

**SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT PROGRAM.**

Section 1001(a)(23) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(23)) is amended to read as follows:

“(23) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out part Y, \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.”.

**SEC. 3. EXPIRATION OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.**

Section 2501 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 37961) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) EXPIRATION OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—

“(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘appropriated funds’ means any amounts that are appropriated for any of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 to carry out this part.

“(2) EXPIRATION.—All appropriated funds that are not obligated on or before December 31, 2022 shall be transferred to the General Fund of the Treasury not later than January 31, 2023.”.

**SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON 2-YEAR LIMITATION ON FUNDS.**

It is the sense of Congress that amounts made available to carry out part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 37961 et seq.) should be made available through the end of the first fiscal year following the fiscal year for which the amounts are appropriated and should not be made available until expended.

**SEC. 5. MATCHING FUNDS LIMITATION.**

Section 2501(f) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 37961(f)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) LIMITATION ON MATCHING FUNDS.—A State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe may not use funding received under any other Federal grant program to pay or defer the cost, in whole or in part, of the matching requirement under paragraph (1).”.

**SEC. 6. APPLICATION OF BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS TO ANY ARMOR VEST OR BODY ARMOR PURCHASED WITH FEDERAL GRANT FUNDS.**

Section 521 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3766a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a grantee that uses funds made available under this part to purchase an armor vest or body armor shall—

“(A) comply with any requirements established for the use of grants made under part Y;

“(B) have a written policy requiring uniformed patrol officers to wear an armor vest or body armor; and

“(C) use the funds to purchase armor vests or body armor that meet any performance standards established by the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

“(2) In this subsection, the terms ‘armor vest’ and ‘body armor’ have the meanings given such terms in section 2503.”.

**SEC. 7. UNIQUELY FITTED ARMOR VESTS.**

Section 2501(c) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 37961(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “; or” and inserting “; and”;

(3) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) provides armor vests to law enforcement officers that are uniquely fitted for such officers, including vests uniquely fitted to individual female law enforcement officers; or”.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion 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.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank all of the Senators who have cosponsored this bill. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for withdrawing his objection. I am hoping the other body will soon take this up so that we can try to have it passed before the police meet here at the Capitol for a memorial to fallen police officers and we can move forward.

This has been underfunded over the years, and we have not been able to fill all of the requests. We have filled a lot of them, and we have saved a lot of lives. Of course, I will be willing to work with the Senator from Oklahoma or with any other Senator on this or any other law enforcement program. But I have always considered my years in law enforcement in many ways the high point of my career. I want to make sure we approve it as soon as we can.

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

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

**ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued****IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT**

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise to sound a note of warning about the nation of Iran. Consider the following facts: The Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, has accused America of lying. We learned that the Iranian regime has been actively arming and supporting the anti-American Houthi rebels in Yemen since 2009. The Iranian regime held a parade of military equipment that featured chants of “Death to America” and “Death to Israel.” The Iranian regime unjustly detained American citizen, Washington Post reporter Jason Rezaian and charged him with espionage and other crimes, including “propaganda against the establishment.” The Defense Minister of Iran declared that IAEA inspectors would be barred from all military sites, even those known to have nuclear facilities. The Iranian Navy threatened a cargo ship sailing under the flag of the United States in the Strait of Hormuz.

The Iranian Navy seized another cargo ship in the Strait of Hormuz sailing under the flag of our ally, the Marshall Islands. The Foreign Minister of Iran accused the United States and our allies of being the biggest danger to the international community. Great Britain informed a U.N. sanctions panel that Iran has an active nuclear procurement network linked to two blacklisted firms. The Iranian Navy harassed a U.S. warship and military plane off the coast of Yemen.

These are not events from 1979 or 1983 or 1996. These are, in chronological order, the aggressive anti-American actions of the Islamic Republic of Iran in the last month. Every one of those occurred in the last month, at least these are the ones we know of that have been covered in the media.

