let me give you one more reason. I respect the intent of those who support this amendment, but let me tell you what it means. It means that if this were, in fact, a treaty, we would be saying that we would be delegating to other entities the decision on whether to eliminate the sanction regime we in Congress imposed.

I have listened to my colleagues, particularly on the Republican side, who say they do not want to delegate that authority, that Congress should keep its legislative authority.

If you believe Congress should keep its legislative authority, that it is up to us to determine whether we are going to change or eliminate or modify the sanction regime, then you cannot be for a treaty because a treaty would give away that power. I do not think you really mean to do that, but that is the intent, if this were to be turned into a treaty, that we would be giving up our power.

Secondly, I don't know how we are going to explain it to our colleagues in the House of Representatives. The Presiding Officer served in the House. I served in the House. Senator MENENDEZ served in the House. The last time I checked, we imposed these sanctions because a bill passed both the Senate and the House, and now we are saying that the approval process is going to ignore the House of Representatives, solely going to be a matter for the U.S. Senate on a ratification of a treaty? That does not seem like a workable solution.

My point is to concur in the observations of Senator CORKER. This is clearly an amendment that if it were adopted would say we are not going to have an orderly review process for Congress to be able to weigh in. We are not going to be able to get the material to set up the logical review by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that we are going to lose all the benefits of this bipartisan bill if this amendment were to be approved.

For all those reasons, I would urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. I think I have about 1 minute remaining. I will be glad to yield that to Senator JOHNSON, if he would like to have a minute and a half to try to rehabilitate his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Maryland yielding time.

If I could ask a question, if this amendment fails in terms of involving the House, I have another amendment that if the Senate decides not to deem this a treaty—and I believe it should be deemed a treaty—we can also deem this a congressional executive agreement which, of course, would have to be voted on by both Houses.

I think the fact is this does rise to the level of a treaty. Again, there is no specific criteria in terms of what creates a treaty or comprises a treaty and what doesn't. In the end, what determines whether something is a treaty is how it is approved by Congress.

From my standpoint, when we take a look at the considerations in the Foreign Affairs Manual, in terms of what actually causes something to become a treaty, the extent to which the agreement involves commitments or risks affects the Nation as a whole. I think this deal between Iran and America and the world affects and risks—certainly affects the Nation as a whole.

Another consideration is whether the agreement can be given effect without the enactment of subsequent legislation by the Congress. I think the fact that we are even debating this bill lends credence to the fact that Congress needs to be involved.

In the end, though, it is not about involving Congress. This is about involving the American people. I think the American people should have a say through their elected officials as to whether this is a good deal or a bad deal. The fact that this bill does allow some involvement, some role, forces the administration to, for example, provide us the details of the bill. Can you imagine the arrogance that they would not even provide the details without this bill?

Again, I appreciate the Senator yielding time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 57, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 167 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Heller	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott
Collins	Kirk	Sessions
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	McConnell	Thune
Daines	Moran	Tillis
Enzi	Murkowski	Toomey
Fischer	Paul	Vitter
Gardner	Portman	Wicker

NAYS—57

Alexander	Blumenthal	Cantwell
Ayotte	Booker	Capito
Baldwin	Boxer	Cardin
Bennet	Brown	Carper
Casey	Hirono	Perdue
Coats	Isakson	Peters
Cochran	Kaine	Reed
Coons	King	Reid
Corker	Klobuchar	Sanders
Donnelly	Leahy	Schatz
Durbin	Manchin	Schumer
Ernst	Markey	Shaheen
Feinstein	McCain	Stabenow
Flake	McCaskill	Tester
Franken	Menendez	Udall
Gillibrand	Merkley	Warner
Hatch	Murphy	Warren
Heinrich	Murray	Whitehouse
Heitkamp	Nelson	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Cruz	Mikulski
Graham	Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

The majority whip.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CORNYN. 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.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes in morning business.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, the evidence of climate disruption caused by carbon pollution is clear and overwhelming. Yet the Senate is sleepwalking through this history. I am here today for the 97th time to say that we must wake up. Climate disruptions are felt in every corner of the globe, from the ocean floor to the reaches of the atmosphere and from pole to pole.

