

now see that the middle class is essentially collapsing, even though we are coming out of the worst recession since the Great Depression because of the leadership of our President and those of us who tried to help him. We need a head of the Department of Labor to make sure everybody gets a fair chance. I wish to thank my friend. He makes a very important point about Republican obstructionism.

After the election, they sat around, all of them, and said: Oh, my goodness. We have to do better with Hispanics. We have to do better with women.

Who are the two people they are holding up with all their might at this point—and I hope they end it—Mr. Perez and Gina McCarthy, a woman who deserves a promotion just as Mr. Perez deserves a promotion. They can say all they want that they are reaching out to minorities and women, but then they are blocking promotions of people who are outstanding Americans. I wished to say that before my friend left the floor.

FACING THE ISSUES

Mrs. BOXER. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are focused on several issues, which they call scandals. I would like to address those and then talk about issues that seem to be falling through the cracks while they focus on “gotcha” politics; they are going to get the President.

I think we will start with the IRS. It is wrong to target any group for scrutiny whether they are on the right or on the left, if it is a tea party group or a liberal church. We have seen this with the IRS over the years. As a matter of fact, I looked back to see how many of my Republican friends stood up and talked about going after the IRS and straightening them out when they went after the NAACP or when they went after a liberal church in Pasadena in Congressman SCHIFF's district. The fact is they got exercised when they went after the tea party. OK. I hear you. I am with you. What is important is so is the President.

If this President says: I agree with you, they say: We didn't hear you.

They just want to fight. I have friends where sometimes we are having a debate, and all of a sudden a bright light goes on and I will say, you know what, I think you are right. Sometimes they keep on arguing.

The President said this is an outrage, and he has already made sure people are being fired. We are going to make sure we straighten things out at the IRS.

Let's focus on how to fix it, not how to make it into a “gotcha” political issue. We also have Republican outrage over the Justice Department seeking the phone records of the Associated Press.

I, myself, believe freedom of the press is one of the most important freedoms we have. I don't like to see phone records of reporters subpoenaed in secret.

I was once a reporter and had a lot of confidential sources. I wrote for a very good weekly magazine called the *PacificSun*. I did in-depth stories on all kinds of issues. People would talk to me, and they knew I would never say who they were and who was giving background.

The thought of having the government take a look at these records without telling the press is bad. Guess what. The President agrees it is bad. The President said we need a law, a media shield law. Guess what else. We had a vote on this in 2008. It was 51 to 43 with all Democrats supporting the media shield law and all Republicans, save 5, voting to filibuster, so the bill was killed.

How do they then say this is horrible when they themselves, Republicans, blocked us from protecting the media?

I believe this is an important issue we should work on together, but it shouldn't be made into a political “gotcha.” We should fix it and move on. Let's take up a media shield law again. This time the Republicans shouldn't filibuster since they are all over this question, and let's get going.

Then we look at Benghazi. I am on the Foreign Relations Committee. I sit next to the chairman. I sat next to John Kerry. I sat through all the hearings where Hillary Clinton, the Secretary of State, said: This was a tragedy. These were my friends who were killed. I take full responsibility.

She ordered an independent investigation. It came back and guess what it said. We need to spend more defending our outposts.

Guess who started cutting embassy security, who initiated it. The Republicans in the House.

I think if they are looking to blame someone, why don't they look in the mirror for starters.

Again, let's fix the problem. I am supporting a bill that will authorize funding for key items identified by the independent review board Secretary Clinton put together. It will deal with a number of pieces they recommend. It requires, among others, detailed reports from the State Department on how they are progressing toward implementing the recommendations, and it requires the identification of the most high-security threats.

I understand why we would look at losing four brave Americans as a tragedy. It is a tragedy. Don't politicize it.

Where were the Republicans when we lost 4,000 Americans in Iraq, injured 10 times as many. Where were they? Where was their indignation at that? Based on false premises, that war was a war of choice, not a war of necessity.

We have all of this swirling around Washington and we look at the American people and we say what is it they want us to do. Sure, we should conduct oversight. I am all for it. Let's solve those problems, but let's move to the issues that matter.