This relentless drumbeat of hostility has gone on unabated for 36 years, and it makes the legislation before this body, the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, all the more critical. The bill’s supporters insist it is the only way to ensure that Congress has its due say over President Obama’s proposed Iran deal.

I agree that it is of paramount importance to give Congress its proper role in an international agreement of this magnitude and to make clear that President Obama must persuade Congress and the American people to support his deal if he wants it to be binding, which is why I have been supportive of this process so far. But I am here to tell you that as the legislation stands, this legislation is unlikely to stop a bad Iran deal.

The problem is an all-too-familiar one here in Washington, DC, which is that the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act contains a provision inserted at the insistence of Senate Democrats which will allow Congress to appear to vote against the deal while tacitly allowing it to go into effect. The bill allows Congress to adopt a “resolution of disapproval” of President Obama’s Iran deal. On the surface that sounds reasonable.

From what we know publicly of the deal, I certainly disapprove of it strongly. But a resolution of disapproval under this legislation, even if it passed a 60-vote threshold, with grand claims of bipartisanship, would not be the end of the matter.

The President would certainly veto it. Once he did, it would require 67 votes in the Senate and 290 votes in the House to override that veto. No wonder the White House has lifted its objection to this legislation. All the President would have to do to force a bad Iran deal on America is hold 34 Senators in the Democratic Party or 145 Members of Congress.

If he could do that, a bad deal that undermines the national security of this country, that endangers our friend and ally, the nation of Israel, would go into effect. He could claim he was simply following the process Congress required. That is not an oversight. That

is not an accident. This bill, as drafted, will provide some political cover to Senate Democrats to say they have voted to provide strict scrutiny and congressional approval of an Iran deal.

Yet, as currently drafted, it is a virtual certainty that no matter how terrible this deal is, it will go into effect and this legislation is unlikely to stop it. Our first priority should be stopping a bad Iran deal that jeopardizes the lives of millions of Americans and millions of our allies. There is nothing more important this body can consider, not trade, not the budget. There is nothing more important.

The first responsibility of this body is to protect the national security of this country, to protect the lives and safety of men, women, and children across this country. The President's Iran deal deeply jeopardizes the safety of Americans. From what we know publicly—and the details are still shrouded in considerable secrecy—but from what we know publicly, under this deal, Iran will be allowed to keep its enriched uranium. It will be allowed to keep its centrifuges and reactors. It will continue its ICBM Program, the only purpose of which is to deliver a nuclear weapon to the United States of America.

Tehran will receive even more economic relief, reportedly including a \$50 billion signing bonus. Who in their right mind would give a \$50 billion signing bonus to Iran? It is worth noting that even under one of the strictest regimes of international sanctions, Iran was still able to marshall the resources to become one of the world's leading state sponsors of terrorism. We can only imagine what Iran will do with this new source of funding, which will certainly flow to Hamas, to Hezbollah, and to the Houthis, as well as to their proxies in Latin America.

I would note, if this deal goes into effect, and tens or hundreds of billions of dollars flow into Iran, including a \$50 billion signing bonus, and that money is given directly to radical Islamic terrorists, the blood of the men and women and children who will be murdered by those terrorists will be directly on the hands of this administration. If we allow tens and hundreds of billions of dollars to flow into the hands of terrorists, it places complicity for that terrorism on this administration.

There is no topic more serious this body could consider than preventing the murder of Americans. The Iranians' behavior speaks for itself. They are, right now today, unlawfully imprisoning multiple American citizens—Pastor Saeed Abedini, Amir Hekmati, as well as Jason Rezaian—under brutal conditions. They are withholding information on the whereabouts of Robert Levinson.