Indeed, the United States is an Arctic Nation. We have been so since Secretary of State Seward negotiated the purchase of Alaska from Russia in 1878 for about $7 million. From our vantage point at the Arctic Circle, we are witnessing some of the direst climate disruptions.

The Arctic region has been warming now for decades, twice as fast as the rest of the planet. Alaska's warmest year on record was 2014, going back to at least 1918. Here I am talking about measurements, not a theory. This year the Alaskan winter was so mild that the start of the famous Iditarod race had to be moved from Anchorage to Fairbanks, more than 300 miles to the north, so that the mushers could find snow and hard, frozen rivers to sled on.

The Arctic Biodiversity Assessment, a project drawing on more than 250 scientists from 15 countries, detailed the risk to the iconic wildlife and landscape of the Arctic. The report's chief scientist said:

> Polar bears and other highly adapted organisms cannot move further north, so they may go extinct. We risk losing several species forever.

The report is clear. Climate change is the most serious threat to Arctic biodiversity and to its fisheries and tourism. Arctic warming has wreaked havoc on the ice cover of the Arctic terrain and ocean.

Look at the Greenland ice sheet. In 2012, the National Snow and Ice Data Center recorded melting over a larger area than ever in more than 30 years of satellite observation.

Here is a map of the average annual days of melting across the Greenland ice sheet from 1979 to 2007. That is the average. Here is 2012. Some areas, such as along here, the southwestern coast, saw more than 120 days of melting in 2012. Scientists estimate that the water pouring out of this ice sheet accounts for 30 percent of current global sea level rise. If the entire Greenland ice sheet were to melt, the seas would rise 6 meters.

Here is what 20 feet of sea level rise would look like for the east coast. Much of Rhode Island's coastline here would be lost. Florida, ground zero for climate change, would lose the entire southern region of the State. Here is Miami, completely underwater. Here is Tallahassee's new oceanfront.

Sea ice in the Arctic, not just land ice, is also in full retreat. Our scientists at NASA track disappearing sea ice using satellites. Since NASA started measurements in 1979, Arctic ice coverage has diminished in almost all regions and seasons. The winter record low ever—ever—was this March.

The ice is not just a feature of the Arctic landscape. It supports the way of life of Native people. Thinning ice, dangerous to traverse, threatens traditional sustenance such as quail hunting. Sea ice protects the shoreline from powerful ocean storms and waves. As that ice barrier fades away, land and infrastructure flood and wash away. Entire villages are facing wholesale relocation, as Senator MURKOWSKI from Alaska has indicated on the floor. It is the climate that has sustained them for generations that is being disrupted.

A new national security theater has opened in the Arctic as melting ice frees up the Northwest Passage for transportation and shipping, for new fishing grounds, and for its natural resources. The Departments of Homeland Security and Defense need new strategies and equipment to protect American interests in this new theater.

In 2013, the Pentagon released its ''Arctic Strategy.'' Then Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel, the former Republican Senator, said:

> Climate change is shifting the landscape in the Arctic more rapidly than anywhere else in the world. While the Arctic temperature rise is relatively small in absolute terms, its effects are significant—transforming what was a frozen desert into an evolving navigable ocean, giving rise to an unprecedented level of human activity.

His words are echoed by former Coast Guard Commandant ADM Robert Papp, Jr., who is now the U.S. Special Representative to the Arctic Region. It is his job to help manage risk in this remote but increasingly accessible region of the world. He had this to say about the disruptions of the Arctic climate:

> I am not a scientist. I can read what scientists say, but I am in the world of consequence management. My first turn in Alaska was thirty-nine years ago, and during the summertime we had to break ice to get up to the Bering Strait and to get to Kotzebue. Thirty-five years later, going up there as commandant, we flew into Kotzebue at the same time of year; I could not see ice anywhere. So it is clear to me there are changes happening, but I have to deal with the consequences of that.

