow members of the Senate Armed Services Committee in expressing my respect and gratitude to GEN Lloyd Austin for his outstanding and selfless service to our Nation. I wish him and his wife, Charlene, all the best.

#### REMEMBERING COLONEL THOMAS SCHAEFER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to honor a beloved U.S. Air Force hero, COL Thomas E. Schaefer, who sadly passed away on May 31.

In 1979, Colonel Schaefer was among those taken hostage in Iran while serving as a senior military attache to the U.S. Embassy. From November 4, 1979, to January 20, 1981, Colonel Schaefer survived 444 days of captivity, but never allowed his ordeal or his captors to undermine his spirit thanks to a strong faith in God. To keep his mind alert during that time, he read over 250 books, walked over 200 miles in his room to keep warm, and studied German.

Throughout this time, he overcame this adversity with bravery, endurance, and a spirit that became an inspiration for his friends, family, and all Americans—many of whom greeted him with open arms in 1981 following his release when he returned to his hometown, Rochester, NY.

Originally from Rochester, NY, where much of his family and many friends still reside today, Colonel Schaefer made a lasting impact on the community through speaking publicly about his experiences. He wanted each and every person to know that they possess an inner strength which allows them to overcome any challenge that may present itself in their lives.

Colonel Schaefer was a brave man, who endured the unthinkable, and his sacrifices should be remembered forever.

Thank you.

#### REMEMBERING FELIX AND MARIA NORAT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I would like to honor the memory of SGT Felix Norat and his wife, Maria, two remarkable New Yorkers who were interred at Arlington National Cemetery last week. Sergeant Norat was a WWII veteran who served in the Army's 45th Infantry Division. His bravery and heroism earned him a Bronze Star for Valor, as well as a Purple Heart. Maria was a native of Puerto Rico who worked for the War Department in New York City. Maria and Felix were married nearly 70 years, a testament to their love and devotion to one another. I would like to commit their story—a quintessentially American story—to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

Mr. Norat's unit, the 45th Infantry of the Army, was one of the most battle-tested divisions of the entire war, and Mr. Norat was still among it when the division came to Munich days before the Germans surrendered.

Mr. Norat's late wife, Maria, upon moving to New York, rented a room from her future mother-in-law, who noticed Maria's penmanship and asked her to rewrite her letters to her son who was fighting in Europe. Often, Maria would include a note of her own at the bottom of each letter, encouraging Felix and wishing him well. She later recounted, in an interview with the local newspaper, "I was telling him how proud we were that he was serving this great country and how beautiful that was," she said. "I never thought I was going to fall in love."

But that is what happened. When Sergeant Norat returned home and met Maria, it was love at first sight. For Maria, it was nice to meet the man whom she would encourage and write; love came more gradually. The couple courted for 2 years and married in November 1947. Sergeant Norat attended Brooklyn College for engineering and worked in the construction business after 2 years. He and Maria bought oceanfront property and built the Ocean Beach Motel in Montauk Point, NY.

Though life moved on, the wounds and aftershocks of war did not so quickly fade. Throughout the year after he returned home, if Felix heard anything that resembled a mortar whizzing by, he would instinctively take cover, a result of several close encounters with mortar fire. During the invasion in southern France, he sustained a serious injury from a mortar shell, resulting in an extended hospitalization in Italy and for which he earned a Purple Heart. In his later years, he also recounted the story of a stroll that saved his life. Felix reported

that, a few yards into a walk down the trench he shared with three other GIs from the 45th Infantry, a German shell hit close by, killing two of his friends and taking off the arm of the third. Felix often recounted seeing photos of his friends' children and lamented that they "never knew what happened to their father."

Felix and Maria sold the motel in 1984, retired, and moved to Naples, FL, a few years later, where they spent their final years in retirement reflecting on the war and on their lives together.

Let the record show that this body recognizes the faithful service of Felix and Maria Norat and their contributions to this country. May their children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren accept the thanks of a grateful nation.

Thank you.

#### HONORING OFFICER ASHLEY GUINDON

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I rise to recognize the extraordinary life and service of a true hero and dedicated public servant whose time was tragically cut short, Officer Ashley Guindon of Merrimack, NH.

Born and raised in Merrimack, NH, Officer Guindon graduated from Merrimack High School in 2005. She later joined the Marine Corps following graduation, honoring the service of her father, New Hampshire Air National Guard member David Guindon, who passed away after returning from serving in Iraq.

In her high school yearbook she wrote, "As I take flight it only makes me closer to [you] daddy. Mom, thanks for everything it'll be a long road but we can manage and it will only make [you] stronger." Underneath her picture in her high school yearbook, the caption read, "live for something rather than die for nothing." Officer Guindon did live for something. She lived for her country and she answered the call of duty.

Officer Guindon began her career with the Prince William County Police Department in Virginia and was sworn in as a police officer on February 26, 2016. Tragically, she was killed in the line of duty on her first day.

Officer Guindon responded to an emergency call on her first day of duty as an officer with the same sense of professionalism and dedication demonstrated by the very best of our law enforcement community. Officer Guindon responded quickly and compassionately, embodying her true spirit of selflessness. Her caring manner and desire to help those in need will not be forgotten.

Officer Guindon left behind her mother, Sharon, and her beloved family pug, Scout. We are deeply saddened by the loss of Officer Ashley Guindon, an extraordinary young woman who served our country and her community with honor, courage, and dedication. She



represented the very best of our law enforcement community, and it is an honor to recognize her service. She will be truly missed and my thoughts and prayers remain with her family. We will never forget Officer Guindon's service and sacrifice to keep us safe.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT JAMES "JIMMY" GERAGHTY

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and honor the exceptional service and the extraordinary life of New Hampshire State Police Lieutenant James "Jimmy" Geraghty of Bedford, NH. I join his family, his friends, and the law enforcement community in New Hampshire in mourning Jim's passing after a courageous battle with cancer. I had the honor of working with Jim over the years, and I know that he made a positive difference for so many people in our State. Jim truly embodied a life of service, a life of heroism, and a life of integrity.

Lieutenant Geraghty served honorably in the U.S. Army for 5 years, where he was stationed at Fort Benning in Georgia, Fort Polk in Louisiana, and Fort Richardson in Arkansas. Ultimately, he earned the rank of sergeant and received an honorable discharge. After courageously serving our Nation, he then returned home to New Hampshire and embarked on a career in law enforcement, first serving as a police officer in the Hudson Police Department, after which he became a trooper for the New Hampshire State police.

Jim was a member of the New Hampshire State police for 24 years and rose to the rank of commander of the New Hampshire State police major crimes unit—a post in which he served until he became ill last year. Lieutenant Geraghty handled some of the most troubling and horrific cases. He always conducted himself with incredible dedication and commitment.

In 2009, Lieutenant Geraghty led the investigation into the brutal Mont Vernon homicide that focused on multiple, juvenile defendants and was a "complex, and extremely time-consuming investigation." Despite these challenges, Jim's thoroughness and professionalism as commander of the major crimes unit allowed the prosecution to successfully convict all the defendants involved.

As New Hampshire's former attorney general, I worked closely with the major crimes unit, and those of us who had the privilege of working with Jim saw his natural talent for leadership and keen ability to work collaboratively with others. He represented the very best of New Hampshire's law enforcement officers.

While Jim was known for his many professional accolades, he was a humble man who never wanted to discuss

his accomplishments. Instead, Jim lived by the motto "family first," which was very apparent to anyone who knew him. Jim and his wife, Valerie, were married for 30 years. Together they had four wonderful children—a son, Jimmy, and daughters, Colleen, Katie, and Erin.

I am honored to recognize Lieutenant Jim Geraghty and his tremendous contributions to New Hampshire as the commander of the major crimes unit. Jim was an amazing individual and a committed family man. There is no question that he lived his life with great dedication, courage, and integrity.

We are all deeply saddened by the untimely loss of this true hero, a dear friend, and a beloved father, Lieutenant Jim Geraghty. My thoughts and prayers remain with Valerie, Jimmy, Colleen, Katie, and Erin. I continue to offer my deepest condolences and gratitude for Jim's life and his work. Jim gave so much to New Hampshire and our Nation and truly represented what it means to be an American.●

##### 275TH ANNIVERSARY OF EPPING, NEW HAMPSHIRE

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Epping, NH—a thriving community in Rockingham County that is celebrating the 275th anniversary of its founding. I am proud to join citizens across the Granite State in recognition of this historic event.

The land where Epping stands today was given by the town of Exeter in 1710 as the part of the "Great Land Give-away." In 1741, Epping officially separated from the town of Exeter and was established under Governor Benning Wentworth during the westward expansion of New Hampshire.

Epping is renowned for its many brickyards that thrive off the town's supply of naturally occurring clay. While the first brickyard did not open until 1840, many previous generations learned the trade and produced their own bricks. Evidence of their hard work is still visible today and indicative of the nature of Epping's residents.

Epping has produced three New Hampshire Governors, the most notable being William Plummer. Governor Plummer was a lawyer, a Baptist preacher, a historian, and an author. He was also one of New England's first weathermen, recording weather conditions daily from 1796 to 1823.

Steeped in a rich history of hard work and dedication, Epping is a shining example of what makes New Hampshire great. This year, on the occasion of Epping's 275th anniversary of its founding, I am proud to join the more than 6,000 residents in celebrating this special milestone and Epping's many wonderful contributions to New Hampshire and our Nation.●

##### REMEMBERING RONDA BYRD SCOTT

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today I must share some bittersweet news about a beloved Montana woman. After a long life of dedicated service and leadership CSM Ronda Scott passed away on July 7, 2016.

Ronda attended Helena High School in 1972 and receiving her associates degree from Western Montana College Ronda and went on to become an influential member of the National Guard in 1975. Ronda's dedication to her country and her tenacious spirit was rewarded when she was elevated to the rank of command sergeant major, a first for a Montana woman. She served her State, her country, and her fellow soldiers selflessly as a member of the honor guard and served in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

During her 34 years of service, she received multiple honors and distinctions, including the Bronze Star and the Legion of Merit Medal. After retiring in 2009, Ronda continued to dedicate her life to others. However, this time her priorities were her beloved grandchildren and the community of Helena. Not only was she a leader in uniform, she volunteered her time for events and organizations such as Race for the Cure, the American Legion, the Wine Fair, and many other veteran service organizations.

Ronda fought her final battle against bone cancer and graciously lost the ultimate fight we will all face one day. Those close to her say that, despite the circumstances, she never lost her cheerful spirit or love of life. I thank Ronda for her service and the impact she left on the city of Helena—she truly paved the way for Montana women. I hope she finds rest and that her family finds joy in all the wonderful memories she left behind.●

##### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

###### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1777. An act to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the "Former Presidents Act of 1958", with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4372. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15 Rochester Street, Bergen, New York, as the Barry G. Miller Post Office.

H.R. 4960. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 525 N Broadway in Aurora, Illinois, as the "Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building".

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The message further announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill (H.R. 636) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for

other purposes, and agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, with an amendment and an amendment to the title, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

At 2:17 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3178. An act to simplify and streamline the information regarding institutions of higher education made publicly available by the Secretary of Education, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3179. An act to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4404. An act to require an exercise related to terrorist and foreign fighter travel, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4785. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in managing the Department's vehicle fleet, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5056. An act to modernize and enhance airport perimeter and access control security by requiring updated risk assessments and the development of security strategies, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5252. An act to designate the United States Customs and Border Protection Port of Entry located at 1400 Lower Island Road in Tornillo, Texas, as the "Marcelino Serna Port of Entry".

H.R. 5322. An act to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to terminate an exemption for companies located in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and any other possession of the United States.

H.R. 5385. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make technical corrections to the requirement that the Secretary of Homeland Security submit quadrennial homeland security reviews, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5469. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to direct the United States Executive Director at the International Monetary Fund to support the capacity of the International Monetary Fund to prevent money laundering and financing of terrorism.

H.R. 5485. An act making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5528. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to simplify the FAFSA, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5529. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize additional grant activities for Hispanic-serving institutions.

H.R. 5530. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to modify certain provisions relating to the capital financing of historically Black colleges and universities.

H.R. 5588. An act to increase, effective as of December 1, 2016, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5594. An act to require the establishment of a national strategy for combating the financing of terrorism and related financial crimes, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5602. An act to amend title 31, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to include all funds when

issuing certain geographic targeting orders, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5607. An act to enhance the Department of the Treasury's role in protecting national security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5636. An act to increase the effectiveness of and accountability for maintaining the physical security of NIST facilities and the safety of the NIST workforce.

H.R. 5638. An act to provide for the establishment at the Department of Energy of a Solar Fuels Basic Research Initiative.

H.R. 5639. An act to update the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5640. An act to provide for the establishment at the Department of Energy of an Electricity Storage Basic Research Initiative.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 138. Concurrent resolution designating the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3178. An act to simplify and streamline the information regarding institutions of higher education made publicly available by the Secretary of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 3179. An act to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 4404. An act to require an exercise related to terrorist and foreign fighter travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4785. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in managing the Department's vehicle fleet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5056. An act to modernize and enhance airport perimeter and access control security by requiring updated risk assessments and the development of security strategies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 5252. An act to designate the United States Customs and Border Protection Port of Entry located at 1400 Lower Island Road in Tornillo, Texas, as the "Marcelino Serna Port of Entry"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 5322. An act to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to terminate an exemption for companies located in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and any other possession of the United States; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5385. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make technical corrections to the requirement that the Secretary of Homeland Security submit quadrennial homeland security reviews, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5469. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to direct the United States

Executive Director at the International Monetary Fund to support the capacity of the International Monetary Fund to prevent money laundering and financing of terrorism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 5528. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to simplify the FAFSA, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 5529. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize additional grant activities for Hispanic-serving institutions; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 5530. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to modify certain provisions relating to the capital financing of historically Black colleges and universities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 5594. An act to require the establishment of a national strategy for combating the financing of terrorism and related financial crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5602. An act to amend title 31, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to include all funds when issuing certain geographic targeting orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5607. An act to enhance the Department of the Treasury's role in protecting national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5636. An act to increase the effectiveness of and accountability for maintaining the physical security of NIST facilities and the safety of the NIST workforce; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 5638. An act to provide for the establishment at the Department of Energy of a Solar Fuels Basic Research Initiative; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 5639. An act to update the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 5640. An act to provide for the establishment at the Department of Energy of an Electricity Storage Basic Research Initiative; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The following concurrent resolution was read, and referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 138. Concurrent resolution designating the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

#### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 5485. An act making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes.