They have killed Americans across the globe and they have plotted to kill us here at home. They are explicitly threatening to wipe our ally, the nation of Israel, off the map. Indeed, in

the midst of this negotiation, the senior Iranian general said: The annihilation of Israel is “non-negotiable”. Given that, there is no way on Earth we should be allowing billions of dollars to flow into a radical terrorist organization that has declared its object destroying Israel, which they call the “Little Satan,” and ultimately destroying America, which they call us the “Great Satan.” They are telling us they want to kill us, not 10 years ago or 20 years ago—they are telling us this right now. If history teaches any principle with abundant clarity, it is that if somebody tells you they want to kill you, believe them. They are not being subtle. Those are the people the Obama administration are putting on a path to having nuclear weaponry, the most fearsome weaponry known to man. Make no mistake. That is what this deal would do unless Congress steps in to stop it—not to have a show vote, not to pretend to disapprove but to actually stop a bad deal that jeopardizes our safety.

To see how this scenario is likely to play out, we do not have to speculate. We need to look no further than to the recent history of North Korea. In October 1994, the Clinton administration reached another agreed framework with North Korea over that nation's nuclear program. Then-Secretary of State Madeleine Albright insisted she had gotten a deal that would freeze the military components of the program and, through economic incentives and diplomatic outreach, entice the hermit kingdom to join the international community and reject their pursuit of nuclear weapons.

At first, all seemed to go well as North Korea eagerly accepted the influx of hard currency, as well as the promised civilian nuclear reactors. Secretary Albright, accompanied by then-Policy Coordinator for North Korea Wendy Sherman, even visited North Korea in 2000 to celebrate the progress. Despite all of the diplomatic initiatives, despite all of the champagne toasts, the North Koreans were cheating, we now know, they were cheating on the framework from the get-go.

When the George W. Bush administration figured it out, economic sanctions were reimposed. But they had no effect, neither did yet more additional rounds of negotiations while they continued and continued and continued to enrich.

Kim Jong-il had gotten the resources he needed because the Clinton administration relaxed sanctions and allowed billions of dollars to flow into his hands. In 2006, North Korea tested its first nuclear weapon—two more tests to follow.

In 2012, when Kim Jong Un came to power, then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton suggested that Kim Jong Un might be a transformative leader. The State Department reportedly assured the President that he would be more concerned with economic improve-

ments than with his inherited nuclear program. In less than 2 years, this, too, was proven wrong. Kim Jong Un has demonstrated no interest in reform. He has, instead, resolutely pursued his father's policy. Just last week, we learned from the Chinese that North Korea is well on its way to having some 40 nuclear weapons by 2016, as their ability to enrich uranium is significantly more sophisticated than had been believed.

In addition, they are hard at work at their ICBM Program and may soon be able not only to threaten our regional allies but also to strike the west coast of the United States. With so many weapons in their arsenal, it seems only logical that this rogue regime may, in turn, offer some of those weapons for sale to the highest bidder.

All of this proves the fallacy of the Clinton administration's repeated basic assumption; that the North Koreans would act in their best interests economically, for which, for Albright and Sherman, meant reaching a diplomatic agreement to achieve economic relief. Unfortunately, they were dead wrong. The result is the United States faces an escalating strategic threat in the Pacific.

We are now in grave danger of history repeating itself with Iran. Wendy Sherman, the very same person who negotiated the failed North Korea deal, the Obama administration brought her back from the Clinton administration to be our lead negotiator with Iran. Think about that. The person who led the failed North Korea talks, the talks that led to North Korea getting nuclear weapons, is President Obama's lead negotiator with Iran, and her negotiations will certainly lead to the same outcome.

Indeed, when Secretary Clinton brought Wendy Sherman back, Wendy Sherman promptly followed the exact same playbook for the negotiations that she had followed under the Clinton administration with respect to North Korea. You know, Albert Einstein famously said: “The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results.” If we negotiate the same failed deal, we will get the same failed outcome.