Last weekend, Secretary Kerry headed to the Canadian city of Iqaluit to assume the chair of the Arctic Council on behalf of the United States. The Arctic Council is the international forum for Arctic nations to work together to ensure a secure and sustainable Arctic future. Secretary Kerry made it clear that climate disruption would be a focus for America's chairmanship, saying plainly:

> The ability of future generations to be able to adapt, live, and prosper in the Arctic the way people have for thousands of years is tragically but actually in jeopardy. . . . So if we want to know where the problem begins, all we have to do is look in the mirror.

Secretary Kerry sees this problem for what it is and knows we need to lead in addressing climate change. Congress, too, should seize the opportunity to do big things, to understand the changes that are occurring, and to protect against these climate disruptions. Our executive homeland and national security leaders must deal in real world consequences. So should we. They do not have the privilege of shrugging off serious risk analysis; neither should we.

But the big polluters and their front organizations ignore the consequences of carbon pollution, cherry pick the evidence, and traffic in denial, doubt, and delay. Deniers are quick to point out that Antarctic sea ice is increasing while Arctic sea ice is melting. But the fact is that, overall, the globe is losing sea ice at a rapid peace. Since satellite measurements began, the planet has been losing sea ice at an average rate of 13,500 square miles per year.

The deniers usually also leave out the melting of the great ice sheets of Antarctica. Remember, see ice floats on the sea and its melting does not much raise the sea level. Ice sheets rest on land. Their melting adds to the seas. Scientists now warn that the melting of some of those massive Antarctic ice sheets may have ''passed the point of no return.''

Rhode Island has already experienced nearly 10 inches of sea level rise. The implications of an Arctic ice sheet melting are measured in feet, not inches. Many thought that the Alaska Purchase was a mistake. Some called it ''Seward's folly.'' But Secretary Seward had vision when he secured Alaska for the United States, and now it is a treasured part of this great Nation.

We in Congress, in the Senate, should try to see through the haze of polluter influence and muster some vision ourselves on what scientists and world leaders alike call the greatest challenge of our time. The United States should be leading—not stalled by special-interest politics. Secretary Kerry knows we should lead. He has made fighting carbon pollution a priority for the State Department in the lead-up to the global climate talks in Paris this fall. More than 100 Democratic Members of Congress sent a letter last month to the President, supporting U.S. leadership in these talks. We told the President: ''We stand ready to help you seize this opportunity to strengthen the global response to climate change.''

But what do our Republican colleagues try to do? They try to undermine American leadership. The majority leader openly warned other countries that the United States would not be able to meet its climate plan and that they should proceed with caution before entering into a binding, unattainable deal. It is past time to take action. The price of being wrong on this will be very high, particularly if the reason turns out, in the eyes of history and of our fellow nations, to have been partisan politics and special-interest influence.

One of America's great powers is the power of our example. What a sickening example we are setting now. Our inaction is our folly. It is, indeed, time to wake up.

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

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

REMEMBERING JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I honor a longtime champion of Arkansas, Congressman John Paul Hammerschmidt, who passed away earlier this month at the age of 92 after a long life as a dedicated public servant.

As a member of the ''greatest generation,'' John Paul served as a combat pilot during World War II and was a decorated war hero. As a Congressman from the Third District of Arkansas for 26 years and the only Republican member of the delegation at the time, he worked across the aisle to provide infrastructure and various improvements to Arkansas, paving the way for the growth in the northwest corner of the State.

Even following his retirement more than 20 years ago, John Paul continued to serve the people, who fondly referred to him as ''JPH.'' He always put Arkansas first. His vision for a two-party system in Arkansas led him to seek elected office. He paved the way for the