#### MEASURE HELD AT THE DESK

The following measure was ordered held at the desk:

S. 2650. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any prizes or awards won in competition in the Olympic Games or the Paralympic Games.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER  
COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-6088. A communication from the Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas; Relaxation of Container and Pack Requirements" (Docket No. AMS-SC-16-0021) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6089. A communication from the Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2016-2017 Marketing Year" (Docket No. AMS-SC-15-0074) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6090. A communication from the Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Christmas Tree Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Late Payment and Interest Charges on Past Due Assessments" (Docket No. AMS-SC-15-0072) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6091. A communication from the Chairman, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corporation's annual report for calendar year 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6092. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's annual report for calendar year 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6093. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's strategic plan for fiscal years 2016 through 2021; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6094. A communication from the Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of Southeastern California; Increased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-SC-15-0077) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6095. A communication from the Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "United States Standards for Grades of Processed Raisins" (Docket No. AMS-FV-14-0087) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6096. A communication from the Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department

of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, et al.; Free and Restricted Percentages for the 2015-16 Crop Year for Tart Cherries" (Docket No. AMS-FV-15-0063) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6097. A communication from the Administrator of the Cotton and Tobacco Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cotton Board Rules and Regulations; Amending Importer Line-Item De Minimis" (Docket No. AMS-CN-14-0037) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6098. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the mobilizations of select reserve units, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6099. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a delay in submission of a report relative to the "Fiscal Year 2015 Inventory of Contracted Services"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6100. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Financial Stability Oversight Council 2016 annual report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6101. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rules of Practice and Procedure; Civil Money Penalty Inflation Adjustment" (RIN2590-AA88) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 6, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6102. A communication from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act" (31 CFR Parts 501, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 541, 542, 543, 544, 546, 547, 548, 549, 560, 561, 566, 576, 588, 592, 593, 594, 597, and 598) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6103. A communication from the Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Avocados Grown in South Florida; Increased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-SC-15-0083) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6104. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Integrated Light-Emitting Diode Lamps" ((RIN1904-AC67) (Docket No. EERE-2011-BT-TP-0071)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 5, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6105. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Depart-

ment of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Gathering of Certain Plants or Plant Parts by Federally Recognized Indian Tribes for Traditional Purposes" (RIN1024-AD84) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6106. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Ocean Disposal; Amendments to Restrictions on Use of Dredged Material Disposal Sites in the Central and Western Regions of Long Island Sound; Connecticut" (FRL No. 9948-61-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6107. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutant Emissions: Petroleum Refinery Sector Amendments" (FRL No. 9948-92-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6108. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Expedited Approval of Alternative Test Procedures for the Analysis of Contaminants Under the Safe Drinking Water Act; Analysis and Sampling Procedures" (FRL No. 9948-54-OW) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6109. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determination of Attainment; Atlanta; Georgia; 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9948-93-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6110. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Iowa's Air Quality Implementation Plans; Polk County Board of Health Rules and Regulations, Chapter V, Revisions" (FRL No. 9948-84-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6111. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington: Spokane Second 10-Year Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan" (FRL No. 9948-97-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6112. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; NC; Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards Revision" (FRL No. 9948-95-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6113. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the deauthorization of the Green

River Locks and Dams 3, 4, 5, and 6 and Barren River Lock and Dam 1; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6114. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Turkey Creek Basin Flood Risk Management project, Merriam, Kansas; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6115. A communication from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Part D Plans Generally Include Drugs Commonly Used by Dual Eligibles: 2016"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6116. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2015 Actuarial Report on the Financial Outlook for Medicaid"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6117. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report required by the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015 (MACRA); to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6118. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program: Expanding Uses of Medicare Data by Qualified Entities" ((RIN0938-AS66) (CMS-5061-F)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 5, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6119. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Alternative Payment Models & Medicare Advantage"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6120. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Country-by-Country Reporting" ((RIN1545-BM70) (TD 9773)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6121. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Geographical Areas Included in the 'North American Area' for Purposes of I.R.C. 274(h)" (Rev. Rul. 2016-16) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6122. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Proposed Qualified Intermediary Agreement" (Notice 2016-42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6123. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report on the continued compliance of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan with the 1974 Trade Act's freedom of emigration provisions, as required under the Jackson-Vanik Amendment; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6124. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "World Trade Center Health Program; Addition of New-Onset Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease and WTC-Related Acute Traumatic Injury to the List of WTC-Related Health Conditions" (RIN0920-AA61) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 5, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6125. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Best Pharmaceuticals for Children Act and Pediatric Research Equity Act"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6126. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Office of the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Department of Labor Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act Catch-Up Adjustments" (RIN1290-AA31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 6, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6127. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medication Assisted Treatment for Opioid Use Disorders" (RIN0930-AA22) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6128. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Certification of Fiscal Year 2016 Total Local Source General Fund Revenue Estimate (Net of Dedicated Taxes) in Support of the District's Issuance of \$431,815,000 in General Obligation Bonds (Series 2016A)"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6129. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Customer Service Tests of Seven Large Agencies Show Mixed Results"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6130. A communication from the Executive Director, United States Access Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's fiscal year 2015 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Anti-discrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6131. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semi-Annual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016 and the Semi-Annual Report of the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration (TIGTA); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6132. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Monetary Penalty Adjustments for Inflation" (RIN1601-AA80) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 6, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6133. A communication from the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the activities performed by the agency that are not inherently governmental functions; to the Committee on

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6134. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The 2016 Indian Health Service and Tribal Health Care Facilities' Needs Assessment Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-6135. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XE420) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6136. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XE414) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6137. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XE457) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6138. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Longnose Skate in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XE589) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6139. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XE462) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6140. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XE496) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6141. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 60 Feet (18.3 Meters) Length Overall Using Hook-and-Line or Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XE430) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6142. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

“Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catch/Processors Using Trawl Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XE426) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6143. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XE415) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6144. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; Final 2016 and 2017 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish” (RIN0648-XE202) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6145. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska; Final 2016 and 2017 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish” (RIN0648-XE130) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6146. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Observer Coverage Requirements for Small Catcher/Processors in the Gulf of Alaska and Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Groundfish Fisheries” (RIN0648-BF36) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6147. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XE519) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6148. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic: 2015 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Snowy Grouper” (RIN0648-XE666) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6149. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic: Re-Opening of Commercial Sector for South Atlantic Gray Triggerfish; January Through June Season” (RIN0648-XE606) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6150. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Closure of the Nantucket Lightship North Access Area to General Category Individual Fishing Quota Scallop Vessels” (RIN0648-XE681) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6151. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Gag Management Measures” (RIN0648-BF70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6152. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-2457)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 6, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6153. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Removal of Grant Handbook References” (RIN2700-AE27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6154. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trimester Total Allowable Catch Area Closure for the Common Pool Fishery” (RIN0648-XE683) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 3361. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Insider Threat Program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-297).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S. 3156. An original bill to provide enhanced protections for taxpayers from fraud and other illegal activities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-298).

S. 3157. An original bill to prevent taxpayer identity theft and tax refund fraud, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-299).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 1557. A bill to amend the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 to strengthen Federal antidiscrimination laws enforced by

the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and expand accountability within the Federal government, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-300).

S. 461. A bill to provide for alternative financing arrangements for the provision of certain services and the construction and maintenance of infrastructure at land border ports of entry, and for other purposes.

S. 2509. A bill to improve the Government-wide management of Federal property.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

Susan S. Gibson, of Virginia, to be Inspector General of the National Reconnaissance Office.

\*Dimitri Frank Kusnezov, of California, to be Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, National Nuclear Security Administration.

\*Gail H. Marcus, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term expiring October 18, 2018.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (1h) William J. Galinis, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (1h) Christian D. Becker, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (1h) Bruce L. Gillingham, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Troy M. McClelland, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Ronny L. Jackson, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Luke M. McCollum, to be Vice Admiral.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Steven M. Shepro, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Tammy S. Smith, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Brian E. Alvin, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Col. Richard J. Heitkamp, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Miles A. Davis, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Fletcher V. Washington, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Nikki L. Griffin Olive, to be Brigadier General.

Navy nomination of Capt. Darius Banaji, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Tina A. Davidson, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Gayle D. Shaffer, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Frank D. Whitworth, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Stephanie T. Keck, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. David A. Goggins and ending with Capt. Douglas W. Small, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 29, 2016.

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Richard D. Heinz and ending with Capt. John T. Palmer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 29, 2016.

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Carl P. Chebi and ending with Capt. Michael A. Wettlaufer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 29, 2016.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save



the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nominations beginning with Walter W. Bean and ending with Scott L. Rummage, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 18, 2016.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jennifer D. Bankston and ending with William F. Wolfe, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 18, 2016.

Air Force nominations beginning with Richard D. Betzold and ending with Jennifer E. Tonneson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 28, 2016.

Air Force nominations beginning with Stefanie L. Shaver and ending with William J. Bridgham, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 28, 2016.

Air Force nomination of Erol Agi, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Joshua D. Wright, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Phillip W. Neal, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Nathan D. Schroeder, to be Major.

Army nomination of Renee V. Scott, to be Major.

Army nomination of Keith D. Blodgett, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Jeffrey M. Alston and ending with Michael J. Turley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 28, 2016.

Army nomination of Steven C. Loos, to be Major.

Army nomination of Daniel W. M. Mackle, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Michael P. Lindsay, to be Major.

Army nomination of Brando S. Jobity, to be Major.

Army nomination of David C. Martin, to be Major.

Navy nominations beginning with Gregory A. Verlinde and ending with David T. Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 7, 2016.

\*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 3156. An original bill to provide enhanced protections for taxpayers from fraud and other illegal activities, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Finance; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 3157. An original bill to prevent taxpayer identity theft and tax refund fraud,

and for other purposes; from the Committee on Finance; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. SASSE):

S. 3158. A bill to promote economic opportunity for military families, to facilitate workforce attachment for military spouses in their chosen occupation across multiple geographical postings, to reduce barriers to work on military installations, to amend the District of Columbia Code to promote greater freedom in the practice of regulated occupations, to combat abuse of occupational licensing laws by economic incumbents, to promote competition, encourage innovation, protect consumers, and promote compliance with Federal antitrust law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. HELLER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KING, Mr. REED, Ms. HIRONO, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 3159. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax credits for energy storage technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mr. SASSE, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 3160. A bill to require all Department of State employees to use Department-managed email accounts and telephonic systems for all work-related electronic communications, to require the Secretary of State to submit an annual report to Congress on any security violations within the Department, to provide training to Department of State employees on the rules and procedures governing the appropriate handling of classified information, to reform the process for identifying and archiving classified information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 3161. A bill to include the Secretary of Agriculture on the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States and to provide for the consideration by that Committee of the national security effects of foreign investment on agricultural assets; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 3162. A bill to provide for the consideration of energy storage systems by electric utilities as part of a supply side resource process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. REED, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3163. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require oil polluters to pay the full cost of oil spills, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 3164. A bill to provide protection for survivors of domestic violence or sexual assault under the Fair Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. REED, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3165. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to require oil polluters to pay the full cost of oil spills, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 3166. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a

study on the designation of surgical health professional shortage areas; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 3167. A bill to establish the Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 3168. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to establish the Stronger Together Program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

S. 3169. A bill to support basic energy research and eliminate the wind production tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 3170. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3171. A bill to prohibit the transfer, loan, or other disposition of a machinegun or semiautomatic assault weapon to an individual under 16 years of age; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 3172. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide for certain wildfire mitigation assistance; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. RUBIO, and Mrs. ERNST):

S. Res. 526. A resolution calling for all parties to respect the arbitral tribunal ruling with regard to the South China Sea and to express United States policy on freedom of navigation and overflight in the East and South China Seas; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. Res. 527. A resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the opening of the National Gallery of Art; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. WICKER):

S. Res. 528. A resolution commending the Tennessee Valley Authority on the 80th anniversary of the unified development of the Tennessee River system; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. Res. 529. A resolution calling upon the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran to release Iranian-Americans Siamak Namazi and his father, Baquer Namazi; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):



S. Con. Res. 46. A concurrent resolution expressing support for the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years, and urging the Federal Republic of Germany to continue to reaffirm its commitment to comprehensively address the unique health and welfare needs of vulnerable Holocaust victims, including home care and other medically prescribed needs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 214

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 214, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require shareholder authorization before a public company may make certain political expenditures, and for other purposes.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 386

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 386, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 524

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 524, to authorize the Attorney General and Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use, and to provide for the establishment of an inter-agency task force to review, modify, and update best practices for pain management and prescribing pain medication, and for other purposes.

S. 772

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 772, a bill to secure the Federal voting rights of persons when released from incarceration.

S. 773

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 773, a bill to prevent harassment at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes.