Iran has already enjoyed significant economic relief and legitimization on the international stage, while America's demands have dwindled from dismantling Iran's nuclear program to now merely curbing it around the edges temporarily and unverifiably. It may only be a matter of time before Secretary John Kerry, no doubt accompanied by Under Secretary Wendy Sherman, pays a courtesy call on Tehran to echo history and to show the world how “civilized” the whole arrangement is and only a matter of time until the Iranians cheat—just like the North Koreans—their way to a bomb.

Yet the grim reality is that, as bad as the situation is with North Korea, with Iran it is qualitatively worse. The

Kim dynasty are brutal, megalomaniacal dictators, but they do seem to be motivated, at least to some extent, by self-preservation, and so to some form, there is at least a possibility of rational deterrence. And therein lies the fundamental difference with Iran.

The mullahs in Tehran are radical, Islamist zealots, for whom the eradication of the little Satan, Israel, and the great Satan, America, is a solemn religious duty. And with radical religious zealots, ordinary cost-benefit analysis doesn't apply the same way. With zealots who glorify death and suicide, deterrence doesn't work the way it works elsewhere.

“Death to America” is not just a slogan; it is a religious promise.

The risk that the Ayatolla will use the economic windfall of billions of dollars, courtesy of the United States, to pursue nuclear weapons that he would either use himself or give to terrorist surrogates to use is intolerably high.

The consequences of this deal could very well be an Iranian nuclear weapon used in the skies of Tel Aviv, New York or Los Angeles. The consequence of this deal could very well be millions of Americans murdered. There is no more serious topic we could be addressing.

Now, President Obama and his two Secretaries of State have had their chance to negotiate with Iran, and they have squandered it on the same approach that was so spectacularly unsuccessful with North Korea. They changed very little. They just replayed the same failed plan.

Once again, assuming they can reason with a rogue regime, they are on the verge of sealing a deal that could result in the most significant threat to our Nation in the 21st century.

The administration's claim that Tehran will not use their economic windfall to pursue a nuclear program or to support terrorism and that if they do, “snapback” sanctions will fix the problem are hardly reassuring, especially, as we know from the example of North Korea that the opposite result is far more likely. Having gotten what they wanted, the mullahs will string out the economic benefits for as long as they want and then, when they are ready, test a nuclear bomb.

The Iranians know perfectly well what a very good deal this is for them. And they are doing what they can to prevent Congress from disrupting it.

In March, I was proud to join with 46 of my colleagues in signing a letter written by Senator TOM COTTON of Arkansas that explained the constitutional role of the Senate in approving a treaty—or of both Houses of Congress—passing legislation into law, for any deal to be binding on the United States of America.

Judging from their reaction, Tehran does not appreciate our free system of government. Foreign Minister Mohamed Zarif responded that:

The authors [of the letter] may not fully understand that in international law, gov-

ernments represent the entirety of their respective states, are responsible for the conduct of foreign affairs, are required to fulfill the obligations they undertake with other states and may not invoke their internal law as justification for failure to perform their international obligations.

Speaking last week to an audience at NYU, Mr. Zarif reiterated his opinion that as a matter of international law, President Obama would have to abide by the dictates of whatever deal is struck and that Congress is powerless to stop it.

He also said that he “does not deal with Congress.” As a matter of U.S. law, Mr. Zarif is wrong. It is true that in the nation of Iran, when you have a supreme leader, an ayatolla, with the ability to string you up or shoot you if you disagree, the word of the Supreme Leader is binding. But we have no supreme leader in the United States of America.

We are bound by a Constitution and rule of law that keeps sovereignty in we the people. If Mr. Zarif wants a sanctions agreement, the only way to make that binding is to deal with Congress pursuant to the Constitution of the United States. But if we pass the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act as it stands right now, he won't have to.

It is time to tell the American people the truth—enough games. This legislation is not a victory of Congress. This legislation, at best, will slow down, slightly, a terrible deal from being put into place. That is the very best outcome—a slight delay in the President's putting into effect a terrible deal that jeopardizes American security.

