

I wasn't here at the time it was passed, but from the legislative history and, most important, from the structure and language of the act itself, there seems to be irrefutably and incontrovertibly an understanding that tax credits would be available regardless of which governmental agency set up an exchange. The act simply would not have worked any other way and courts have an obligation to read statutes in a way that makes the most sense in terms of the overriding intent and purpose of the Congress.

The financial support simply, for universal coverage, would not be there without this interpretation, a common-sense interpretation that makes sense of congressional intent, purpose, and the law as a whole.

The law has given so many families across the country access to care for the first time. There has been an effort to repeal this act legislatively. There has been an effort to overturn it in the courts. Both have failed because it is working and because it is constitutional.

A ruling for the plaintiffs in this case that is now before the Court would not only be contrary to law, it would be catastrophic to millions of families who owe their health insurance to the structure the ACA has established. It would be, in fact, a human tragedy as well as a legal travesty.

There is simply no alternative that has been offered by opponents to this law. It is difficult therefore to see how this misguided lawsuit is anything other than one more cynical attempt to repeal or overturn this law—or torpedo it by any means necessary, regardless of the collateral damage to millions of innocent people who would suffer loss of health care insurance and health care. And the tragedy would be not only for them but for our entire Nation because the cost would ripple throughout our society—the cost in lost work; the cost in families suffering from the consequences of bankruptcy, which is caused most frequently by health care-related financial issues; the cost in the ability of our workforce to function at the height of efficiency that we all need; and the cost ultimately in diseases that have to be treated and ailments that have to be addressed and preventable health care consequences for our children. Prevention is one of the most cost-effective goals of the Affordable Care Act.

So I will work with my colleagues to support this act and to determine what other efforts can make progress toward the ultimate goal that we all should share—an America that is free from disease or injury that will bankrupt our families, an America that is healthier and better able to afford health care, and quality and timely health treatment.

The lack of standing on the part of these plaintiffs seems clear, but putting aside all of the technical issues and the legal debate, the Affordable Care Act has allowed America to make

huge, exciting strides in the direction of better health care. So we should be proud of the act passed by this body. Even many of us perhaps who were not here at the time can look forward to how much further we can go, and America has that fundamental obligation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am back now for the 91st consecutive week the Senate has been in session to urge my colleagues to wake up and pay attention to the threat of climate change. I am delighted and proud to be joined today by my colleague and friend Senator BALDWIN from Wisconsin to consider the effects of carbon pollution in her State.

According to scientists at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, weather stations around the State show that average temperatures in Wisconsin increased by about 1.1 degrees Fahrenheit between 1950 and 2006. During the same period Wisconsin got wetter. Annual average precipitation increased by almost 3 inches. These changes are likely to continue and intensify as carbon pollution continues to pile up in the atmosphere. Researchers at the University of Wisconsin-Madison estimate that by midcentury the State could warm by 4 to 9 degrees Fahrenheit. By the end of the century the climate in Wisconsin may look more like that of present-day Missouri or Oklahoma, raising the possibility of a dramatic shift in the Wisconsin economy and way of life.

This winter has been pretty cold in the Eastern United States and in Wisconsin. So was last year. Cold arctic air dipping down over North America drops the mercury. As we continue into a time of what has been called global weirding, scientists say that climate change may make these cold blasts more common as it alters patterns in the atmosphere. In a nutshell, on top of the long-term warming trend lies weather disorder. But the long-term warming trend is apparent. New research from UW-Madison's Professor Jonathan Martin shows that last year the so-called cold pool of frigid air that accumulates in the Northern Hemisphere each winter was the smallest since records began in the winter of 1948 to 1949. This year it is on track to be even smaller.

Sadly, some of our colleagues just can't face up to the role that human activity—such as our carbon pollution from burning fossil fuel—plays in the

changes we are seeing around us. One colleague—indeed, the senior Senator from Wisconsin—is among this group. In January he voted against amendments to the Keystone XL bill stating that climate change is real and that humans contribute to it. Well, in 2013 the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel—his State's largest paper—noted that this type of denial was at odds with both Wisconsin opinion and Wisconsin scientific evidence. The senior Senator from Wisconsin, wrote the paper's editorial board, "is just flat-out wrong." The paper went on to say, "We elect politicians to make tough decisions and find solutions, not to shut their eyes and cover their ears, as Johnson repeatedly has done on this issue." The article continued: "[S]tubbornly denying the facts on climate change may be akin to denying the facts on evolution or whether the Earth is flat."