S. 979

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 979, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit

Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 1139

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1139, a bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to provide for same day registration.

S. 1538

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1538, a bill to reform the financing of Senate elections, and for other purposes.

S. 2067

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2067, a bill to establish EUREKA Prize Competitions to accelerate discovery and development of disease-modifying, preventive, or curative treatments for Alzheimer's disease and related dementia, to encourage efforts to enhance detection and diagnosis of such diseases, or to enhance the quality and efficiency of care of individuals with such diseases.

S. 2126

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2126, a bill to reauthorize the women's business center program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 2175

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2175, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the role of podiatrists in the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2217

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2217, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve and clarify certain disclosure requirements for restaurants and similar retail food establishments, and to amend the authority to bring proceedings under section 403A.

S. 2373

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2373, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 2655

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2655, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the historic rehabilitation tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 2750

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2750, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend and modify certain charitable tax provisions.

S. 2774

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2774, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income certain amounts realized on the disposition of property raised or produced by a student farmer, and for other purposes.

S. 2791

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2791, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the treatment of veterans who participated in the cleanup of Enewetak Atoll as radiation exposed veterans for purposes of the presumption of service-connection of certain disabilities by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

S. 2904

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2904, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

S. 2927

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2927, a bill to prevent governmental discrimination against providers of health services who decline involvement in abortion, and for other purposes.

S. 3026

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3026, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to expand and clarify the prohibition on inaccurate caller identification information and to require providers of telephone service to offer technology to subscribers to reduce the incidence of unwanted telephone calls, and for other purposes.

S. 3032

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3032, a bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2016, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 3083

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Mississippi

(Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 3083, a bill to provide housing opportunities in the United States through modernization of various housing programs, and for other purposes.

S. 3132

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3132, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide service dogs to certain veterans with severe post-traumatic stress disorder.

S. 3134

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3134, a bill to improve Federal population surveys by requiring the collection of voluntary, self-disclosed information on sexual orientation and gender identity in certain surveys, and for other purposes.

S. 3147

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3147, a bill to support educational entities in fully implementing title IX and reducing and preventing sex discrimination in all areas of education.

S. CON. RES. 43

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 43, a concurrent resolution supporting the bid of Los Angeles, California, to bring the 2024 Summer Olympic Games back to the United States and pledging the cooperation of Congress with respect to that bid.

S. RES. 521

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 521, a resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2016 as National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 3162. A bill to provide for the consideration of energy storage systems by electric utilities as part of a supply side resource process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today, along with my colleague Senator HELLER, I am introducing the Storage Technology for Operational Readiness and Generating Energy Act, or STORAGE Act. I thank Senator HELLER for his work with me on this bipartisan bill.

The advent of energy storage capacity means unused energy from renewable sources can be made available for use when needed, rather than wasted.

As a result, advances in energy storage can help improve the reliability, resiliency, and flexibility of the grid, as well as reduce the potential for future rate increases for consumers.

To further encourage the research and development of energy storage, the legislation we are introducing authorizes the Secretary of Energy to coordinate efforts among various existing programs at the Department of Energy. By streamlining these energy storage research and development programs, we hope we will maximize efficiency of funds and expand this vital research. I am pleased that the Senate has already included an amendment I offered with Senator HELLER to add these provisions as part of the Energy Policy Modernization Act that we passed earlier this year.

Our bill also amends the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 19781, or PURPA, to add energy storage systems to the list of strategies states should consider when developing their energy plan in an effort to promote energy conservation and greater use of domestic energy. The bill does not mandate the implementation of this or any technology. Rather it simply encourages states to analyze whether energy storage would provide benefits to the overall system. I look forward to working with Senator HELLER and our colleagues to also find a path forward for these provisions.

I urge our colleagues to join in supporting the STORAGE Act and taking commonsense steps to advance energy storage technology.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

S. 3169. A bill to support basic energy research and eliminate the wind production tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I am here to talk about the importance of doubling funding for basic energy research and making \$8.1 billion available in the Federal budget to pay for it.

The United States does many things well, but one thing we do better than any other country in the world is innovation through basic research. I have been talking a lot this year about biomedical research. Dr. Francis Collins, the Director of the National Institutes of Health—which he calls the “National Institute of Hope”—tells me that in 10 years, researchers in our country may be rebuilding hearts from stem cells, giving patients an artificial pancreas which would help patients with diabetes, and there may be a vaccine for HIV/AIDS.

Just as remarkable are the opportunities available in clean energy research: lowering the cost of energy, cleaning up the air, improving health, reducing poverty, and helping us deal with climate change—not just in the United States, but all around the world.

Congress has been focused on doubling energy research since the 2007 America COMPETES Act that was

passed with overwhelming bipartisan support and signed into law by President Bush. America COMPETES grew out of a report called “Rising Above the Gathering Storm,” a report on American competitiveness, written by Norm Augustine, who was the committee’s chair. The report’s main recommendation was to increase energy research because of the benefits it would provide to our country and around the world.

Eight years ago, in a speech at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, I called for a project that would duplicate the urgency of the World War II Manhattan Project and put the United States on a path to clean energy innovation. I proposed seven “grand challenges”—No. 1, make plug-in electric vehicles commonplace; No. 2, find a way to capture and use carbon; No. 3, help solar become cost-competitive; No. 4, safely manage nuclear waste; No. 5, encourage cellulosic biofuels; No. 6, make new buildings green buildings; and No. 7, create energy from fusion.

In 8 years, energy researchers have made tremendous progress in these areas. For example, the price of solar panels has fallen over 80 percent since 2008. In some of the other challenges, we still have a long way to go. That is why we need to keep our focus on making energy research a priority. The biggest problem we have in funding basic energy research is how we pay for it.

Today I am introducing legislation that finds a way to pay for it by ending the 24-year-old wind production tax credit at the end of this year, rather than in 2019, as the law now says. Instead of slowly allowing the wind production tax credit to phase out, this bill would end it on January 1, 2017. Then Congress could use the \$8.1 billion in savings to increase the funding authorization for the Office of Science for the same kind of basic energy research that helped drive our natural gas boom and will provide the basis for the next generation of energy innovation that will mean cleaner, cheaper, and more reliable energy.

Research at the Office of Science benefits other Department of Energy programs, including advanced nuclear reactor research at the Office of Nuclear Energy and research on carbon-capture technology at ARPA-E, which was formed by the America COMPETES Act. Energy research through the Office of Science, nuclear and fossil energy programs, energy efficiency research, and ARPA-E have led to amazing new discoveries. If more funding is available, it could be used to make sure energy research is a priority.

Let’s not continue to give away this money to wind developers that have been using it to get rich over the last 24 years, often over the objections of communities, towns, and homeowners who don’t want their farmlands and mountain lands covered with 45-story turbines with blades as long as a football field.

It is obvious what Congress ought to do, and it is obvious how we ought to

pay for it. In 2014, taxpayers committed to spend—or Congress committed for them—another \$6 billion to extend the wind subsidy for 1 year. Let me emphasize that—\$6 billion to extend the wind subsidy for 1 year. That amount is more than the United States of America spends in an entire year on energy research through the Office of Science. That money could be used instead to put us on a path to double government funding for basic energy research.

Let's not make that same mistake again. Basic energy research is one of the most important things we can do in this country. We need to unleash our free enterprise system to provide clean, cheap, reliable energy that will power our 21st century economy, create good jobs, and keep America competitive in the global economy.

Political scientist Bjorn Lomborg wrote in the *Wall Street Journal* last month that “the Obama administration’s signature power policy, the Clean Power Plan . . . will accomplish almost nothing.” He said:

We should focus more on green-energy research and development, like that promoted by Bill Gates and the Breakthrough Coalition. Mr. Gates has announced that private investors are committing \$7 billion for clean energy R&D while the White House will double its annual \$5 billion green innovation fund. Sadly, this sorely needed investment is a fraction of the cost of the same administration’s misguided carbon-cut policies.

Instead of rhetoric and ever-larger subsidies of today’s inefficient green technologies, those who want to combat climate change should focus on dramatically boosting innovation to drive down the cost of future green energy.

Finally, Bjorn Lomborg writes:

The U.S. has already shown the way. With its relentless pursuit of fracking driving down the cost of natural gas, America has made a momentous switch from coal to gas that has done more to drive down carbon dioxide emissions than any recent climate policy.

That is the end of the quote from the article in the *Wall Street Journal*.

In my own conversations with Mr. Gates, he has said the government should double its \$5 billion annual investment in basic energy research in order to support clean energy innovation in the private sector. For example, that research could help develop small modular reactors which would allow inherently safe nuclear power to be produced with less capital investment and less resulting nuclear waste in more places. Small modular reactors are one way the country can increase cheap, clean, reliable power. Another way is to continue to develop new advanced reactors and do the research that is necessary to begin the process of extending reactor licenses from 60 to 80 years.

Why should we close reactors when our 100 reactors provide 60 percent of the carbon-free electricity in the United States? Nuclear power provides 60 percent of the carbon-free electricity in the United States today. It is available 92 percent of the time. On the

other hand, wind, despite these huge subsidies, produces 15 percent of our country’s carbon-free electricity. The wind often blows at night when electricity isn’t needed, and it isn’t easy to store that electricity.

It is hard to think of an important technological innovation since World War II that hasn’t involved at least some form of government-sponsored research. Natural gas, our latest energy boom, is a very good example. The development of unconventional gas was enabled in part by 3-D mapping at Sandia National Laboratory in New Mexico and the Department of Energy’s large-scale demonstration project. Then our free enterprise system and our tradition of private ownership of mineral rights capitalized on our basic energy research.

Supercomputing, which is part of the Office of Science, is another tool for energy innovation. Supercomputing could do for nuclear power what massive hydraulic fracturing, new mapping tools, and horizontal drilling did for natural gas. By the end of next year, we expect the world’s fastest supercomputer will again be in the United States, and once again, it will be at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee.

That computer is called Summit, and it will help researchers better understand materials, nuclear power, and basic energy science to drive breakthroughs. Supporting the next generation of computers, known as exascale, an area of agreement between the Obama administration and Congress, is also essential to our ability to solve the most complex scientific problems for both our country’s competitiveness and national security.

Exascale computers will have a 1,000-fold increase in sustained performance over today’s petascale computers, which have been operating since 2008.

Congress can invest in this kind of innovation or we can invest in subsidizing giant wind turbines that produce a puny amount of electricity at a great cost to taxpayers. Some energy developers are reaping great financial benefits provided by the wind production tax credit, which has been in place now for 24 years. It has provided billions in subsidies to the wind industry and has been extended 10 different times.

The subsidy to Big Wind is so generous that, in some markets, wind producers can literally give their electricity away and still make a profit. This phenomenon is called negative pricing. Most of the time, wind power is unreliable and ineffective at meeting the demands of our industries, our computers, our homes, and almost everything else we depend upon. Nationwide, wind power is available about 35 percent of the time, and only 18 percent of the time in Tennessee, my home State, while nuclear power on the other hand is available 92 percent of the time.

Wind is not effective at meeting peak power demands because the wind blows,

as I said, mostly when demand is low at night and does not blow when demand is high during the day. Wind production tends to peak in the spring and fall when the need for energy is at its lowest. In fact, wind production decreases in the winter and summer, when heating and cooling needs can dramatically increase the demand for electricity.

Until there is some way to cost-effectively store wind power, it would be dangerous for a country our size to rely significantly on wind. Relying on wind when nuclear plants are available is the energy equivalent of going to war in sailboats when a nuclear navy is available.

If reliable, cheap, and clean electricity is the goal, then four nuclear reactors, each occupying 1 square mile, would equal the production of a row of 45-story wind turbines strung the entire length of the 2,178-mile Appalachian Trail from Georgia to Maine. Even if you wanted to build all of those turbines along the most picturesque mountains in the Eastern United States, you would still need a nuclear reactor or gas plant to power your home or business when the wind does not blow.

These are not your grandma’s windmills. Each one is over two times as tall as the skyboxes at the University of Tennessee football stadium and taller than the Statue of Liberty. The blades on each one are as long as a football field. Their blinking lights can be seen for 20 miles.

Many communities—take a look at the windmills in Palm Springs, CA—where wind projects have been proposed have tried to stop them before they go up because, once the wind turbines and new transmission lines are built, it is hard to take them down.

In October, the residents of Irasburg, VT, voted 274 to 9 against a plan to install a pair of 500-foot turbines on a ridgeline visible from their neighborhoods.

In New York, three counties opposed 500- to 600-foot wind turbines next to Lake Ontario. People in the town of Yates voted unanimously to oppose the project in order to “preserve their rural landscape.” Yet utilities are talking about closing nuclear reactors, which produce 60 percent of our carbon-free electricity.

In January, Apex Clean Energy announced it would spoil Tennessee’s mountain beauty by building up to 23 wind turbines in Cumberland County, less than 10 miles from Cumberland Mountain State Park, where for a half century Tennesseans and tourists have camped, fished, canoed, and kayaked alongside herons and belted kingfishers around Byrd Lake. Residents are voicing their opposition. The city council has voted to oppose it.

Finally, Clean Line Energy is proposing to build a single 700-mile direct current transmission line from Oklahoma, through Arkansas, to deliver wind power to Tennessee and other

Southeastern States even though the Tennessee Valley Authority has announced publicly that it does not need the power. Yet the subsidies for wind are so large that developers are continuing with wind projects anyway. Arkansas objects to the project. Tennessee does not need the power. But the Federal Government is attempting to use Federal eminent domain to proceed. According to the Congressional Research Service, this would be the first time that Federal eminent domain authority has been used for electric transmission lines over the objection of a State.