I will tell you what matters most in California: jobs, jobs, jobs, the econ-

omy, the economy, the economy. We just moved off a double-digit unemployment rate. For the first time in a long time we are below 10 percent. It means we have to keep our eye on this economy. We have to make the investments that matter. Restore some of the mindless cuts that were made with the sequester while we see this deficit going down.

That is another point. All the howling from the Republicans about how this President doesn't care about deficit reduction, we are witnessing deficit reduction. We are witnessing the housing market come back. We are witnessing a lot of good. Just think of what we could witness if we came together, sat down with this President and inked a whole new plan for this economy, for deficit reduction.

We have to do the farm bill. We just did the water resources bill. Let the House get it done. We did the Marketplace Fairness Act. Let the House get it done.

Republicans, I say to them—they are not here—rhetorically, help us pass a budget. They are blocking the budget. They went around the country campaigning against Democrats saying we didn't pass a budget. Then we passed a budget and now they will not finish the job, which means making sure we get conferees appointed. Bring the two bills together, the House and the Senate, compromise on that, and get the budget done. There is no budget. They will not let us do it.

Endlessly, they bash the President. Immigration reform, my colleagues are doing an incredible job in the Judiciary Committee, very difficult—sensible gun laws, background checks, things that matter to people.

Working on the farm bill, I hope we get it done this week. Last time it died in the House. I have a message for my House friends. Please, do your oversight but do something for the people that they are asking us to do. Get a budget, get a farm bill, get a Marketplace Fairness Act. Work on restoring the mindless cuts so we can have more jobs. These are the things that have to be done. Background checks. We didn't get it here. It was very close. It would be great if they did something in the House.

This week I believe we are voting on Richard Cordray to head the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. We have to protect the middle class.

Today I read the paper about some new instrument that has been thought of by Wall Street that would go to people and say give us the proceeds of your pension plan, and we will give you a lump sum. Maybe that is great, but it sounds risky to me. We need someone who is out there protecting the consumers, particularly in banking and housing. I hope we get Richard Cordray done.

I thought Senator MENENDEZ was brilliant the way he explained why Thomas Perez deserves to be head of Department of Labor.

I wish to spend a couple of minutes on Gina McCarthy. She has a history of bipartisanship. She worked for not one, not two, not three but four Republican Governors: Republican Governor of Connecticut Jodi Rell, Republican Governor of Massachusetts Paul Cellucci, Republican Governor of Massachusetts Jane Swift, Republican Governor of Massachusetts Mitt Romney. She worked for four Republican Governors. She is not enough qualified for my friends on the other side. She was confirmed here without a dissenting vote for her current position. What more do they want? She worked for four Republicans and one Democrat, Barack Obama. What more do they want?

This is what Christie Todd Whitman said about the Republican boycott: They walked out. They have since returned to the table. I was happy, but when they walked out of that meeting, they didn't come to the meeting, and we couldn't mark her up the first time we tried. She said: They looked like sore losers when they walked out. If they don't object to the person and what they have done in the past, and they don't with Gina, then they have even less grounds to hold up this nominee.

Jane Swift, who was a former Republican Governor of Massachusetts, said it was disgraceful.

I don't get it. Ms. McCarthy answered 1,000 of their questions. Then when I approach my friends on the other side and say, you asked her a thousand questions, their answer was: Well, we only cared about five. Then why did you ask her a thousand questions? She had to sit there, exhausted, answering every single question.

Now Senator VITTER says I don't know what I will do. I might let it go and not filibuster, but then I might filibuster or I might wind up voting for her. Well, you know, the time for all this contemplation has passed. The woman is qualified. The President deserves his Cabinet, he deserves an EPA Administrator. He made a bipartisan choice in Gina. Gina was brilliant when we had our hearing. Enough already. Please, it is time to have a vote up or down on Gina McCarthy.

We have a lot of work to do. I mentioned a few. How about the latest threat from the Republicans? They decided they are not sure they are going to raise the debt ceiling so they now have a bill where they lay out who would get paid first when we default on our debt. And guess what, America: It is not you. It is China. Before we pay America's business or American bondholders, we are going to pay China.