It is not a guarantee that President Obama will have to submit this deal and honor the will of Congress. In fact, it provides a back-door path for a minority in Congress, one-third of Congress, to ensure that the deal goes into effect over the bipartisan will of the majority. And even worse, the President will be able to claim that he satisfied the terms that Congress itself set.

That is hardly the message we want to send on Iran's nuclear program. And this issue is far too important to pass a bad bill simply to send a message. By prioritizing bipartisan compromise over our national security, we are endangering the safety and lives of Americans across this country.

Now, I will note there is a silver lining. In 20 months, Mr. Obama will no longer occupy the Oval Office.

In January of 2017, when a new President enters the White House, he or she will have full authority to rescind any international agreement with Iran that has not been ratified by the Senate or passed into law by both Houses of Congress.

Any man or woman who is fit to be Commander in Chief of the United States of America should be prepared to rescind a bad deal with Iran on day one. No President of the United States should jeopardize the lives of millions of Americans or millions of our allies.

Congress could act right now to stop a bad deal. We could come together and

assert our constitutional role, and we can do so through a very simple mechanism. Right now, the current bill provides that if Congress doesn't override President Obama's veto, a terrible Iran deal goes into effect.

I have joined with Senator PAT TOOMEY of Pennsylvania in filing an amendment that simply reverses that default, which simply says: The President cannot lift sanctions on Iran unless the deal is affirmatively approved by Congress. That is the constitutional structure.

That ought to be a provision supported—not by 51 Senators or even 60 Senators or even 67 Senators—by all 100 Senators.

What a strange development in our modern polity that the Congress of the United States is content to effectively neuter itself.

The Presiding Officer and I are both Members of the Republican Party. I feel quite confident that if a Republican President were in office, we would not be content to give up the constitutional authority and responsibility that is given to this body to ratify treaties or to pass law. And yet I am sorry to say, on the Democratic side of the aisle, our friends are perfectly content to forfeit their constitutional authority to the President.

If this deal is a good deal on the substance—it most assuredly is not, but if it is—the President should be able to get congressional approval.

Yet the reason that Senate Democrats are terrified of requiring congressional approval is they know full well you cannot defend a deal that allows Iran to keep tens of thousands of centrifuges, to keep enriched uranium, to keep developing their ICBM program, to keep remaining the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, and to keep working to annihilate the nation of Israel. That is not defensible on the merits.

One simple change would turn this legislation into something meaningful. One simple change that would say: The President is free to negotiate any deal he likes, but before it goes into effect, bring it to Congress and get the affirmative agreement of Congress. Don't have a fig-leaf vote and let the President's bad deal go into effect. That undermines our national security. Have a meaningful vote that requires the affirmative approval of Congress.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the Cruz-Toomey amendment, which is a commonsense fix that will give this bill real teeth by removing the resolution of disapproval and, instead, would allow an Iran deal to go into effect only if Congress approves it. In the spirit of this legislation, it is purely procedural, and so it is germane to this bill.

Yet Senate Democrats have blocked a vote on it. They have refused even to vote on this amendment. All this amendment does is ensure that the burden is on President Obama to persuade Congress and the American people that the deal is a good one or, at a

very minimum, is not a terrible threat to the national security of the United States of America.

This should be something on which we come together—not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Senators who have a responsibility to protect our constituents, to protect the American people, and to defend the Constitution. We should come together with one voice and say: We will not allow a bad Iran deal that ensures that Iran will acquire nuclear weapons that could be used to murder millions of Americans or millions of our allies.

This should be unanimous.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—AMENDMENT NO. 1152

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of H.R. 1191, that I be allowed to offer my amendment No. 1152.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). Is there objection?

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, first I thank my friend from Texas. He and I share the same goal, and that is to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapon State.

There are three basic problems with my friend's amendment, if it were to be adopted.

One, it would either defeat the bill—which is very possible, because it changes the fundamentals of this bill. We are looking at reviewing an agreement that does not require consent, because Congress may, in fact, decide it does not want to take up this issue. That is one of the options.