The wind production tax credit is as bad for taxpayers as giant wind turbines are bad for the environment. Clean energy research can help us lower the cost of energy, clean the air and improve health, reduce poverty, and deal with climate change. Let's end the wind production tax credit this year instead of 2019 and authorize the \$8.1 billion in basic energy research to find more ways to ensure that the United States has reliable sources of cheap, efficient, and carbon-free electricity.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 526—CALLING FOR ALL PARTIES TO RESPECT THE ARBITRAL TRIBUNAL RULING WITH REGARD TO THE SOUTH CHINA SEA AND TO EXPRESS UNITED STATES POLICY ON FREEDOM OF NAVIGATION AND OVERFLIGHT IN THE EAST AND SOUTH CHINA SEAS

Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. RUBIO, and Mrs. ERNST) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 526

Whereas, on July 12, 2016, the Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA) of the International Tribunal of the Law of the Sea ("Tribunal"), constituted under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), done at Montego Bay December 10, 1982, issued a legally binding ruling on the parties in the case brought at the request of the Republic of Philippines against the People's Republic of China concerning a dispute over the maritime jurisdiction in the South China Sea;

Whereas the Tribunal supported the Philippines' claim that China breached its sovereign rights, ruling that "China has, by promulgating its 2012 moratorium on fishing in the South China Sea, without exception for areas of the South China Sea falling within the exclusive economic zone of the Philippines and without limiting the moratorium to Chinese flagged vessels, breached Article 56 of the Convention with respect to the Philippines' sovereign rights over the living resources of its exclusive economic zone"

Whereas the Tribunal invalidated China's so-called "nine-dash line" sovereignty claims over the South China Sea, concluding that "as between the Philippines and China, China's claims to historic rights, or other sovereign rights or jurisdiction, with respect

to the maritime areas of the South China Sea encompassed by the relevant part of the 'nine-dash line' are contrary to the Convention and without lawful effect to the extent that they exceed the geographic and substantive limits of China's maritime entitlements under the Convention";

Whereas, on January 22, 2013, arbitration began when the Philippines served China with a Notification and Statement of Claim pursuant to the UNCLOS provisions concerning the resolution of disputes and the arbitration procedure;

Whereas, on February 19, 2013, China rejected and returned the Philippines' Notification and since that date has refused to participate in the arbitration proceedings;

Whereas, on June 21, 2013, the Tribunal was constituted pursuant to the procedure set out in Annex VII of the UNCLOS to decide the dispute presented by the Philippines;

Whereas, on October 29, 2015, the Tribunal held that "both the Philippines and China are parties to [UNCLOS] and bound by its provisions on the settlement of disputes," that "China's decision not to participate in these proceedings does not deprive the Tribunal of jurisdiction," and that "the Philippines' decision to commence arbitration unilaterally was not an abuse of the Convention's dispute settlement procedures";

Whereas the South China Sea is one of the world's most strategically important commercial waterways, and almost 30 percent of the world's maritime trade transits the South China Sea annually, including approximately \$1,200,000,000,000 in ship-borne trade bound for the United States;

Whereas, according to the United States Energy Information Administration, there are approximately 11,000,000,000 barrels and 190,000,000,000,000 cubic feet of proven and probable oil and natural gas reserves in the South China Sea;

Whereas, according to the United States Department of Defense, "[a]lthough the United States takes no position on competing sovereignty claims to land features in the region, all such claims must be based upon land (which in the case of islands means naturally formed areas of land that are above water at high tide), and all maritime claims must derive from such land in accordance with international law.;"

Whereas, according to the Department of Defense, "[s]ince Chinese land reclamation efforts began in December 2013, China has reclaimed land at seven of its eight Spratly outposts and, as of June 2015, had reclaimed more than 2,900 acres of land";

Whereas, according to Director of National Intelligence: "China continued its land reclamation efforts at Subi and Mischief Reefs after 5 August 2015, based on commercial imagery. Between that date and late October, when reclamation activity ended, China reclaimed more than 100 additional acres of land.;"

Whereas, according to the Director of National Intelligence: "We assess that China has established the necessary infrastructure to project military capabilities in the South China Sea beyond that which is required for point defense of its outposts. These capabilities could include the deployment of modern fighter aircraft, surface-to-air missiles (SAMS), and coastal defense cruise missiles, as well as increased presence of People's Liberation Army Navy (PLAN) surface combatants and China Coast Guard (CCG) large patrol ships.;"

Whereas, according to the Director of National Intelligence: "We assess that China will continue to pursue construction and infrastructure development at its expanded outposts in the South China Sea. Based on the pace and scope of construction at these outposts, China will be able to deploy a

range of offensive and defensive military capabilities and support increased PLAN and CCG presence beginning in 2016.;"

Whereas, on May 30, 2015, Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter stated at the Shangri-La Dialogue in Singapore, "[T]he United States will continue to protect freedom of navigation and [overflight—principles] that have ensured security and prosperity in this region for decades. There should be no mistake: the United States will fly, sail, and operate wherever international law allows, as United States forces do all over the world.;"

Whereas, in October 2015, January 2016, and May 2016, the United States Navy conducted three freedom of navigation operations (FONOP) in the area, transiting inside the 12-mile nautical zone of the contested features in the South China Sea;

Whereas Article 5 of the Mutual Defense Treaty Between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines, signed on August 30, 1951, states that "an armed attack on either of the Parties is deemed to include an armed attack on the metropolitan territory of either of the Parties, or on the island territories under its jurisdiction in the Pacific or on its armed forces, public vessels or aircraft in the Pacific"; and

Whereas the United States reiterates its security commitment to Japan and reaffirms that Article 5 of the United States-Japan Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security covers all territories under Japan's administration, including the Senkaku islands; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) supports the July 12, 2016, ruling issued by the Tribunal as binding on all parties in the case, and calls on all claimants to pursue peaceful resolution of outstanding maritime claims in the South China Sea consistent with international law;

(2) urges all parties to take action to implement the Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea and take steps towards early conclusion of a meaningful Code of Conduct, which would provide agreed upon rules of the road to reduce tension among claimant states;

(3) opposes any actions in the South China Sea to change the status quo by coercion, force, or the threat of use of force;

(4) calls on the Government of the People's Republic of China to cease all reclamation and militarization activities in the South China Sea and end provocative actions in the East China Sea, which undermine peace and stability in the region;

(5) reaffirms Article V of the Mutual Defense Treaty Between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines;

(6) reaffirms Article V of the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States and Japan;

(7) urges the Secretary of State to utilize all diplomatic channels to communicate worldwide unwavering United States support for freedom of navigation and overflight in the South China Sea; and

(8) urges the Secretary of Defense to routinely enforce freedom of navigation and overflight in the East and South China Seas, which is critical to United States national security interests and peace and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I rise to speak about American leadership in the Asia-Pacific region, an area that will be more and more critical to our economy and national security for generations to come.

Earlier today, an international tribunal issued an important ruling regarding maritime claims in the South China Sea, which can potentially have

lasting consequences for peace and stability in that region and global security in general as the world chooses between an order of rule or an order of lawlessness. Today, the tribunal ruled in favor of our ally the Philippines and against the People's Republic of China, which has refused to recognize and participate in the tribunal altogether, a tribunal sanctioned under international agreement both nations are a party to.

The tribunal began its work on January 22, 2013, when the Philippines served notice to China in international court regarding the violations of its sovereignty and China's claims in the South China Sea.

On February 19, 2013, China rejected and returned the Philippines' notification, and since that date, China has refused to participate in the arbitration proceedings.

On October 29, 2015, the tribunal held that despite China's nonparticipation, it has the jurisdiction to deliver a binding legal ruling in this case since both nations are treaty participants.

Today, the panel ruled that China "breached the sovereign rights of the Philippines" with regard to maritime disputes between the two nations. More importantly, the tribunal invalidated China's sovereignty claims over almost the entirety of the South China Sea, stating that "China's claims to historic rights or jurisdiction, with respect to the maritime areas of the South China Sea encompassed by the relevant part of the 'nine-dash line' are contrary to the Convention and without lawful effect."

While the United States is not directly a party to this dispute and takes no position on the sovereignty claims among the various claimants, this ruling is important for many reasons:

First, the South China Sea is one of the most important commercial waterways in the world. Almost 30 percent of the world's maritime trade transits the South China Sea annually, including approximately \$1.2 trillion in shipborne trade bound for the United States.

Moreover, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, there are approximately 11 billion barrels and 190 cubic feet of proven and probable oil and natural gas reserves in the South China Sea itself which China wants to claim.

Second, the ruling reinforces the right of our military to operate freely in the region, utilizing our longstanding rights of international transit on the high seas—the rights long established by international law.

On May 30, 2015, speaking at the Shangri-La Dialogue in Singapore, Secretary of Defense Ash Carter stated:

The United States will continue to protect freedom of navigation and overflight—principles that have ensured prosperity and security in this region for decades. There should be no mistake: The United States will fly, sail, and operate wherever international law allows, as U.S. forces do all over the world.

The United States has since conducted three freedom of navigation op-

erations—or FONOPs—in the area in October of 2015, January of 2016, and May of 2016, transiting inside the 12-mile nautical zone of the contested features in the South China Sea.

Last month, I attended the Shangri-La Dialogue along with a number of my Senate colleagues, and we heard a tremendous amount of concern from regional leaders, not only about the South China Sea but also about whether or not the United States can endure regionally and globally. The South China Sea and what happens there are important tests of American leadership and our ability to support our close allies in the face of aggression that is outside of international norms.

So we need to start this conversation, as well, by asking the simple question: How did we get here?

I wish to point out a chart that helps show what is going on in the South China Sea. The situation in the South China Sea stems from a Chinese claim called the nine-dash line. It is the red dash line here in the South China Sea, which covers more than 90 percent of the South China Sea. We can see it on the chart, within the lines.

China has never offered any detailed explanation or any legal basis for this claim. As the ruling stated today by the tribunal:

As far as the Tribunal is aware, China has never expressly clarified the nature or scope of its claimed historic rights. Nor has it ever clarified its understanding of the meaning of the "nine-dash line."

For decades we did not pay much attention; the U.S. did not pay much attention to these groundless claims because, while there are certainly incidents and skirmishes, China did not take the highly coercive actions to enforce its claims that we see today. However, over the last several years, China has significantly upped the ante and undertaken a massive effort to reclaim a number of the disputed features in the South China Sea and to militarize these islands.

According to the Department of Defense, "[s]ince Chinese land reclamation efforts began in December of 2013, China has . . . reclaimed more than 2,900 acres of land" and "has deployed artillery, built aircraft runways and buildings and positioned radars and other equipment."

According to the Director of National Intelligence:

We assess that China has established the necessary infrastructure to project military capabilities in the South China Sea beyond that which is required for point defense of its outposts. These capabilities could include the deployment of modern fighter aircraft, surface-to-air missiles, and coastal defense cruise missiles, as well as increased presence of Peoples' Liberation Army Navy surface combatants and China Coast Guard large patrol ships.

With these capabilities, China could easily intimidate and, if needed, overpower its much smaller and less capable neighbors.

So let me point out the second chart here today. In the next year, we will be

able to see just how fast the Chinese can build these islands.

According to reports and expert assessments, what we are seeing here is "an artificial island"—what it looked like in the very beginning, the original structure—"covering 75,000 square yards—about 14 football fields—including two piers, a cement plant and a helipad, at a land formation called Hughes Reef. . . . The reef, which is above water only at low tide, lies about 210 miles from the Philippines and 660 miles from China."

So here is what this looked like in 2014—this original structure right here, the Hughes Reef. We can see what it looked like here, and in January of 2015: 75,000 square yards of land reclamation activities, the helipad over here, the original structure—we can see it right here—and the cement plant. There are 14 football fields worth of land reclamation on a structure that is only 210 miles away from the Philippines yet 660 miles away from China.

These actions not only show blatant disregard for the rights of the other claimants in the South China Sea, but it undermines international law.

This is what the international tribunal confirmed today. Now it is up to the United States and the world to address the question as to what comes next.

Make no mistake, through these activities, China has sent a message not only to its neighbors but also to America as a Pacific power, and we must be ready to answer.

So today I am proud to submit a resolution with my colleagues, Senators MCCAIN, COTTON, SULLIVAN, RUBIO, and ERNST, that offers some policy guidelines moving forward on how to address the challenge of the South China Sea. Our resolution, first of all, supports the July 12, 2016, ruling issued by the tribunal as binding on all parties and calls on all parties to pursue peaceful resolution of outstanding maritime claims in the South China Sea consistent with international law. It urges all parties to take action to implement the Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in South China Sea and take steps toward early conclusion of a meaningful, binding code of conduct which would provide agreed-upon rules of the road to reduce tension among claimant States.

It states that we will oppose any actions in the South China Sea to change the status quo by coercion, force, or the threat of use of force.

It calls on the People's Republic of China to cease all reclamation and militarization activities in the South China Sea and to end provocative actions in the East China Sea, which undermine peace and stability in the region.

Furthermore, the resolution reaffirms article V of the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines, and article V of the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States and Japan.

It urges the U.S. State Department to utilize all diplomatic channels to communicate worldwide, unwavering U.S. support for freedom of navigation and overflight of the South China Sea, and it urges the U.S. Department of Defense to routinely enforce freedom of navigation and overflight in East and South China Seas, which is critical to U.S. national security interests and peace and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region.

It is my sincere hope that instead of an escalation, China chooses the opposite track and abides by this ruling and immediately ceases its destabilizing activities. But should that not come to pass, the United States and our allies must be ready to lead and defend our allies, our values, and our principles.