So when you look at where we are going with this debt ceiling, the last time they held it up it cost us \$19 billion—\$19 billion over 10 years—because they played games, even though when Ronald Reagan was President he said: Don't even go there. Of course, I am paraphrasing. But he said even the thought of not raising the debt ceiling and not paying our debts is dangerous for our Nation.

Yet now the Republicans have a bill that we call "Pay China First." That is what it is about. They would pay China and other foreign bondholders before we pay our troops, our disabled and retired veterans, doctors and hospitals that treat Medicare patients, and before we pay American businesses that are contractors.

I understand they had a meeting to discuss this further, and they were so excited about it—what hostages they could hold—they talked about proposals that threaten a woman's right to choose, tax breaks for the wealthy, and repealing ObamaCare. They have already tried it 37 times. And cutting Medicare.

What are they thinking over there? Pay our bills. Don't let this country's credit be downgraded again.

I tell you something, if that is what they do, they do not deserve to get their salary. I have a bill that would say if we default on our obligations by not raising the debt ceiling we should give up our pay. I don't know what they are doing over there other than playing politics, and it is dangerous.

We know they do not care for our President, but he is the President. Show a little respect for the office. Show a little respect for what he has on his shoulders. Show a little respect for what he has already accomplished, and accept the fact that when there is trouble he doesn't hide in the corner. He says: You are right, I want to fix it. Let's fix it together.

CLIMATE CHANGE

I have gone over just some of the issues we have to look at, but I am going to close with one very big issue that no one, except a handful of Senators, seems to care about, and that is climate change.

I have to say it is shocking to me that as this planet enters a planetary emergency, where we are as close as we can be to carbon concentrations of almost 400 parts per million, which is the danger zone, I still don't see anyone here saying to me, as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, let's get a bill to the floor. Oh, no. Oh, no. So we are burning up.

I am going to read a little bit from what I thought was a very well-done piece in *Politico*, and I am going to read parts of it, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* the entire *Politico* article I am about to read from.

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

[From *Politico Pro*, May 10, 2013]
SCIENTISTS ALARMED AS CO2 PASSES
THRESHOLD

(By Andrew Restuccia)

The amount of heat-trapping carbon dioxide in the atmosphere passed a symbolic milestone this week, scientists announced Friday, reaching levels that haven't prevailed on the Earth since long before human civilization began.

The long-expected announcement by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Adminis-

tration—that CO2 concentrations had finally hit 400 parts per million at a key measuring station in Hawaii—means little by itself. But it's a sign that time is slipping away to head off or lessen the rising sea levels, worsening storms, species die-offs and other fallout from global warming, scientists and climate activists warned.

Still, there are few signs that Washington will emerge from its deep snooze on the issue.

Congress remains unable to pass serious legislation to tackle climate change. Efforts to reach a major binding international climate change treaty have sputtered. And while the Obama administration has made some strides in lowering greenhouse gas emissions, including increasing fuel-efficiency standards for cars, climate experts say much more needs to be done—and fast.

"We've never been here before, certainly not while human beings were on the planet," said Melanie Fitzpatrick, climate scientist at the Union of Concerned Scientists, estimating that it's been 3 million–5 million years since the planet has had such high carbon dioxide levels.

"The carbon dioxide concentration in the atmosphere is like the thermostat in your house. Every time you turn it up, we are essentially turning up the heat in the planet," said Jon Hoekstra, chief scientist at the World Wildlife Fund. "We're essentially baking ourselves in, perhaps quite literally."

NOAA said the daily mean CO2 concentration was 400.03 ppm on Thursday at Mauna Loa, Hawaii, the world's oldest continuous carbon dioxide measurement station. That was the first time the figure had crossed 400 ppm there since measurements began at the site in 1958, the agency said.

NOAA said last year that sites in the Arctic had already reached 400 ppm, but measurements from the facility in Hawaii are closely watched as an indicator of broader trends on the planet.

"It's unprecedented," said James Butler, director of the Global Monitoring Division of NOAA's Earth System Research Laboratory. "Hitting 400 is just saying, 'Folks, we haven't addressed this yet.'"