Professor John Kutzbach of the University of Wisconsin—an elected member of the National Academy of Sciences—was among a group of climate scientists who in 2011 wrote to us in Congress imploring us to take action on climate change. Here is what the letter said:

Congress needs to understand that scientists have concluded, based on a systematic review of all of the evidence, that climate change caused by human activities raises serious risks to our national and economic security and our health both here and around the world. It is time for Congress to move on to the policy debate.

Well, I welcome that debate. Indeed, the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Senator MURKOWSKI, recently said on the floor of the Senate that she hopes we can "get beyond the discussion as to whether or not climate change is real and talk about . . . what do we do." So where is that debate? Where are the other Republicans? Let's finally talk about the cost of action and the cost of inaction.

The Wisconsin Initiative on Climate Change Impacts was formed in 2007 by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and the University of Wisconsin Nelson Institute for Environmental Studies. The scientists and public officials in this program are doing important work to help the State of Wisconsin understand and prepare for climate change. They are studying how it will affect wildlife, water resources, public health, and important Wisconsin industries such as forestry, agriculture, and shipping and tourism on the Great Lakes.

Climate change threatens iconic aspects of the Wisconsin environment and economy. The Wisconsin Initiative on Climate Change Impacts Agriculture Working Group reports that higher summer temperatures and increasing drought will create significant stress on livestock, even touching—dare I say it—Wisconsin's famed cheese industry. Victor Cabrera, an assistant professor in the University of Wisconsin-Madison Dairy Science Department—they have one—says heat stress

interferes with fertility and milk production. Dairy cows could give as much as 10 percent less milk. The U.S. Department of Agriculture predicts that by 2030 climate change will cost the U.S. dairy sector between \$79 and \$199 million a year in lost production. When opponents say reducing carbon pollution will cost too much, they conveniently leave out the cost of doing nothing, such as these costs.

Well, the dairy State is not waiting for Congress to take action. The University of Wisconsin is leading a USDA-funded effort to identify dairy practices that minimize the emission of greenhouse gases and make dairies more resilient to the effects of a changing climate. Some Wisconsin dairy farmers are burning excess methane in enormous manure digesters—that is a frightening concept—to generate their own renewable electricity.

Wisconsin sportsmen know that Wisconsin has more than 10,000 miles of trout streams—some of the best trout fishing in the country. Cold-water fish, such as the brook trout, are there, but they are highly sensitive to temperature increases in streams. Under the worst cases analyzed by the researchers at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, “brook trout are projected to be completely lost from Wisconsin’s streams.” Even the best-case scenarios see losses of as much as 44 percent of the brookies’ current range by midcentury. Other cold-water species, such as the brown trout, are not much better off.

Trout Unlimited—sportsmen and conservationists working to protect trout streams in the Driftless Area in southwest Wisconsin and parts of Minnesota, Illinois, and Iowa—did a 2009 study showing fishing in the Driftless Area adds over \$1 billion per year to the surrounding economies.

We have heard of loggers having trouble getting to the timber because the ground is thawed and too soggy to hold up logging equipment. For Wisconsin’s loggers, the hard, frozen winter ground is what lets them move logging equipment. According to a study out of the University of Wisconsin, that period of frozen ground has decreased by 2 to 3 weeks since 1948, shortening the working window for loggers before their gear bogs down.

And then there is the badger. The Upper Midwest and Great Lakes Landscape Conservation Cooperative even lists the great Wisconsin badger as one of the species at risk from regional climate change.

Senator BALDWIN knows that, done right, action on climate change saves Americans money, spurs American innovation, and creates new American industry and jobs. Focus on Energy, Wisconsin’s statewide energy efficiency program, has been helping Wisconsin families and businesses save money and reduce energy use since 2001. The Wisconsin Public Service Commission expects this program to inject over \$900

million into the State’s economy, and net over 6,000 new Wisconsin jobs over the next decade.

I am very grateful to my friend Senator BALDWIN for her strong leadership on behalf of the people of Wisconsin to stave off the worst effects of climate change in her home State.

I yield to her now.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his commitment to addressing the threats that climate change poses globally, to our country, and to our States. I thank him for highlighting some of those threats to my home State of Wisconsin.