The world is better served when those of us around the globe recognize rules of international behavior, international law, and that we can together reinforce responsible behavior. And we will know going forward from this ruling if China is going to be a responsible rising power that respects the rules of international law, or if the history books will later look back at this time period and show a nation that decides to ignore international law, to ignore the law that binds itself with its neighbors and, instead, acts out of self-gain and self-interests.

No matter what happens going forward, the United States must show leadership, resolve, and we must show our allies that we are committed to making sure that international law is respected and upheld.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 527—RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OPENING OF THE NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

Mr. UDALL (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 527

Whereas March 17, 2016, marked the 75th anniversary of the opening of the National Gallery of Art (in this preamble referred to as the "Gallery");

Whereas the Gallery is the culmination of the dream of Andrew Mellon to endow a true national gallery in Washington, DC;

Whereas President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the 75th Congress recognized the importance of this monumental gift to the people of the United States by quickly accepting the gift of Mr. Mellon on behalf of the United States;

Whereas the landmark buildings of the Gallery were given to the people of the United States as gifts by Andrew Mellon and his children, Paul Mellon and Ailsa Mellon Bruce;

Whereas the agreement to place the Gallery on the National Mall, side-by-side with the monuments most meaningful to the people of the United States, symbolized the importance of art in the life of the United States;

Whereas the extraordinary collection of Mr. Mellon of 153 works of art served as a

magnet to attract other gifts from across the United States and established the highest standard of quality for the works of art, resulting in one of the finest collections in the world, with more than 144,000 works;

Whereas the collections of the Gallery have grown entirely through private donations from generous individuals in service to all of the people of the United States;

Whereas the Gallery epitomizes the fruitful collaboration of the United States Government and the people of the United States in creating a great institution dedicated to art, education, and service;

Whereas all subsequent Presidents and Congresses have supported the Gallery by providing for the protection and care of the collection;

Whereas Federal support and donations of extraordinary art from generous individuals in the United States have resulted in the most successful public-private partnership in the United States, hosting more than 250,000,000 visitors from every State and from other countries to demonstrate the commitment of the United States to promoting the shared cultural heritage of all humanity;

Whereas the permanent collection of the Gallery comprises masterpieces of art from Europe and the United States from the Renaissance period to the present day;

Whereas some 1,200 temporary exhibitions have brought great art from throughout the world, from a wide range of cultures and time periods, to the people of the United States;

Whereas the Gallery has set a standard of generosity in lending works of art to museums throughout the United States and in sending those works as ambassadors of good will to countries throughout the world;

Whereas, for 75 years, the Gallery has served as both trustee of the fine arts collection of the United States and as an active and vigorous educational resource, serving hundreds of thousands of students who visit Washington, DC;

Whereas, since its founding, the Gallery has provided art education programs without charge to students in elementary and secondary schools and at institutions of higher learning in every State;

Whereas, through the support of Andrew Mellon and his son Paul, the Gallery serves as an international center for scholarship and research and is a leader in internationally published conservation and research;

Whereas the Gallery is home to a superb center for advanced studies in the visual arts that brings new insights to the humane heritage of mankind both nationally and internationally;

Whereas the Gallery has created a major art research library, housing a collection of more than 400,000 books, periodicals, and documents on the history, theory, and criticism of art and architecture, and an image collection of some 13,000,000 photographs, slides, negatives, and microform images of Western art and architecture;

Whereas, since 1942, the Gallery has sponsored more than 3,100 free Sunday concerts featuring the National Gallery Orchestra as well as musicians and ensembles from around the world for the enjoyment of more than 1,000,000 visitors, creating what is considered the oldest continuous series of free weekly concerts in Washington, DC;

Whereas, to facilitate learning, enrichment, enjoyment, and exploration, the Gallery has expanded its educational mission by providing free downloads of more than 45,000 digital images of works from its collection through its innovative web service, NGAImages; and

Whereas the Gallery provides permanence in an ever-changing world, maintaining a tangible record of human aspirations and

values for the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 75th anniversary of the opening of the National Gallery of Art;

(2) acknowledges the contribution of the National Gallery of Art to the cultural life of the United States;

(3) applauds the work of the National Gallery of Art to collect and preserve art, educate people in the United States, and bring exciting exhibitions for all to enjoy;

(4) commends the work of the staff of the National Gallery of Art to ensure that all of the people of the United States have access to the highest quality art; and

(5) continues to support the National Gallery of Art, a great national treasure.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 528—COMMENDING THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ON THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT OF THE TENNESSEE RIVER SYSTEM

Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 528

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority (in this preamble referred to as the "TVA") was created by Congress in 1933 to improve navigation along the Tennessee River, reduce the risk of floods and flood damage, provide low-cost electricity, and promote environmental stewardship and economic development in the region;

Whereas the TVA submitted a plan to Congress in March of 1936 to improve navigation of the Tennessee River and to help control flooding in the Tennessee Valley;

Whereas Norris Dam, the first dam constructed by the TVA, began to operate on July 28, 1936;

Whereas the integrated management of the Tennessee River system by the TVA provides a wide range of benefits that include electrical power, reducing floods, improving water quality and supply, enhancing recreation, and protecting public land;

Whereas the TVA has improved navigation of the Tennessee River system and facilitated freight transportation;

Whereas the TVA has reduced the risk of flood damage through the construction of locks, dams, and reservoirs throughout the Tennessee Valley;

Whereas the TVA provides reliable and affordable electricity and has stimulated economic growth;

Whereas the TVA continues to promote economic development by helping companies and communities attract investments that bring good jobs to the Tennessee Valley region; and

Whereas the TVA continues to serve more than 9,000,000 customers in Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee, Mississippi, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Virginia: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) commends the Tennessee Valley Authority on the 80th anniversary of the unified development of the Tennessee River system;

(2) recognizes the important role of Norris Dam, the first dam constructed by the Tennessee Valley Authority, which was completed on July 28, 1936;



(3) honors the accomplishments of the Tennessee Valley Authority in improving navigation, controlling floods, promoting environmental stewardship, and providing affordable electricity throughout the Tennessee Valley region;

(4) recognizes the Tennessee Valley Authority for its long and proud history of service in the areas of energy, the environment, and economic development throughout Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee, Mississippi, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Virginia; and

(5) respectfully requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit a copy of this resolution for appropriate display to—

(A) the Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Joe Ritch; and

(B) the Chief Executive Officer of the Tennessee Valley Authority, William Johnson.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 529—CALLING UPON THE GOVERNMENT OF THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN TO RELEASE IRANIAN-AMERICANS SIAMAK NAMAZI AND HIS FATHER, BAQUER NAMAZI**

Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 529

Whereas dual citizen of the United States and Iran Siamak Namazi studied international relations at Tufts University and urban planning at Rutgers University;

Whereas Siamak Namazi was named as a Young Global Leader by the World Economic Forum in 2007;

Whereas Siamak Namazi was a former Public Policy Fellow at the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars, was a business consultant, and most recently worked in the petroleum industry for a company based in Dubai, United Arab Emirates;

Whereas Siamak Namazi traveled from Dubai to Tehran to visit relatives in July 2015;

Whereas Siamak Namazi was prohibited from leaving Iran in mid-July 2015;

Whereas Siamak Namazi was interrogated for 3 months before he was detained on October 15, 2015, without any charges;

Whereas Amnesty International has stated that detainees and prisoners in Iran have reported “acts of torture and other ill-treatment, particularly during primary investigations mainly to force ‘confessions’ or gather other incriminatory evidence” and “were denied adequate medical care; in some cases, the authorities withheld prescribed medications to punish prisoners”;

Whereas on March 14, 2016, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran stated that serious human rights abuses continue to be reported in Iran including “an alarming surge in the rate of unlawful executions in the country and ongoing arbitrary arrests, detention and prosecution of individuals for the exercise of their fundamental rights” and at least 966 persons were executed in Iran in 2015, which is the highest rate in more than 20 years;

Whereas Siamak Namazi remains under arrest in Evin Prison even though no charges have been filed against him;

Whereas dual citizen of the United States and Iran, Baquer Namazi, who is the father of Siamak Namazi was detained on February 22, 2016, and is also being held in Evin Prison;

Whereas Baquer Namazi worked for UNICEF in New York and served as the UNICEF Representative to Somalia, Kenya, and Egypt;

Whereas Baquer Namazi is a recognized leader of humanitarian causes, especially poverty eradication, through his United Nations work and his post-retirement civil society activities;

Whereas Secretary of State John Kerry stated on February 25, 2016, in response to a question about the detention of Siamak Namazi, “I am very familiar with this and I am engaged on it specifically”; and

Whereas on January 16, 2016, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran released United States citizens Jason Rezaian of California, Saeed Abedini of Idaho, Amir Mirzaei Hekmati of Michigan, Matthew Trevithick of Massachusetts, and Nosratollah Khosravi-Roodsari: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) calls upon the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran to unconditionally release Siamak and Baquer Namazi immediately;

(2) urges the Secretary of State, the allies of the United States, and the United Nations to raise the cases of Siamak and Baquer Namazi with officials of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran at every opportunity and undertake efforts to secure their immediate release;

(3) encourages the President to utilize appropriate measures against the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran if Siamak and Baquer Namazi are not released; and

(4) expresses sympathy to the family of Siamak and Baquer Namazi for their anguish and expresses hope that their ordeal can be brought to an end in the near future.

**SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 46—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE GOAL OF ENSURING THAT ALL HOLOCAUST VICTIMS LIVE WITH DIGNITY, COMFORT, AND SECURITY IN THEIR REMAINING YEARS, AND URGING THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY TO CONTINUE TO REAFFIRM ITS COMMITMENT TO COMPREHENSIVELY ADDRESS THE UNIQUE HEALTH AND WELFARE NEEDS OF VULNERABLE HOLOCAUST VICTIMS, INCLUDING HOME CARE AND OTHER MEDICALLY PRESCRIBED NEEDS**

Mr. NELSON (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 46

Whereas the annihilation of 6,000,000 Jews during the Holocaust and the murder of millions of others by the Nazi German state constitutes one of the most tragic and heinous crimes in human history;

Whereas hundreds of thousands of Jews survived persecution by the Nazi regime despite being imprisoned, subjected to slave labor, moved into ghettos, forced to live in hiding or under false identity or curfew, or required to wear the “yellow star”;

Whereas in fear of the oncoming Nazi Einsatzgruppen, or “Nazi Killing Squads”, and the likelihood of extermination, hundreds of thousands of Jewish Nazi victims fled for their lives;

Whereas whatever type of persecution suffered by Jews during the Holocaust, the common thread that binds Holocaust victims is that they were targeted for extermination and they lived with a constant fear for their lives and the lives of their loved ones;

Whereas Holocaust victims immigrated to the United States from Europe, the Middle

East, North Africa, and the former Soviet Union between 1933 and the date of adoption of this resolution;

Whereas it is estimated that there are at least 100,000 Holocaust victims living in the United States and approximately 500,000 Holocaust victims living around the world, including child survivors of the Holocaust;

Whereas tens of thousands of Holocaust victims are at least 80 years old, and the number of surviving Holocaust victims is diminishing;

Whereas at least 50 percent of Holocaust victims alive today will pass away within the next decade, and those living victims are becoming frailer and have increasing health and welfare needs;

Whereas Holocaust victims throughout the world continue to suffer from permanent physical and psychological injuries and disabilities and live with the emotional scars of a systematic genocide against the Jewish people;

Whereas many of the emotional and psychological scars of Holocaust victims are exacerbated in the old age of the Holocaust victims;

Whereas the past haunts and overwhelms many aspects of the lives of Holocaust victims when their health fails them;

Whereas Holocaust victims suffer particular trauma when their emotional and physical circumstances force them to leave the security of their homes and enter institutional or other group living residential facilities;

Whereas tens of thousands of Holocaust victims live in poverty and cannot afford, and do not receive, sufficient medical care, home care, mental health care, medicine, food, transportation, and other vital life-sustaining services that allow individuals to live their final years with comfort and dignity;

Whereas Holocaust victims often lack family support networks and require social worker-supported case management in order to manage their daily lives and access government-funded services;

Whereas in response to a letter sent by Members of Congress to the Minister of Finance of Germany in December 2015 relating to increased funding for Holocaust victims, German officials acknowledged that “recent experience has shown that the care financed by the German Government to date is insufficient” and that “it is imperative to expand these assistance measures quickly given the advanced age of many of the affected persons”;

Whereas German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer acknowledged, in 1951, the responsibility of Germany to provide moral and financial compensation to Holocaust victims worldwide;

Whereas every successive German Chancellor has reaffirmed that acknowledgment, including Chancellor Angela Merkel, who, in 2007, reaffirmed that “only by fully accepting its enduring responsibility for this most appalling period and for the cruelest crimes in its history, can Germany shape the future”;

Whereas, in 2015, the spokesperson of Chancellor Angela Merkel confirmed that “all Germans know the history of the murderous race mania of the Nazis that led to the break with civilization that was the Holocaust . . . we know the responsibility for this crime against humanity is German and very much our own”; and

Whereas Congress believes it is the moral and historical responsibility of Germany to comprehensively, permanently, and urgently provide resources for the medical, mental health, and long-term care needs of all Holocaust victims: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—*

(1) acknowledges the financial and moral commitment of the Federal Republic of Germany over the past seven decades to provide a measure of justice for Holocaust victims; and

(2) supports the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims in the United States and around the world are able to live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

##### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 12, 2016, at 9:30 a.m.

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

##### COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 12, 2016, at 10 a.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "How Will the FCC's Proposed Privacy Regulation Affect Consumers and Competition."