Butler said the planet hasn't seen atmospheric levels of carbon dioxide this high since the Pliocene era, between 2.5 million and 5 million years ago. He said the global average temperature will probably reach 400 ppm in one or two years.

Scientists warn that continued increases could result in catastrophe. A federal report released earlier this year, for example, said 5 million Americans living in low-lying areas could be affected by sea-level rise in the coming decades.

And global emissions appear poised to continue soaring. Not only has the CO2 concentration risen over the decades, NOAA said, but the rate of increase has been accelerating—"from about 0.7 ppm per year in the late 1950s to 2.1 ppm per year during the last 10 years."

"Before the Industrial Revolution in the 19th century, global average CO2 was about 280 ppm," NOAA said in a statement Friday. "During the last 800,000 years, CO2 fluctuated between about 180 ppm during ice ages and 280 ppm during interglacial warm periods. Today's rate of increase is more than 100 times faster than the increase that occurred when the last ice age ended."

The surge in atmospheric carbon dioxide emissions shows that federal and global policies to curb global warming aren't even close to adequate, said Dan Lashof, director of the climate and clean air program at the National Resources Defense Council.

"It's a very black and white record of what we're doing to the atmosphere. The bottom line for climate policy can be measured by

the CO₂ concentration we're observing in the atmosphere," Lashof said.

Bill McKibben, founder of 350.org—an activist group that has led the call for lowering carbon dioxide in the atmosphere to 350 ppm—called the measurement “one more grim milestone.”

“Somewhere between 350 and 400 ppm the Arctic melted, and the ocean turned 30 percent more acidic,” he said. “And the country's political leaders took no action even remotely commensurate with the scale of the crisis. Let's hope we can build this movement strong enough that that changes before we add another 50 ppm.”

Environmental groups used the 400 ppm milestone to revive their long-standing demands for action.

“What we're looking at is really an opportunity for a wake-up call for people,” Fitzpatrick said. “We really need to come up with solutions. And they're out there. We just need to implement them.”

But bitter partisanship in Washington has proven that policymakers face massive hurdles in their push to tackle the problem. Brad Johnson, campaign manager of the climate activist group Forecast the Facts, painted a bleak picture of the political landscape.

“We must respond with urgent resolve to end this uncontrolled experiment on our only home,” he said in a statement. “Yet the Republican Party maintains climate change denial as a central tenet of their party platform, and President Obama refuses to admit the threat projects like the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline pose to our future survival.”

Still, some expressed hope that recent events like the droughts that hammered much of the country and Hurricane Sandy will build support for action.

“At what point do we as a society say this is more than we can put up with?” Hoekstra asked.

Mrs. BOXER. This is from an article dated May 10 from Politico:

The amount of heat-trapping carbon dioxide in the atmosphere passed a symbolic milestone this week, scientists announced Friday, reaching levels that haven't prevailed on the Earth since long before human civilization began.

Let me say that again. Is anybody listening to this? Scientists said:

The amount of heat-trapping carbon in the atmosphere passed a symbolic milestone this week, reaching levels that haven't prevailed on the Earth since long before human civilization began.

Do you know who said that? NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

... CO₂ concentrations had finally hit 400 parts per million at a key measuring station in Hawaii. ... Still, there are few signs that Washington will emerge from its deep snooze on the issue.

How right on. They are all sleeping, except for a handful of us. Wake up to this.

Congress remains unable to pass serious legislation to tackle climate change.

Melanie Fitzpatrick, climate scientist at the Union of Concerned Scientists, was quoted in the article saying:

... it's been 3 million to 5 million years since the planet has had such high carbon dioxide levels. We've never been here before, certainly not while human beings were on the planet.

She goes on. Oh, no, this is Jon Hoekstra of the Wildlife Fund.

The carbon dioxide concentration in the atmosphere is like the thermostat in your house. Every time you turn it up, we are essentially turning up the heat in the planet.

James Butler, Director of Global Monitoring of NOAA's Earth System Research Lab, was quoted as saying:

It is unprecedented. Hitting 400 is just like saying, “Folks, we haven't addressed this yet.” The planet hasn't seen atmospheric levels of carbon dioxide this high since the Pliocene era, between 2.5 million and 5 million years ago. The global average temperature will reach 400 parts per million in 1 or 2 years.