Second, if it were adopted, it could very well affect our ability to negotiate with Iran. They may say: Gee, we have to negotiate with the President, and then we have to negotiate with the Congress.

And our negotiating partners, who don't have those circumstances, might very well say: That is the end of negotiations.

Then the United States is blamed, and we are isolated as the country that prevented a diplomatic solution to this very difficult problem.

Or, third, it puts our negotiators in a tough position because they don't have a united position. Therefore, we won't negotiate, and we won't have the strength to negotiate the strongest possible deal.

And for my friend who says it is just simple for Congress to pass a bill in order to implement this, we have been on this bill for 2 weeks. It came out of the committee 19 to 0, and I don't yet see an end in sight. So at the same time, this bill prevents the President from exercising his waiver authority under the sanctions regime while Congress is reviewing it.

So, in effect, delay tactics could be used by a minority to prevent the agreement from being considered on the floor of the Senate.

So for all those reasons the well-intended amendment would have, I think it could have the reverse effect. But, from a procedural point of view, as I have explained earlier, we have been working to try to get amendments up.

For all those reasons, I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am a little confused about our scheduling. I know I was supposed to be speaking at 5:05 p.m. We do want to get back to where we are going back and forth.

I know my good friend from Ohio wishes to be recognized next for a short period of time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that he be recognized now and that he be followed by my good friend from Delaware to be recognized for his time, and then I be recognized at the end of his remarks for such time as I would consume as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas still has the floor.

Is there objection to the request?

Mr. INHOFE. I am sorry about that.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I will wrap up momentarily and then will be happy to yield to my friend from Oklahoma for his very reasonable time allocation suggestion.

I would note that the Senator from Maryland suggested the problem of Congress affirmatively approving this is that it could be subject to delay; that Congress might not take it up. I would note for my friend from Maryland that I would certainly be amenable to a friendly amendment to my amendment that required expedited consideration of an Iran deal without the ability to filibuster but with the requirement that it receive the affirmative approval of both Houses of Congress.

So the specific problems my friend from Maryland suggested could be avoided. We could put in a short but expedited time period, if necessary, but what is critical, I would suggest, is that Congress has to ultimately approve this; that we take responsibility. If the deal is a good one, then the majority of Congress should support it. If it is not a good one, then it will not receive the approval of the majority of Congress.

So I would ask my friend from Maryland if that would be a friendly amendment that he would be open to in reaching a compromise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I appreciate the friendliness of my friend from Texas, but I must tell him we have this bill balanced. There is an expedited process in regard to Congress taking action if there is a violation of the agreement by Iran. We do have an expedited process in the bill currently before us so that we can snap back sanctions quickly, and Congress receives not only certification but notices from the administration as to whether there are mate-

rial breaches. So we already have that process in the bill to deal with any violation of any agreement.

The balance here is that Congress does not know what process it uses: We impose the sanctions. We might want to take up modifications to the sanctions. We may want to take up an approval resolution. We may want to take up a disapproval resolution. We might want to take up something totally different with Iran. Those are our options. So it would be difficult now to predict an expedited process when we don't know what the action of the Congress is going to be in regard to the agreement being submitted by the President of the United States.

So even though it is a very friendly suggestion, I can't take the Senator up on it.

Mr. CRUZ. I would note, Mr. President, the result of this amendment not being taken up is that Congress is abrogating our authority and responsibility to approve this deal. Because of the result of this bill as drafted, we can look in a crystal ball and know exactly what is going to happen. In a couple of months, the administration will come forward with the details of its terrible deal with Iran. This summer we are going to have debates in this body. A resolution of disapproval will be introduced, and it will not get 67 votes in this body. There will be enough Members of the President's own party who will stand with him no matter how terrible the deal is for our national security.