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

##### COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 12, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a Subcommittee hearing entitled "Intermodal and Interdependent: the Fast Act, the Economy, and Our Nation's Transportation System."

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

##### COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 12, 2016, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Examining the Stark Law: Current Issues and Opportunities."

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

##### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 12, 2016, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Review of the 2016 Trafficking in Persons Report."

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

##### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 12, 2016, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "FOIA at Fifty: Has the Sunshine Law's Promise Been Fulfilled?"

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

##### SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 12, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

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

##### SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources' Subcommittee on Energy be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 12, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

##### SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE DEPARTMENT, AND USAID MANAGEMENT, INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS, AND BILATERAL INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on State Department, and USAID Management, International Operations, and Bilateral International Development be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 12, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Public-Private Partnerships in Foreign Aid: Leveraging U.S. Assistance for Greater Impact and Sustainability."

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

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my health policy fellow, Rachel Cumberbatch, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this Congress.

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

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Genevieve Gorman, a legislative aid in my office, be granted the privileges of the floor for the remainder of the 114th Congress.

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Cal-

endar No. 652 only, with no other executive business in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Carole Schwartz Rendon, of Ohio, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Ohio for the term of four years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Rendon nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

#### UNITED STATES SEMIQUINCENTENNIAL COMMISSION ACT OF 2016

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4875, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4875) to establish the United States Semiquincentennial Commission, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 4875) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

#### UNITED STATES APPRECIATION FOR OLYMPIANS AND PARALYMPIANS ACT

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 2650 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2650) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any prizes or awards won in competition in the Olympic Games or the Paralympic Games.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and that the papers be held at the desk.

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

The bill (S. 2650) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2650

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “United States Appreciation for Olympians and Paralympians Act”.

#### SEC. 2. OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC MEDALS AND USOC PRIZE MONEY EXCLUDED FROM GROSS INCOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 74 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) EXCEPTION FOR OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC MEDALS AND PRIZES.—Gross income shall not include the value of any medal awarded in, or any prize money received from the United States Olympic Committee on account of, competition in the Olympic Games or Paralympic Games.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to prizes and awards received after December 31, 2015.

#### NATIONAL LOBSTER DAY

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 513 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 513) designating September 25, 2016 as “National Lobster Day.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 513) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 28, 2016, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

#### COMMENDING THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ON THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT OF THE TENNESSEE RIVER SYSTEM

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 528, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 528) commending the Tennessee Valley Authority on the 80th anniversary of the unified development of the Tennessee River system.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 528) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

#### ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 13, 2016

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, July 13; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 524, with the time until 11 a.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

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

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators MARKEY and WHITEHOUSE.

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

The Senator from Massachusetts.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, it is summer. It is supposed to be hot, but if last month felt hotter than past summers, you are right. Last week the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency, or NOAA, said the United States

experienced its warmest June on record ever. Already this year there have been eight weather-related and climate-related disasters that each caused at least \$1 billion in damage. Globally, it was found that 2015 was the hottest year on record, and so far this year is on track to beat last year. We can’t even hold the record for a year—2016 has been as hot as Pokemon GO—and anyone watching the Senate floor tonight who is younger than 31 has never experienced in their life a month where the temperature was below the 20th century average.

That last happened in February of 1985. Ronald Reagan was starting his second term as President, and “Beverly Hills Cop” was the No. 1 film at the box office. If you went to the movies that month, you probably saw a trailer for what would be that summer’s blockbuster, “Back to the Future.”

Well, that future is here. Temperatures are increasing, sea levels are rising, rainfall is more extreme, and the oceans are more acidic. Why is that? It is mostly because of carbon dioxide pollution that is released from the extraction and burning of fossil fuel. Virtually all climate scientists agree that the climate is changing and that human interference with the climate is now the driving force of that change. Thanks to excellent investigative reporting at Inside Climate News and other news outlets, we now know that as far back as the 1970s, Exxon and the other oil companies were following the latest developments in climate science and Exxon was undertaking its own research on the impact of carbon pollution on the climate.

The top leadership of Exxon was warned in July of 1977 by its senior scientist James Black: “In the first place there is general scientific agreement that the most likely manner in which mankind is influencing the global climate is through carbon dioxide release from the burning of fossil fuels.”

That is from 1977 to Exxon from its own scientists. A year later in 1978, that same scientist once again told senior management: “Present thinking holds that man has a time window of 5 to 10 years before the need for hard decisions regarding changes in energy strategies that might become critical.”

Ten years later in 1988, a memo laid out Exxon’s position, which included these three points: No. 1, emphasize the uncertainty in scientific conclusions regarding the potential enhanced greenhouse gas effect; No. 2, urge a balanced scientific approach; and No. 3, resist the overstatement and sensationalization of potential greenhouse effects which could lead to economic development of nonfossil fuel resources.

Exxon knew full well back then the impact of carbon dioxide on the climate and what that could mean to their businesses. Exxon, the Koch brothers, Peabody Energy, and other individuals and businesses whose profits might suffer under rules to reduce

carbon pollution have had a vested interest in stopping climate action for decades.

That is why Congress still hasn't sent comprehensive climate legislation to the President. More than 50 years ago, in a special message to Congress on pollution, President Lyndon Johnson noted that "the increase in carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels has altered the composition of the global atmosphere." Since then, the scientific evidence and observation of climate changes already underway have continued to mount.

But even as the science has become overwhelming, climate policies have gotten trapped in a web of denial. During the last 2 days, we have heard many of my colleagues talk about the many strands of this web of denial. Like a real spiderweb, it is hard to see this web unless the light catches it in just the right way. So this evening I am going to shine a light on a few threads of this web.

At the heart of this web is denial. That is where you find the George C. Marshall Institute, whose attacks on the science of the so-called nuclear winter consequence of nuclear war and its opposition to the nuclear freeze movement expanded over the years to include anti-climate change efforts. The institute was named after the U.S. Army Chief of Staff during World War II who then became Secretary of State. He helped to rebuild Europe and won the Nobel Peace Prize for what is now called the Marshall Plan. Given Marshall's view of the need to address hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos, it seems likely that if he were alive today, he would agree that national security experts see that climate change is a security threat to the United States. Marshall himself would likely support efforts like the Green Climate Fund to ensure that the poorest countries in the world have the resources necessary to overcome the challenges climate change pose to their economic development. He would likely support American leadership of global climate efforts to ensure that all countries are taking action to address climate change.

But the institute that carries the George Marshall name has countered international climate science and action every step of the way. When the Marshall Institute first expanded into environmental policy in the 1980s, the environment and climate change had bipartisan support. In the 1988 election, George Herbert Walker Bush pledged to meet the "greenhouse effect with the White House effect." Increasingly, world scientists were raising concerns about carbon pollution. In 1990, the first assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, or IPCC, detailed what the fossil fuel companies already knew—that carbon pollution released from burning fossil fuels was causing the Earth to warm. The very business model of the fossil fuel industry was altering the planet.

So while the scientific community was sounding the alarm, it has now been revealed that Big Oil and fossil fuel companies conspired to mute that alarm, and the Marshall Institute soon became a critical part of their climate denial web.

Mind you, we are not talking about the original George C. Marshall. He would have had no part of this. This is just the absconding of his name and having it placed above an institute—the Marshall Institute—which is now disseminating this bad science. That is what has happened.

In 1989, this Marshall Institute published a report on climate change casting doubt on the impact of carbon pollution and spinning a core component of the web of denial. As Washington insiders, the institute's report was read by the White House, shared by media outlets, and became a so-called side of a new public debate on climate change. The Marshall Institute turned debating climate change into a game, and the science became a political football. It was exactly what they wanted. By dividing climate science into sides, pitting each one against the other, they had found a foothold for doubt and a reason to delay climate action.

Still, the first Bush administration signed and the Senate ratified the historic United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in 1992. The goal of the treaty was to reduce atmospheric greenhouse gas emissions and prevent "dangerous anthropogenic interference with Earth's climate system." But it took another 23 years, until 2015, for the countries of the world to agree on a global solution in Paris last December.

That 1989 Marshall Institute report, funded by the fossil fuel industry, was an especially sticky strand of this web of denial. Since then, the tactic of casting doubt on climate science has been used time and again by the Marshall Institute and other organizations to delay policies that could hurt the profits of oil, coal, and petro-polluters like the Kochs. This is what Senator WHITEHOUSE has led all of us in trying to bring out here to the Senate floor—that there is a web, and the web goes back to money, and that money is the profits that are made by the coal, the gas, and the oil industries. Those millions of dollars that the Marshall Institute has received from Exxon and the Koch-connected foundation over the years have allowed the web of denial to grow.

The Marshall Institute misinformation campaign doesn't just come in the form of reports. Their chairman, William Happer, has testified in front of Congress multiple times espousing climate denialism and perpetuating the self-serving interests of the fossil fuel industry and the Kochs. He may be an accomplished physicist, but Dr. Happer's views on climate science have been routinely debunked.

When I was chairman on the Select Committee on Energy Independence

and Global Warming, in the House of Representatives, I heard Dr. Happer use the theatrics of a CO<sub>2</sub> meter as proof that climate change doesn't exist. He advocated for the government to support an "alternative hypothesis" and to support his alternative hypothesis, which was nothing more than the denial of climate change. Just last year, while the climate talks in Paris were underway, Dr. Happer testified before the Senate Commerce Committee, continuing to spread doubt. But this past May, William Happer was a signatory on a misleading, full-page ad in the New York Times. The ad, placed by another thread in the web of deceit, the Competitive Enterprise Institute, attacked the reasonable efforts of New York attorney general Eric Schneiderman and a coalition of other attorneys general united for clean power who are investigating more than 100 businesses, nonprofits, and private individuals to see if they misled the public about climate change.

But the Marshall Institute's efforts alone were not enough. So they helped form the cynically named Global Climate Coalition in 1989, shortly after the formation of the IPCC at the U.N. to fight climate change.

The Marshall Institute CEO, William O'Keefe, a former lobbyist for Exxon, chaired the coalition that included members of manufacturing, automotive, oil and gas, mining and chemical industries, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. They invested in denial and delay to allow business as usual to continue. But climate science and international climate efforts continued to advance after the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change came into force.

Of course, the fossil fuel coalition's concern continued to increase. As the IPCC worked on its second report in the early 1990s, it decided to include a chapter entitled Detection of Climate Change and Attribution of Causes. It became clear that the world's climate scientists were examining the considerable collection of climate observations and research to see what they could say about human influence on the climate.

So the Global Climate Coalition sprang into action to influence what the IPCC might say about the human influence on climate.

At a November 1995 session to finalize the text of the IPCC report, alongside Saudi Arabian and Kuwaiti representatives, the Global Climate Coalition weighed in heavily against the chapter focused on the detection and causes of climate change. After a flurry of negotiations and additional objections, the IPCC agreed that the amassed climate observations "now point toward a discernable human influence on global climate."

The world's climate scientists, the government representatives had now acknowledged that humans were altering the climate. So the calls for climate action got louder, and the effort

to extend the 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and draft what would become the Kyoto Protocol in 1997 increased. But in an effort to silence the calls to action, the investment in the web of denial grew.

The Global Climate Coalition spent more than \$13 million opposing the Kyoto Protocol. Between 1994 and 1997, they spent \$1 million every year downplaying the threat of climate change.

Ultimately, this broad coalition collapsed as their business interests and the impact of climate change on their profits changed. The Global Climate Coalition closed its doors in 2002, but the web of denial was already stretching to find new places to grow. Those threads have since expanded with the careful cultivation and collusion by the fossil fuel industry and the petrol polluters.

We know that the Koch brothers, Exxon, and other major donors have invested millions of dollars into organizations that actively work to discredit climate change and oppose climate legislation. Those organizations pressure elected officials to take increasingly extreme stances with specific reference and focus on the members of the Republican Party.

During President George W. Bush's first campaign in 2000, he promised to fight climate change by limiting greenhouse gas emissions. But in 2001, he pulled the United States out of the Kyoto Protocol. In 2005, his Vice President, Dick Cheney, helped pass an energy bill that included massive subsidies and tax breaks for the fossil fuel industry.

As recently as 2008, the Republican Presidential nominee, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, recognized the science of climate change and supported action. This was an era that has now passed. The web of denial has firmly trapped this issue in the Republican Party in such a way that no action is possible at all. But even in the face of the millions of dollars pumped into the denial machine, the House of Representatives was able to overcome it in 2009.

The Waxman-Markey bill passed the House just over 7 years ago. It was the only comprehensive climate change legislation ever to pass a Chamber of Congress. It has been reported that the oil and gas industry, including the Koch brothers and ExxonMobil, spent \$175 million and hired more than 800 lobbyists in 2009 to kill the Waxman-Markey bill. Let me give those numbers again: \$175 million and 800 lobbyists to kill a bill that would have put a clamp on the increase in greenhouse gas emissions in the United States.

They saw any action on climate, especially legislation, as a threat to their bottom line. But Members of the House knew better. They saw that Waxman-Markey was good for our environment, good for our economy, good for America. A Congressional budget analysis found that Waxman-Markey would

have reduced the Federal deficit and cost the average American household less than 50 cents per day. An analysis of the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy found that Americans would save about as much as CBO's cost estimates from energy efficiency policies in the bill that CBO did not take into account.

With an outstretched arm to lift them into the clean energy future, the bill included more than \$200 million for the coal industry, \$200 billion to capture carbon and to sequester it. Seven years ago, we gave the fossil fuel industry a choice: legislation or regulation.