The article continues:

Scientists warn that continued increase could result in catastrophe. ... 5 million Americans living in low-lying areas who could be affected by sea level rise.

It goes on and on. Hoekstra ends his quote with:

At what point as a society do we say this is more than we can put up with?

I will tell you why we are not doing anything. Special interest: Big oil, big coal, big polluters. They do not want to address this. For their short-term profit they do not want to address this. It is sad, the control they have here. Special interests have a lot of control, whether it is the NRA stopping us from doing something 90 percent of the people want, such as background checks, or it is big polluters—big polluters who don't want us to do anything about this issue for their short-term benefit.

When they are all gone and people are suffering in our country, our grandkids and great-grandkids are going to say: What was my great-grandma thinking? What was my great-grandpa doing? We see what is happening in the weather. Just look out the window. We see it.

Mr. President, I have discussed the latest scientific information that is available to us, including a front-page story in USA Today, on March 1, that spotlighted the impacts of climate change unfolding around us. The story was part of a year-long series called “Why You Should Sweat Climate Change,” and it described how climate disruption is happening all around us.

I have also talked about a report entitled the “2013 High Risk List” that was released by the Government Accountability Office—GAO—a government watchdog agency. That report told us how climate disruption and the increased frequency and intensity of extreme weather events, such as Superstorm Sandy, threaten our Nation's financial security.

Another aspect of climate change that I have discussed is its impact on public health in the U.S. and China, which has experienced the harmful health effects from air pollution due to its rapid industrialization over the past few decades.

Today I will discuss how climate disruption poses a risk to our national security in several ways. It has serious implications on national security planning, it places additional burdens on the U.S. military, and it affects our military readiness.

We have been told by a number of military leaders and defense experts, such as former Secretary of State George Schultz under President Reagan, that climate change is a fact and we must address it as a national security priority.

It is a priority that we simply cannot ignore. An open letter was signed by 38 former high-ranking Republicans, Democrats, and Independents—including 17 former Senators and Congress members, 9 retired generals and admirals, and Cabinet officials from the Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, Bush (41), Clinton, and Bush (43) administrations. The letter was turned into an ad highlighting that.

Look at this chart.

“The cost of inaction will be staggering.” This is a February 25, 2013, Partnership for a Secure America ad.

Some of our most senior military leaders have already told us that climate disruption will have significant impacts on national security.

According to the Chief of U.S. Pacific forces:

The significant upheaval from climate change ‘is probably the most likely thing . . . that will cripple the security environment . . . Navy Admiral Samuel J. Locklear, III, “Chief of US Pacific forces calls climate biggest worry.”

That is from the Boston Globe, March 9, 2013.

There are a broad range of risks associated with the impacts of climate change, such as drought and lack of drinking water supplies, which can contribute to military crises around the world. These threats must be factored into our national security planning and operations.

According to President Obama's National Security Advisor, the environmental impacts of climate change are clear:

[T]he danger from climate change is real, urgent, and severe. The change wrought by a warming planet will lead to new conflicts over refugees and resources; new suffering from drought and famine; catastrophic natural disasters; and the degradation of land across the globe.

That is from Tom Donilon, National Security Advisor, April 24, 2013.

In March, the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, reported to the Senate that climate change and extreme weather will create water scarcity, disrupt food supplies, and harm energy infrastructure in ways that will raise global risks of instability and aggravated regional tensions.

This is from the March 12, 2013, Worldwide Threat Assessment of the U.S. Intelligence Community, report to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

While climate change alone does not cause conflict, it can accelerate instability, increase the threat of international military crises, and hinder our ability to combat terrorism. According to the Department of Defense's Defense Science Board:

Climate change effects, particularly those related to water and food and security, can erode the legitimacy of fragile states and create conditions terrorists and extremists seek to exploit. Therefore, they are significant factors in combating terrorism.

This is from "Trends and Implications of Climate Change for National and International Security," Department of Defense's Defense Science Board, October 2011.