Right now, with this legislation, the bad deal will go into effect—a deal that has the potential to result in the murder of millions of Americans. There are very few topics we address that come anywhere close to the gravity of this topic, and it is disappointing to see Democratic Senators putting partisan politics above our national security. We should stand together to protect America.

The next 20 months are going to be very dangerous in this Nation. Yet I am encouraged that in 20 months America is going to embark on a different path. America is going to return to defending our Nation and defending our Constitution and defending the men and women across this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, before I propound my unanimous consent request, let me just applaud my friend from Texas.

I had a hard time believing it when they said they were going to be negotiating with a terrorist, they were going to negotiate with Iran. Have these people forgotten our unclassified intelligence way back in 2007 said that by 2015 Iran was expected to have a weapon and a delivery system that could actually reach the United States of America? Here it is—what year is it, 2015—and they are talking about negotiating.

I happened to be out on the USS *Carl Vinson* during this negotiation just a couple of weeks ago, and at the same time we were out there, Iran was sending to Yemen the different weapons, and our sister ship, the USS *Roosevelt*, had to go down and turn them around. At the same time that they are negotiating with Iran, we had Putin sending down to Iran the S-300 rocket. That S-300 rocket—and it is not even classified—it can go up and kill something 98,000 feet above the ground. Yet here we have Israel and the United States, and if the time would come that we would want to take out some of the nuclear activity in Iran, our proven enemy, we would perhaps be unable to do that.

So I do applaud my friend for bringing this up. Not many people are talking about this. I remember so well, though it has been several years ago now, when President Bush was first elected and he talked about the triad, those dangers, and he put at the top of that Iran. How much do they have to do before we realize that is the greatest threat facing America today.

With that, I ask unanimous consent—to straighten out the confusion in the order of things—that my friend from Ohio be recognized for a short presentation; after that, my friend from Delaware would be recognized; and that I be recognized at the conclusion of the remarks of my friend from Delaware for such time as I shall use.

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

The Senator from Ohio.

#### IRAN AND FEDERAL PERMITTING REFORM

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on a couple of issues, one with regard to Iran. I would just make one point that I think is pretty obvious to most Members on this floor, which is that these sanctions really matter. In other words, regardless of what we end up doing with regard to the Iranian nuclear agreement—and I am very concerned about what I see in the framework agreement—we have to be very careful about relieving sanctions because Iran is the No. 1 state sponsor of terrorism in the world. That is based on our own State Department.

With us providing them sanctions relief, it frees up resources that they can then use for some of their terrorist activity in the Mideast and really around the globe.

I returned from Israel a couple days ago and got some great briefings that were very troubling about what is happening with regard to Iran's support of Hezbollah—additional and more sophisticated missiles with guidance systems—and what is happening even with the other groups in the region, including a Sunni group, Hamas, in providing rockets there, and certainly what they are doing in Syria and what they are doing today in Yemen and even in Libya.

So this is not just about the nuclear arms agreement, if that, in fact, does

come to some conclusion. It is about a broader issue, about ensuring that we do not provide this funding for Iran to continue its aggression in the Middle East and around the globe.

I want to speak about something closer to home, and I appreciate my colleague from Oklahoma giving me a chance to talk briefly. This is about a piece of legislation that actually passed a committee today that helps create jobs and helps to encourage more construction projects and would make a huge difference in getting people back to work.

I will say I am glad Senator CARPER is on the floor because I want to talk about him too. He was part of this project. We have worked on this the last few years. Senator CLAIRE McCASKILL of Missouri is my cosponsor, but today in the committee, with the help of chairman RON JOHNSON and Ranking Member CARPER on the floor today, we were able to get people working together to move this permitting reform bill forward.

This is about regulatory reform. It is about ensuring we streamline to make our system work better. But ultimately it is about jobs. That is why both the business community and the labor unions representing the building trades—the AFL-CIO Building Trades Council supported this legislation today. They want to see people get back to work, and so do I.