But Exxon opposed the bill. The Koch brothers opposed the bill. Peabody coal opposed the bill, except for the parts that helped the coal industry. Rather than change their current business model, centered on pumping more CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere, they fought attempts to change the law. Now, 7 years later, Peabody coal has filed for bankruptcy. We are continuing to untangle the Koch brothers' web of denial.

The Koch brothers have lied to the American people for decades about climate change. They have also lied to their own employees. When Waxman-Markey was being debated, the Koch Industries newsletter published an article attacking the climate change legislation and encouraging employees to check out specific Web sites for more information. The listed Web sites were funded by the Koch brothers. They sent their employees to other parts of the web of denial. When a Republican tries to stand up and publicly support climate action, the Koch brothers' "spidy sense" goes off and their web of denial springs into action. They mobilize, they target, they attack every Republican who stands against their business plan. Koch money floods primary campaigns to ensure that their self-serving lies trump in every election.

The oil and coal industry will not stop their efforts because now the presumptive nominee of the Republican Party is a climate denier. But their obstruction and climate denial tactics are as bogus as a degree from Trump University. Trump says he wants an "all of the above" energy agenda, but we know he is really running on an "oil above all" platform. But the Koch brothers are now bigger than the Republican Party.

The Kochs have built upon the tactics practiced by the tobacco industry generations ago in its campaign to discredit the science linking smoking with increased risks of lung cancer. The Kochs' goal is to discredit the science itself. How successful are they? Donald Trump has said that if he is President, he is going to abolish the Environmental Protection Agency of the United States—abolish it. I guess he assumes that Americans think that the air is too clean, the water is too clean, the soil is too clean, the rivers are too clean in the United States, and that we can afford to abolish the Environmental Protection Agency of our country.

This is the world that the Koch brothers have forgotten. Their mission has always been to create doubt across America on climate science. They fund attempts to counter the fact that climate change is a threat to our national security and to our public health. Their funding attempts to counter the fact that action to combat climate change is feasible and necessary and will create American jobs. They fund the web of denial to serve their own interests to make billions in profits at the expense of America's health, America's safety.

But for someone who is focused on protecting the poor and the vulnerable of this world—that person understands the threat presented by climate change. I have in my hand Pope Francis's encyclical on climate change, "Laudato si'," subtitled "On the Care for our Common Home." The Pope is a chemistry teacher. That is what he did before he became Pope. When he came to Washington, DC, last year, he spoke to Congress and delivered his sermon on the Hill. He said that the planet is dangerously warming and that the science is settled. He said that human beings are a significant contributor to the dangerous warming of the planet. He said that since humans are contributing to the problem, we have a moral obligation to do something about it.

When the rest of the world looked up, they saw red, white, and blue CO<sub>2</sub>. Since the United States has historically been the largest contributor of carbon pollution, we must be the leader in working to reduce our own pollution.

As soon as the Pope spoke out urging action on climate change, the well-oiled climate denial machine shifted into high gear. The Acton Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty is another strand of the web of denial. Between 1990 and 2014, the Acton Institute received millions from Donors Trust or Donors Capital Fund, the Koch-funded dark money ATM, as well as money from the Koch families and from Exxon.

Reverend Sirico, the founder and president of the Acton Institute, testified in front of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee just last year. Reverend Sirico claims that the Catholic Church does not have expertise in science and should stick to matters of faith and morals. Well, here is the irony. A lack of expertise surely has not stopped Senate Republicans from blocking any and all climate change legislation.

Informed by the scientific evidence, the Pope made a clear moral case to act on climate and to act now. The Pope's comments came from the heart and from his belief in our ability to act collectively. It is just common sense that when you learn something is dangerous for you, for your health and for our Earth—and especially, as the Pope said to us, its impact on the poorest people on our planet, those who will be most severely harmed by climate

change—we have a moral obligation to stop that harm.

There is no doubt that fossil fuels forever changed our society, but pointing to the benefits from them does not take away the harm they cause or the urgency to transition to clean energy now. Many of those who oppose action on climate invoke the importance of preserving the free market.

As an example, consider the Lexington Institute, an organization funded by ExxonMobil and those pushing so-called free market solutions. The Lexington Institute—and may I add, the Lexington Institute is in Virginia; it is not in Lexington, MA, where the shot heard round the world was fired. No, this is just, again, absconding with a name and placing it upon an institution to try to give it the veneer of credibility. Of course, beneath the veneer is just more veneer. There is nothing. There is no science. There is nothing that backs up the arguments which they are making.

So the Lexington Institute claims that renewables need to be able to compete with fossil fuels without Federal subsidies, but the real truth is, the fossil fuel industry has never succeeded in the free market alone. Its success is built on more than a century's worth of tax breaks and subsidies.

The Lexington Institute sheds these crocodile tears about how much they care about the free market, but for 100 years they missed the fact that the oil, the coal, the gas, and the nuclear industries were all subsidized by the Federal Government. It is only when wind and solar show up that all of a sudden they become greatly concerned about the fact the free market is being distorted. Well, by giving tax breaks to wind and solar, of course, we are just making it a level playing field so they get the same kind of breaks all of these other industries have received for 100 or more years.

The subsidies for the fossil fuel industry top more than \$7.5 billion annually. You got that? It is \$7.5 billion per year. These tax breaks go back 100 years. Multiply that by 100, and then the crocodile tears start getting shed over something we do for wind or solar or fuel cells, biomass, geothermal?

There is no need for fossil fuel CEOs to come to Congress to justify the support for long-established subsidies, which they have always been getting. They do not even come up to defend it. They get it automatically—the extension of their tax breaks. The oil and gas industry have the Federal subsidies, coal has Federal subsidies, nuclear has Federal subsidies. What has happened every year, when we try to extend subsidies for renewable energy—for wind and solar—for even just 1 year, it is the end of the world as we know it in the capitalist system.

Just last year, the Koch brothers wrote a letter to every single Member of Congress urging them to oppose the tax breaks for wind and solar, and of course they cited “the free market.”

Because even though billions of dollars in Federal subsidies have benefited their companies for years and years, they have never come up here to say: Oh, take them away. It makes my company feel unclean. Oh no, they took those billions every single year. It is only when wind and solar step up and say: Well, how about us? We are clean. We don't pollute. We are what the younger generation wants to see us investing in as the technologies of the 21st century. Then they get morally offended. Then their free market principles start to get offended.

So the Lexington Institute, citing the free market, has fought the extension of renewable tax credits for wind and solar, but unlike the battle of Lexington that started the American Revolution, this Lexington is trying to stop a renewables revolution. Economic growth and climate action go together. We can have a country with clean air and water and clean energy and a strong economy. History continues to prove that the benefits of environmental regulation are enormous and beyond just financial.

Recently, we have seen global economic growth hand in hand with no increase in energy-related carbon pollution. We are seeing GDP go up but not carbon pollution. And in Massachusetts, since the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative started in 2009—the real Lexington revolution, the one in Massachusetts—we have seen powerplant greenhouse gas emissions go down 34 percent while Massachusetts' gross domestic product increased 25 percent.

So we are left with a really simple question: Why do fossil fuel companies continue to get Federal subsidies, but we do not extend them to clean energy? The answer is this: Koch, Exxon, the Marshall Institute, the Global Climate Coalition, the Acton Institute, the Lexington Institute, and their partners in the web of denial. Millions of dollars are spent to deceive and to mislead all in the name of self-interest and profit.

The Global Climate Coalition collapsed more than a decade ago. The Marshall Institute broke up last year, and its climate denial arm morphed into the CO<sub>2</sub> Coalition. Exxon is now publicizing their support for a carbon tax that they began espousing in 2009. The American Petroleum Institute is reportedly rethinking its messaging on climate. The threads of the web of denial are breaking and weakening, and the more light we shine on it—especially light fueled by the power of the Sun—the sooner it will fall apart.

We are in the midst of a clean energy revolution. The United States has a massive reserve of untapped renewable energy. Our reserves are so massive that just a small fraction could power our entire country. The question is no longer if we can power our country with renewable energy, it is when and it is how. We will make the transition to 100 percent renewable energy before the year 2050 if we keep the right policies on the books, and I believe we are going to meet that goal.

In the last 10 years, we have seen a dramatic expansion of renewable energy in our country. Just as the Pilgrims harnessed the wind to sail across the ocean to Plymouth Rock, we too can power our economy. Our current capacity is 74,000 megawatts of wind, and we have 14,000 more megawatts of wind waiting now to be deployed in our country. U.S. solar capacity is now more than 27,000 megawatts. Over 25 percent of this capacity was added in 2015 alone. We are projected to double that capacity by the end of this year.

Megawatts are hard to understand. Simply put, by the end of this year, we should have enough wind and solar energy to power over 25 million homes. That is one-fifth of all American homes.

We must continue to untangle ourselves from the Koch brothers' web of denial sewn by lies and doubt. The science is overwhelming. Climate change is real. Carbon pollution is accelerating the warming, and right now American cities and towns are preparing for an uncertain future in a world with a changing climate and rising seas. While the Senate has yet to knock out all of these old cobwebs of climate denial that are holding back action, we know, if we focus on the future, we cannot continue to have these decisions of today be borne by generations yet to come.

We must focus on resiliency and clean energy and what we are going to do to leave the world better off for future generations. No matter what lies and information the climate deniers try to peddle, the facts are with us, the moral authority is with us, the economic opportunities are with us.

We have a chance to create a clean energy revolution that increases jobs as it cuts pollution. This is job creation that is good for all of creation. We must take the climate deniers and their fossil fuel funders to task for their obstinate, obdurate, oblivious opposition to the clean energy to battle climate change.

Here is where we are. By the end of 2016, there will be 400,000 people employed in the United States in the wind and solar industries and 65,000—65,000—coal miners. By the year 2020, at the current pace, there will be 600,000 people employed in the wind and solar industry.

Half of all new electricity on the planet last year came from renewable electricity. This is a revolution, and it is a revolution we cannot allow to be derailed because we will be employing people, giving them the jobs they want, which will make it possible for us to save this planet.

I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for organizing all of the Members over the last 2 days to come out on the floor to make this case about this web of denial, which is at the core of what has been blocking this Senate from taking the actions necessary to deploy the technologies, to create the jobs which can save the planet by deploying



these technologies all across the planet.

I thank the Senator from Rhode Island once again for his incredibly great and historic leadership, and I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, it is an honor for me to follow Senator MARKEY, who has battled so long and so effectively in this struggle against such odds, and I think we both feel the tide has turned, things are going our way, but we have to hurry because nature is unforgiving. As the Pope said: God forgives, mankind forgives sometimes, but nature never forgives. You slap her and she will slap you back. And we have given nature one hell of a slap with climate change.

When I was here yesterday, I was pointing to the web of denial and pointing out that the web of denial has to mislead to be effective. That is what it is—a tool to mislead. I pointed out what a Koch brothers operative described as its goal when this whole web was being developed. This was the quote: “It would be necessary [to] use ambiguous and misleading names, obscure the true agenda, and conceal the means of control.”

Well, if you are looking for ambiguous and misleading names that can obscure the true agenda and conceal the means of control, one tactic would be to exploit our Founding Fathers—to seize their names and use them to lend authority and gravitas to the deception, in the same way that using the names of Lord Acton, the famous historian, or George C. Marshall, the hero of World War II, accomplished that task. In this case, the names are Franklin, Madison, and Jefferson, and they are joined by the philosopher John Locke.

Let’s start with the so-called Franklin Center for Government and Public Integrity, which has a nice little silhouette of Ben Franklin on its logo. It was established in 2009. It says it “supports and trains investigative journalists to advance transparency, accountability, and fiscal responsibility in local government, and to spotlight free-market, pro-liberty solutions to difficult policy challenges.”

According to “DeSmogBlog,” the Franklin Center was launched and funded by a conservative think tank that encouraged grassroots activism, which is the now defunct Sam Adams Alliance.

Oh no, another bogus organization exploiting the name of yet another Founding Father. There is a little pattern here.

Jeff Nesbitt, whom I spoke about yesterday, wrote this about the Franklin Center in his book “Poison Tea: How Big Oil and Big Tobacco Invented the Tea Party and Captured the GOP.”

At the start of 2008, the Franklin Center for Government and Public Integrity had a budget of zero dollars. Its legal home was a taffy shop in Medora, North Dakota. By 2009,

the Franklin Center’s budget had jumped to \$2.4 million, according to IRS tax records. That is a spectacular leap for a nonprofit, especially in Medora, North Dakota. It was almost as if someone wished to utilize the charter concept of the Franklin Center, developing individual but interlinked news centers across the United States that would all promote the same messages—for other purposes and therefore infused it with a mountain of funding and network support.

Let’s dig into the Franklin Center’s connections to groups and funders in this web of denial.

According to “DeSmogBlog,” the Franklin Center’s director of donor development comes out of the Charles G. Koch Foundation—wow. Its senior vice president in charge of strategic initiatives comes out of the Koch brothers’ Americans for Prosperity. The founding board member who set it up helped run, oh, Americans for Prosperity in North Dakota. According to Media Matters for America, the Franklin Center’s coalitions coordinator and its chief of staff also came out of, oh, Americans for Prosperity. Not surprisingly, the Pew Research Center’s Project for Excellence in Journalism ranked the Franklin Center Watchdog.org group as “highly ideological.” It is clear they have a bias at the Franklin Center to sow doubt regarding human-caused climate change. It is no surprise, considering where their staff and money comes from.

Here is the stuff they say. In 2015, a vice president for research and resident scholar at the John Locke Foundation—more on them shortly—wrote in the Franklin Center-affiliated Carolina Journal that “global warming is not about data points” so much as it has been “a trick pulled by global warming alarmists over the last decade.” There is a responsible view.