Climate disruption is also placing an additional burden on our military, because it impacts the type of missions that must be planned for and undertaken. Climate change is increasing the frequency and intensity of extreme weather events, and when a weather disaster occurs, our Armed Forces mobilize to provide humanitarian assistance to local communities and families in need.

We saw this happen with Superstorm Sandy, which wiped out entire communities in just a few hours. In response, our soldiers came to the rescue of people on the east coast who were impacted by Sandy's storm surge. These types of humanitarian missions—whether it is in the U.S. or overseas—place additional burdens on our brave men and women in uniform.

Disasters such as Sandy that harm our civilian infrastructure, such as airports, ports, and electric grids, also create national security issues, because they can affect military readiness.

In addition to civilian infrastructure, Superstorm Sandy caused tremendous damage to our military facilities. A portion of the \$60 billion Sandy emergency relief package that Congress passed earlier this year went toward repairing and replacing damaged Federal military assets, including: Fort Dix in New Jersey; Norfolk Naval Station in Virginia; Dover Air Force Base in Delaware; and the Coast Guard Academy campus in Connecticut.

The U.S. military has almost 300,000 buildings valued at \$590 billion—much of which is at risk because of climate change. In January, DoD stated:

In ways, coastal military installations have been on the front lines of climate change."

In fact, 10 percent of DoD coastal installations and facilities are located at or near sea level. According to the National Intelligence Council, more than 30 U.S. military installations were already facing elevated risks from storm surges and rising sea levels. These installations include

Eglin Air Force base, located on the Gulf of Mexico in the Florida panhandle—this facility faces storm surges and sea level rise; and

Norfolk Naval Station and the neighboring Newport News shipyard—the location where we build aircraft carriers. These facilities are also threatened by storm surges and sea level rise.

The U.S. military is not alone in viewing climate change as a threat. A recent study found that over 70 percent of nations surveyed around the world

view climate change as a national security threat.

This is from the American Security Project: Global Security Defense Index on Climate Change, March 21, 2013.

Countries around the world recognize that climate change is a national security threat, but it is the U.S. military that must take a leading role. As one of America's retired military leaders, former U. S. Navy Vice Admiral Lee Gunn, stated:

Climate Change poses a clear and present danger to the United States of America . . . The imperative, then, is for leadership and action on a global scale. The United States must act. The United States must lead.

This is from the November 1, 2012, "Climate Change and the Homeland," American Security Project.

I could not agree more. We must follow the analysis and advice of our Nation's military leaders and national security experts to protect the American people by addressing the dangerous threat posed by climate disruption.

I want to show a few charts about what people are saying, and then I will stop.

"The cost of inaction will be staggering." This ran in March.

The effects of climate change in the world's most vulnerable regions present a serious threat to American national security. Countries least able to adapt to or mitigate the impacts of climate change will suffer the most, but the resulting crisis will quickly become a burden on U.S. priorities. Both the Department of Defense and State Department have identified climate change as a serious risk to American security and an agent of instability.

This is a very bipartisan group. It is actually mostly Republicans on this, of people saying do something about this. Our national security is at stake.

When there are refugees who are run out of their country, what is going to happen to the world? There already are climate refugees. There is a movie called "Climate Refugees."

"Danger from climate change is real, urgent and severe."

The change wrought by a warming planet will lead to new conflicts over refugees and resources; new suffering from drought and famine; catastrophic natural disasters; and the degradation of land across the globe.

That is a quote from Tom Donilon, National Security Adviser. So this is a national security issue.

How could the polluters have so much power to overwhelm our national security people? But that is where it is. That is where it is.

"Climate change can hinder ability to combat terrorism."

Climate change effects, particularly those related to water and food and security . . . can create conditions terrorists and extremists seek to exploit. Therefore, they are significant factors in combating terrorism.

That was the Department of Defense, October 2011. Department of Defense. National security advisers. The CIA has been telling us this for a long time. We have to act. We have to act.

I have to say there are a number of my colleagues here—a small number—

who feel the way I do. We are all pushing hard. Senator SANDERS and I have a bill, the Sanders-Boxer bill, that would put a price on carbon. Carbon could cost us the planet. The least we can do is put a little charge on it so people move to clean energy—clean energy.