Let there be no doubt that global climate change is real. It is a fact. The question is not whether it is happening, but rather how we are going to address it. Are we going to do all we can to leave the next generation a safer and healthier world?

As my friend from Rhode Island just noted, climate change will be costly to our economy and to our very way of life, and the longer we wait to act, the more costly these impacts will be.

Throughout our history, the State of Wisconsin has been a proud home to environmental leaders who have worked to pass on a stronger environment to future generations—Aldo Leopold, John Muir, and Senator Gaylord Nelson, founder of Earth Day and the namesake for the Nelson Institute at the University of Wisconsin, which my colleague from Rhode Island just mentioned in his remarks. As a representative of our great State, it is one of my top priorities to follow in this legacy and to preserve our natural resources and quality of life for future generations.

It is not hard to see why Wisconsinites have always deeply valued environmental protection. Looking out at the crystal clear waters of Lake Superior from its south shore, or standing atop Rib Mountain gazing at the forests and farmlands of central Wisconsin, to casting your fishing rod in the world-class trout streams of the Driftless region in southwestern Wisconsin, there is no question that we are blessed by the natural beauty of our State.

But even now, the impact of climate change can be seen on each of these landscapes and in the economies they support. We see it in our agriculture—growing seasons are shifting, and extreme weather harms our crops, and we have increasing concerns about drought and our groundwater.

In fact, NASA recently warned that within a few decades—within our lifetimes—the United States may enter a megadrought that could last 30 years.

In my home State, the resulting decreased soil moisture will put additional stress on farmers, on private wells, and on municipal drinking water systems. These prolonged droughts, combined with increased intensity of storm events and changing temperature patterns, will force farmers to make changes to how and what they

grow. This is extremely troubling, as agriculture is an \$88 billion industry in my home State of Wisconsin.

We also see the negative effects of climate change on our Great Lakes. In Lake Michigan, for example, lake levels are largely driven by precipitation. Changes in precipitation patterns due to climate change may cause more dramatic fluctuations or prolonged changes in lake levels.

In addition, data from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shows that summertime surface water temperatures have increased 8 degrees Fahrenheit since 1980. Warmer surface water temperatures disrupt the food chain, which threatens our fish population. As these adverse effects are expected to worsen in the coming decades, they will inevitably lead to more wildlife disease, and warmer waters that will drive out native fish.

Changing water levels also create new challenges for property owners and communities along the Great Lakes. Infrastructure may need to be redesigned, insurance demands may change, and new health risks may emerge or be exacerbated as additional stress is imposed on our sewer systems. Each of these will hurt our local economies.

Tourism is also a major part of Wisconsin’s economy, and the Northwoods is a favorite destination to fish, camp, hunt, and snowmobile. But projections show that by midcentury, the climate of areas such as Bayfield and Vilas County in the Northwoods will be more similar to what we have known in the southeastern part of the State of Wisconsin in counties such as Waukesha County.

Meanwhile, Waukesha County’s climate could be more similar to what we used to expect hundreds of miles south in the neighboring State of Illinois. The impacts on tourism, recreation, and the landscapes we hold near and dear may be dramatic, and the threats may be daunting. But we cannot continue to let the challenges overwhelm us and cause inaction on our part.

Wisconsin’s State motto is “Forward.” The people of Wisconsin have never been afraid of the challenges we face or what the future holds. We have a strong progressive tradition of confronting our challenges and working together to shape our future for the next generation.

In fact, analysis by the World Resources Institute in 2013 found that Wisconsin is well positioned to meet national goals for carbon pollution reduction. By extending existing clean energy policies, Wisconsin could reduce its emissions substantially in coming years.

In addition, many of Wisconsin’s most successful companies are leaders in energy efficiency, renewable energy, and clean technology. They are vital sources of innovation and will provide opportunities for the workers of today and tomorrow.

I believe smart investments by government, by companies and institutions, and by citizens will help us confront the challenge of climate change, while positioning Wisconsin for 21st century economic and ecological resiliency.

This opportunity is great. We must meet the challenge head on—going forward the Wisconsin way.

I once again thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his laser focus on this issue that is so critical to all of our home States, as well as, frankly, the entire global community.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I thank Senator BALDWIN for sharing this time with me this evening, and for all the wonderful work she does on behalf of her home State.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to proceed to S. 625.