In 2014, a staff reporter for the Franklin Center’s Watchdog.org, wrote: “I continue to contend that ‘climate change’ is a meaningless phrase because the climate obviously changes . . . [but] is useful for political activism. . . .”

In 2011, its outlet, the Hawaii Reporter, wrote: “Hard-nosed physical evidence of man-made global warming has yet to be provided by the promoters of warming, even after a nominal \$80 billion have been spent in the attempt to do so.”

The Nieman Foundation for Journalism at Harvard has looked at the Franklin Center and describes it as “at the forefront of an effort to blur the distinction between statehouse reporting and political advocacy.” A former Reuters chief White House correspondent describes the Franklin Center’s state Watchdog.org as “delivering political propaganda dressed up as journalism.”

Let’s follow the money. The Franklin Center’s top donor in 2011, as reported by the nonprofit Media Matters for America and the Center for Public Integrity, was, guess what, the rightwing’s “dark money ATM,” DonorsTrust. It was set up by whom?

Oh, right, the Koch brothers. Over \$6 million, or roughly 95 percent of the Franklin Center’s revenue that year came through this organization, whose sole purpose is to hide the identity of the real donors. That is why it exists. According to data collected by the Conservative Transparency Project, between 2009 and 2014, the Franklin Center received over \$31 million from DonorsTrust and its related Donors Capital Fund. We don’t know who the hidden donors are because that is why they set up the DonorsTrust thing, but a clue of who they might be comes from the reported donors—like the rightwing Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, founded, according to the Center for Media and Democracy’s SourceWatch, by “one of the original charter members of the far rightwing John Birch Society.” Another John Birch Society board member was Fred Koch, the father of Charles and David Koch. Dr. Brulle’s research indicates that the Bradley Foundation between 2003 and 2010 gave almost \$30 million to these organizations that he tracks in this web of denial—\$30 million.

Then there is the Dunn’s Foundation for the Advancement of Right Thinking, a Florida-based grant-making foundation that Dr. Brulle’s research again shows between 2003 and 2010 gave \$13.7 million into this web of denial organizations.

Then there is the Searle Freedom Trust, which, according to the Center for Media and Democracy’s SourceWatch, has also funded Americans for Prosperity—guess what; the Koch group—the American Enterprise Institute, ALEC—the front group—the Heartland Institute—those classics who compared climate change believers to the Unabomber—and the State Policy Network. Dr. Brulle’s research, again, indicates that Searle gave \$21.7 million to this web of denial groups that he tracks.

Another donor, of course, to the Franklin Institute is the Charles G. Koch Charitable Foundation. That one is self-explanatory. So if we look at what is going on at the Franklin Center, we will see Koch people, Koch money, and Koch buddies.

Then there is the so-called James Madison Institute, a libertarian think tank with a long history of trying to undermine climate science and renewable energy policy. Yale Professor Justin Farrell lists the James Madison Institute among the organizations he tracks contributing to the polarization of climate change debate. The Heartland Institute’s—yes, that wonderful Unabomber group—senior fellow for environmental policy is on the James Madison Institute’s research advisory council. It is such a web of connections.

According to research by the American Bridge Project, the Madison Institute received over \$1.4 million in direct donations from Koch-affiliated groups. Between 2003 and 2013, they received funding from the John Templeton

Foundation, which “tries to encourage the integration of religious beliefs and free-market principles into the classroom,” according to the Center for Media and Democracy’s SourceWatch. Mother Jones reported in 2011 that Charles Koch recognized the Templeton Foundation for having donated over \$1 million to Koch-related causes, and Dr. Brulle’s research shows that Templeton gave more than \$20 million to this web of denial organization he tracks.

Dunn’s Foundation for the Advancement of Right Thinking turns up again—Franklin, now Madison. The same foundation that gave \$13.7 million to these climate change countermovement organizations also gave to the Madison one.

Of course, again, the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation gave to the Franklin Center and gave to the Madison Center to the tune of almost \$30 million into the climate denial web.

The James Madison Institute is also a member of the State Policy Network. The State Policy Network, according to the Center for Media and Democracy’s SourceWatch, is an “\$83 million right-wing empire” that has received money from a Koch family foundation, and, of course, the identity-scrubbing DonorsTrust and Donors Capital—which, by the way, are the big green diamond here at the center of this web.

According to the “DeSmogBlog” examination of the Madison Institute, it opposed the Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade legislation, and in 2009 issued a plea to policymakers in Florida—the State that is going fastest under water because of sea level rise—to stop any action on climate change following the so-called Climategate scandal. After six thorough investigations looked at Climategate, true, there was no scandal at all, but it would appear that the Institute neither rescinded its plea nor set the record straight.

This institute actively fights renewable energy policies in Florida. An institute report co-written by a senior fellow at the Heartland Institute—again, the connection, Madison Institute to Heartland Institute and Heartland Institute to the billboard that compared climate scientists to the Unabomber—opposed a proposed solar constitutional amendment. Well, they weren’t alone. According to news reports, Florida’s power companies were contributing big money to a political committee fighting that solar amendment, including over \$1 million from Florida Power and Light, \$1 million from Duke Energy, over \$800,000 from Tampa Electric Company, and \$640,000 from Gulf Power. Well, guess what. The president and CEO of Gulf Power was then on the board of, oh, the James Madison Institute.

Then we move on to John Locke, who gives us a twofor. First, there is the Locke Institute. It is named for the philosopher John Locke, who, with Montesquieu, are the two major philosophical influences of the Founding Fa-

thers. It is listed as one of Dr. Justin Farrell’s organizations contributing to the polarization of climate change debate and “overtly producing and promoting skepticism and doubt about scientific consensus on climate change.”

The institute has been involved in defending the tobacco industry and has on its academic advisory council a political scientist from the Global Warming Policy Foundation, a high-profile UK climate denier group.

There is also a John Locke Foundation, which describes itself as “an independent, non-profit think tank that would work for truth, for freedom, and for the future of North Carolina.” It is one of the blue dots here on Professor Brulle’s denial web diagram. Dr. Farrell, too, has the foundation on his list of climate change denier and countermovement organizations. Yes, it is a member of the Koch-funded State Policy Network, of course, and it is funded significantly by a North Carolina billionaire by the name of Art Pope, who, according to Indy Week, is “one of the most trusted members of the Koch’s elite circle: He has been a regular invitee to the Koch’s secretive, semiannual gathering of the major right-wing donors and activists,” and he is a “valuable junior partner in many key Koch operations.”

The foundation center database shows that between 2003 and 2013, the John Locke Foundation received over \$21 million from the John William Pope Foundation—which is named after Art Pope’s father—and over \$60,000 from the Charles Koch Foundation. It gets so cozy between everyone here. According to a 2014 Washington Post profile of Art Pope, he has poured over \$30 million through his family’s foundation into the Koch front group Americans for Prosperity—all of whose members, you remember, went over to the Franklin Institute. Professor Brulle has put the John William Pope Foundation at over \$20 million of total foundation funding to this climate change denial web. Dr. Brulle cites the John Locke Foundation as having received 3 percent of the total income distributed within the climate change countermovement between 2003 and 2010.

An article in Facing South calls the John Locke Foundation “one of the most outspoken voices of climate denial in North Carolina, claiming that global warming is a ‘pseudoscientific fraud.’” According to research done by Greenpeace, the foundation stated in a 2005 policy brief that “a greenhouse gas reduction policy would have only costs and no benefits.” In 2005, the foundation released a public policy statement entitled “Global Warming Policy: NC Should Do Nothing,” whose author wrote similar climate denial pieces in the Franklin Center-affiliated Carolina Journal. It is hard to keep track of all these crisscrossings.

In 2007, the foundation released a policy report entitled “A North Carolina Citizen’s Guide to Global Warming,”

whose author, according to Facing South, was a visiting scholar at the, yes, Koch-backed American Enterprise Institute. This report falsely declared that consensus on climate change does not exist, and declared: “The greatest threat we face from climate change is the danger of rushing into foolish and costly policies driven by ill-founded climate change hysteria.”

Art Pope figures in Jane Mayer’s book “Dark Money” as “a charter member of the Koch network” and a “longtime friend and ally, [who] shared Charles [Koch’s] passion for free-market philosophy.” Mayer writes that Pope was a regular at the Kochs’ secret planning summits and “served on the board of the Koch’s main public advocacy group”—wait for it—“Americans for Prosperity, as he had on its predecessor, Citizens for a Sound Economy.” Mayer adds: “Pope’s role in his home state of North Carolina was in many respects a state-sized version of the Kochs’ role nationally.”

Other Locke Foundation funders identified by Conservative Transparency Project between 1995 and 2014 include the Searle Freedom Trust, which, according to Center for Media and Democracy’s SourceWatch, has also funded, yes, Americans for Prosperity, and the American Enterprise Institute, and ALEC—which we have talked about and sponsors the State Policy Network—and, of course, we can’t go without the Heartland Institute, with their wonderful Unabomber billboard.

Dr. Brulle’s research indicates that the Searle Trust gave over \$20 million to these groups between 2003 and 2010. Donors Capital Fund—this big spider at the center of the web here—is a donor to the John Locke Foundation, and, of course, the Charles G. Koch Charitable Foundation. The John Locke Foundation is a member of the State Policy Network, that “\$83 million right-wing empire” funded by a Koch family foundation and the identity-launderers Donors Trust and Donors Capital.

That brings us to the so-called Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy. By the way, it is fair to say that yet again when we move from Franklin to Madison, these foundations end up showing Koch people, Koch money, and Koch buddies. The Thomas Jefferson Institute is a public policy foundation and, yes, another member of the State Policy Network, the \$83 million right-wing empire.

By the way, the Center for Media and Democracy’s in-depth investigation of the State Policy Network shows how the network and its member think tanks are all interconnected to ALEC and to the Koch brothers. But that is for another speech.

According to “DeSmogBlog,” many of the Jefferson Institute studies are authored by an operative of the Heritage Foundation, the group that Senator FRANKEN spoke about earlier this evening, and the Energy and Environment Legal Institute—two groups that are both on this web.

The Thomas Jefferson Institute prominently displays a statue of Jefferson on its Web page and claims to be a nonpartisan supporter of “environmental stewardship,” but the institute is an outspoken critic of the President’s Clean Power Plan and renewable sources of energy and actively sows doubt about climate science. The institute is right here on Professor Brulle’s web of climate change countermovement organizations.

According to data compiled by the Conservative Transparency project between 1998 and 2014, the Jefferson Institute received funding from the following entities in the denial web: first, of course, is the identity-laundering Donors Trust and Donors Capital Fund. Then there is the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, which, as we recall, also supported the Franklin Center and the Madison Institute and links to the Koch brothers through the far-rightwing John Birch Society. Remember, they were at almost \$30 million into climate denial organizations in those years between 2003 and 2010. And then there is the William E. Simon Foundation, whose current president is also a senior fellow at the rightwing Manhattan Institute, a member of the Grant Advisory Committee of the Searle Freedom Trust, and a past member of the Board of Overseers of the Hoover Institution. It is quite a web indeed.

The Jefferson Institute’s director was quoted in 2007 as saying: “When it comes to global warming, I’m a skeptic because the conclusions about the cause of the apparent warming stand on the shoulders of incredibly uncertain data and models.” Tell that to NOAA and NASA and every single one

of our National Labs and see how far you get. Tell that to your home State university and see how far you get.

In 2008, he wrote about climate change for the Jefferson Journal, a commentary forum of the Jefferson Institute, that “greenhouse gas reduction goals . . . are both unachievable and irrelevant” and assured “there will be no climate catastrophe due to CO<sub>2</sub> because either the science is wrong or we will use geoengineering.”

In 2011, he wrote two pieces for the Jefferson Journal opposing wind power, contending that—you are not going to believe this, but here is the quote—“wind is not affordable and it is not clean” and that wind power “has no sensible place in a 21st century civilization.” Tell that to our friend Senator GRASSLEY, whose State gets a third of its power from wind energy.

Franklin, Jefferson, Madison, Locke—these are great names put on the front of very shady Koch-funded front groups in the web of denial, and the organizations share several common features: First, they all propagate what by any reasonable standard is preposterous nonsense and masquerade it as science and independent opinion. Second, they all get massive funding from fossil fuel interests and always line up obediently with those interests. Third, they interlock. The interlocking is almost too complicated to track—in staff, in board members, in funding sources—but it all traces back to fossil fuel money. And, of course, they all mask themselves behind the names of great men from history who would recoil to discover their names and reputations being put to such discreditable use. Who needs to hide behind names like that? I submit it is people

who are up to no good and don’t want to be caught out for who they really are.

Let me conclude by thanking the many Senators who have participated in this effort to put a little bit of a spotlight on a very phony web of denial that is operating actively in our democracy to distort and disturb its proper operation and to sabotage America’s ability to respond in a responsible way to the climate crisis. They include our leader HARRY REID, BEN CARDIN, CHRIS COONS, TIM Kaine, ELIZABETH WARREN, CHUCK SCHUMER, TOM UDALL, JEFF MERKLEY, BARBARA BOXER, DICK DURBIN, BRIAN SCHATZ, AL FRANKEN, MARTIN HEINRICH, my senior Senator JACK REED, JEANNE SHAHEEN, GARY PETERS, DICK BLUMENTHAL, and ED MARKEY. I am honored to participate in this effort with them.

With that, I yield the floor.

---

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.  
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 8:27 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 13, 2016, at 9:30 a.m.

---

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 12, 2016:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CAROLE SCHWARTZ RENDON, OF OHIO, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.