Take the issue of the Keystone Pipeline. It is a big controversy. People say, let's just do it. Well, you ought to see what will come out of that in terms of carbon pollution. It will undo all the good we did from fuel economy. And the oil won't stay here. They have a waste disposal problem with it. But it is a little bit inconvenient.

Remember when Vice President Gore wrote the book "Inconvenient Truth." It is a little inconvenient for us. We don't want to know about it because it is hard to deal with. But we can do it.

In California, we are beginning to see more and more solar rooftops, more and more clean power, and the jobs that are coming with it are extraordinary. We can do this. This is the greatest Nation in the world, but we are kind of held hostage to the big polluters. We have to say that we have to act for the safety of the people.

We are hearing it. We are hearing it from our national defense department, we are hearing it from George Shultz, who was the former Secretary of State under President Reagan. He says it is a national priority that shouldn't be ignored. Cabinet officials from the Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, and Bush—41 from Clinton and 43 from Bush—wrote a letter to us. And Navy ADM Samuel Locklear, III, Chief of U.S. Pacific Forces, calls climate "our biggest worry."

That is what he said.

The significant upheaval climate change "is probably the most likely thing . . . that will cripple the security environment. . . ."

This is a Navy man.

There are a broad range of risks associated with the impacts of climate change, such as drought and lack of drinking water supplies, which can contribute to military crises around the world.

This is what the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, said:

. . . extreme weather will create water scarcity, disrupt food supplies, and harm energy infrastructure in ways that will raise the global risks of instability and aggravated regional tensions.

It goes on. The entire national defense establishment is speaking with one voice. We also wanted them to tell us what would happen to our military facilities. Many of them—300,000 buildings valued at \$590 billion are at risk because of climate change. Those are coastal military installations.

We are dealing with a lot of infrastructure. Norfolk Naval Station, neighboring Newport News shipyard where they build the aircraft carriers, they are threatened by storm surges and sea level rise.

I have come to the floor now three or four times to keep raising these different issues. Tonight I am talking about national security, but we also

saw terrible tornadoes in Oklahoma—horrible. I send my condolences to the people who lost loved ones. This is climate change. This is climate change. We were warned about extreme weather—not just hot weather but extreme weather.

When I had the gavel years ago—it has been a while—the scientists started to agree that we would start to see extreme weather. People said: What do you mean? Do you mean it is going to get hot? Yes, it is going to get hot, but we are also going to have snow in the summer in some places. We are going to have terrible storms and tornadoes and all the rest.

We need to protect our people. That is our No. 1 obligation. We have to deal with this threat that is upon us. It is going to get worse and worse through the years.

I certainly hope—and I pray over it—that people will wake up to this and we will start to have support for moving together and at the end of the day it is a win-win-win. We will help save our planet. We will create good-paying jobs right here in America as we move toward clean energy. We will see fewer people with asthma, and we will have a more healthy population.

At the end of the day we will help those in the transition who have to pay a little bit more for their energy. We have it all figured out, how to do that, and no one will be hurt. But right now—I am a very straight from the shoulder person—I can tell you it is not happening, but I feel an obligation to my grandkids to be here every Monday I can be here to put in the RECORD the problems we are facing.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, over the past several weeks the Senate Judiciary Committee has considered the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act. In addition to the three hearings the Committee held this year on the need for comprehensive immigration reform, the Committee held an additional three hearings specifically on this legislative proposal after it was introduced. In those legislative hearings we received testimony from 26 witnesses, including the Secretary of Homeland Security, Secretary Napolitano, who spoke at length about the bill would make our country safer and help address the current problems in our immigration system.

The Judiciary Committee has benefited from more process and transparency than any previous Committee consideration of immigration reform. In 1985, the Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Immigration held three hearings on the Immigration Control and Reform Act and heard testimony from 14 witnesses. In 2006 and 2007, the last two times the Senate tried to enact comprehensive immigration reform, the Republican chairman of the Judiciary Committee held no hearings

on his legislative proposal or the McCain-Kennedy proposal or the Kyl-Kennedy formulation.