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

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT OF 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S. 625.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 27, S. 625, a bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 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 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 proceed to S. 625, a bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Daniel Coats, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, David Vitter, Jerry Moran, Deb Fischer, Johnny Isakson, Lamar Alexander, Richard Burr, Orrin G. Hatch, Thad Cochran, Steve Daines, John Thune.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 625 occur 1

hour after the Senate convenes on Tuesday, March 10.

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

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

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday the Prime Minister of Israel shared with the Congress and the American people his perspective regarding Israel's national security interests and the threat the radical regime in Tehran poses to stability in the greater Middle East. The Prime Minister explained later in the day in a meeting here in the Senate why any agreement that leaves Iran with a threshold nuclear weapons capability is harmful not only to the strategic interests of Israel but to the United States and to our allies.

Unfortunately, President Obama appears to be pursuing an agreement that is designed to leave the Iranians with a threshold nuclear capability under which they can retain thousands of centrifuges, continue to master the nuclear fuel cycle, advance ballistic missile research and testing, and keep secret any possible military dimensions of nuclear development that has already occurred. Iran has a record of covertly pursuing aspects of a nuclear weapons program.

The administration has pursued the P5+1 negotiation, not as part of an overall strategy to end Iran's nuclear program and to defeat its efforts to dominate the region but as a stand-alone matter of litigation where a settlement must be reached. This negotiation shouldn't be about getting the best deal the Iranians will agree to; it should be about the strategic objective of ending Iran's nuclear weapons program.

Many in Congress have been wary of what kind of concessions the Obama administration might agree to with the Iranians and what were the responsible steps to be taken if Iran refused to give up the pursuit of a nuclear weapons capability.

Yesterday I began the process to move to legislation that would meet the demands from both sides of the aisle—to give Congress the ability to review and vote on any deal the President agrees to with Iran. From a legislative perspective, given that this bipartisan bill was introduced last week and that the Foreign Relations Committee has ample time to mark up this bill and send a substitute to the floor, I was surprised that some Senators made statements objecting to their own legislation. It was surprising to see some Members on the other side of the aisle threaten to filibuster their own bill—a bill they rushed to introduce before the President's negotiations were complete.

This isn't complicated. A bill was introduced, and, as I discussed with the chairman of the Foreign Relations

Committee, it can be marked up, and the committee-passed bill would be the substitute the Senate then considers.

From a policy perspective, it makes clear to the administration not to strike a deal that leaves Iran as a threshold nuclear state. And it makes obvious sense to consider the Nuclear Review Act before the deadline for a political agreement because the Iranians need to know that congressional sanctions will not be lifted if a bad deal is reached, and some will oppose lifting sanctions if they refuse to disclose the potential military dimensions of their nuclear program.

But, look, time is running out. Iran's Foreign Minister said today that he believes they are very close to a deal.

There is nothing partisan about the Senate acting to serve its constitutional role in oversight and in pursuing policies that uphold the national security interest. It was the Obama administration that decided to negotiate an agreement with Iran that would not be submitted to the Senate as a treaty. The White House went out of its way to bypass the elected representatives of the people in this negotiation with Iran. It is the Obama administration that is negotiating a deal with the Iranians that will leave them with a nuclear infrastructure. And it is the Corker-Graham-Menendez-Kaine bill that will ensure that Congress will review any deal the President strikes with Iran.

So let's be clear. The actions we have taken would allow the sponsors of this sensible, bipartisan legislation to begin the debate next week. And it will allow for the Foreign Relations Committee to follow the regular order and debate and vote on the bill. If the committee reports a bill, the committee bill will become the text that the full Senate debates. That is called the regular order.

It is my sincere hope that the sponsors of this bill will have the opportunity to review and defend their bill in committee and will not filibuster and prevent the full Senate from also acting on their important legislation. The Senators who introduced the bill—who introduced it—should certainly vote to debate the measure.

REMEMBERING DEEDEE CORRADINI

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a truly iconic Utah leader, a remarkable woman, and Salt Lake City's first and only female mayor, Ms. Deedee Corradini.

Sadly, Mayor Corradini lost her short but valiant battle with lung cancer this week. She was a fighter until the end—just as she was in her career and in all aspects of her life.

Deedee was a true trailblazer in every sense. She served as Salt Lake City's mayor for 10 years during a time of significant growth and change. During her tenure, she was instrumental in finalizing the city's bid to host the 2002