In 2006, the Republican chairman circulated his legislative proposal just one week before the Committee met to make opening statements. He then revised his legislation and circulated it barely 2 days before the Committee met to begin debate and consider amendments. This year, the Judiciary Committee received the bill text on April 17, and after a period of more than 3 weeks to consider it and draft amendments we began our consideration of amendments to the bill on May 9.

During the Committees consideration of the Immigration Reform and Control Act in 1986 the Committee met four times. We are holding our fourth day of markup today. It is my hope that the Committee will complete our consideration of the bill on Wednesday after 6, extended days of consideration. In 1985, the Committee debated only 11 amendments, adopting 7. The Committee sent the bill to the Senate on as 12-5 vote.

In 2006, the Committee met five times to consider amendments to the Chairman's Securing America's Borders bill, conducted 60 votes and adopted 54 amendments. The bill was then reported to the Senate on a vote of 12 to 6. In 2007, the bill was not considered by the Judiciary Committee at all before floor consideration.

Already this year the Committee has met for 4 days to consider amendments to the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act. During just the first three executive sessions, the Committee has considered 99 amendments. Of those 50—more than half—were offered by the Republican minority. During those first 3 days, the Committee debated and voted to accept 67 amendments to the bill. That is already more amendments than were debated in 2006 and 6 times as many amendments as were debated in 1986. Of those accepted, 20 were offered by Republican members. That includes several amendments sponsored by Senator GRASSLEY, Senator CORNYN and a few sponsored by Senator SESSIONS. The Committee has acted in a bipartisan way to accept amendments authored by Senators from both sides of the aisle and by Senators who are proponents of the bill and some by Senators who can fairly be considered opponents of the bill.

The Committee will continue its consideration of the legislation after tonight's votes. As of 4:30 today, we have considered an additional 45 amendments, including 22 offered by Republicans, and 23 offered by Democrats.

One example of the Committee's bipartisan efforts to improve this legislation was offered by Senators HATCH, COONS and KLOBUCHAR, which will increase certain immigration fees and provide 70 percent of the funds collected to the states to improve and enhance the economic competitiveness of the United States by improving

science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education and training in the United States. Senator SCHUMER offered a second degree amendment which would direct some of this funding to promote STEM education in groups that are underrepresented in the sciences, such as women and racial minorities. Both amendments were accepted by the Committee by unanimous consent.

The Committee also unanimously approved my amendment to permanently authorize and further strengthen the EB-5 Regional Center Program which will benefit the economy. The United States Citizenship and Immigration Services—USCIS—estimates that the EB-5 Regional Center Program has created tens of thousands of American jobs and has attracted more than \$1 billion in investment in communities all across the United States since 2006.

These amendments are just a few of the many offered to promote jobs and innovation in the non-immigration visa provisions in Title IV of the bill. Other bipartisan proposals to provide assistance for American workers to apply for jobs in the technology sector and establish employee reporting requirements to address potential abuse of the visa system have also been adopted.

The Committee has voted to accept amendments offered by nearly every member of the minority on the Judiciary Committee. Senators GRASSLEY, HATCH, SESSIONS, GRAHAM, CORNYN, LEE, and FLAKE have all offered amendments adopted by the Committee to improve the bill. Senators FEINSTEIN, WHITEHOUSE, KLOBUCHAR, FRANKEN, COONS, BLUMENTHAL and HIRONO have also contributed important amendments to improve the legislation. With the adoption of these amendments, the Committee demonstrated its ability to act in a bipartisan manner to improve this historic legislation.

In an unprecedented effort to achieve transparency during the Judiciary Committee's public proceedings, and to ensure the American people could follow the Committee's consideration of the bill, I made public all 301 amendments filed on Tuesday, May 7, by posting them on the Judiciary Committee's website. In real time, as the Committee accepts or rejects amendments, the Committee's website is updated to reflect which amendments are modified, accepted or fail.

The Judiciary Committee's mark up of the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act is not yet finished but we have completed work on two of the four titles of the bill as well as the important "trigger" provisions. We have been able to focus our extensive consideration of this complex bill for three weeks and still achieve a fair and transparent process for Committee consideration. With the help of the Senators who serve so diligently on the Judiciary Committee from both sides of aisle, I hope by the end of this week