If we look at what has happened over the past year, our economic growth has been anemic. Even in the first quarter of this year, we find just 0.2 percent growth is now the number out there. Employment numbers from last month were disappointing. We need to give this economy a shot in the arm, and this will help do it.

Unfortunately, what we have now is a permitting process that is full of uncertainty, unpredictability, it is out of date, it hinders investment, it stifles growth, and keeps jobs from being created at a time when too many Americans, particularly in the construction trades, are looking for work.

This is a real problem in getting investment in America too. There is a World Bank study done every year about how countries line up in terms of their ability to get things done, the ease of doing business. With regard to green-lighting a project, permitting, the United States of America now stands No. 41 in the world—41. That is unacceptable. That means that capital is going elsewhere, and one reason is because of the delays; one reason is because of the liability risk; one reason is because people are worried if they put capital here, it is not going to be able to come to fruition quickly enough because of our permitting system. So this is about not just global rankings but helping Americans go back to work.

I learned about this first when constituents came to me; that with regard to Federal permitting, particularly on energy projects, sometimes there are as many as 35 different Federal per-

mits, we are told. American Municipal Power came to me. They were trying to put together a hydro plant on the Ohio River—something we should all be for—and it was taking too much time. They were losing investors.

Folks came to me from Wellsville, OH. They wanted to put together a \$6 billion synthetic fuels plant there. It was a coal-to-liquid plant that would convert coal into clean diesel and jet fuel that would create jobs, employing up to 2,500 workers just to build it. Unfortunately, permitting delays and lawsuits interfered with the project and the plant was never constructed. We need that in Ohio. It would have been a win-win for us.

So this is an urgent issue we should address, and this is just a couple of examples of it. The bottom line is it is not unheard of for some projects to have dozens of different Federal permits. So this will help.

This bill does a few things. One, it does strengthen coordination and deadline setting. It creates an interagency council that identifies best practices, deadlines for reviews and approvals of important infrastructure projects, strengthens cooperation between State and local permitting authorities to avoid the duplication we see too often now in trying to get a permit to build something.

The bill also facilitates greater transparency, more public participation, with the creation of an online dashboard so you know where a project is to see who is holding this thing up and how to get it moving. The bill requires agencies to accept comments from stakeholders early in the approval process, with the goal of identifying public policy concerns early on so it doesn't end up stopping the project.

Finally, the bill institutes some very sensible litigation reforms. Again, I thank my colleague from Delaware because he helped us to work through this. This reduces the statute of limitations on lawsuits, challenging permitting decisions from 6 years, where it is now, down to 2 years.

This is legislation that can unite both our parties. It is something that will help to get the economy going. It is something the President's own jobs council has called for. It is something that also the business groups have called for, including the Chamber of Commerce and the Business Roundtable. Again, it is commonsense reform where we were able to bring together groups that normally don't see eye to eye, including the labor unions.

Here is a quote today from Sean McGarvey, president of North America's Building Trades Unions. He said:

If there was ever an issue that could be considered a no-brainer for Congress, the Federal Permitting Improvement Act is it. . . . Any way you slice it, this is a jobs bill, and it is critically important to the economic interests of the skilled craft construction professionals I represent.

I agree with Sean. This is a bill that makes sense. It is one all Americans

can agree on. We need to be committed to these serious reforms and get them done. This is going to help turn our economy around, help bring back some of these good-paying jobs, and it is an area where we can find common ground.

Again, I thank Senator McCASKILL for her partnership over the last 3 years on this. I thank the members of our committee for voting for it today. Again, to the chairman and ranking member, including Senator CARPER, who is on the floor today, thank you for moving this through the committee. Now let's get it to the floor.

We had a strong vote today. I think the final vote was 12 to 1. Let's get this to the floor and actually get it done, have a vote on this legislation, get it through the House, get it to the President for his signature, and start to bring back these jobs and start to build these projects right here in the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Delaware.

**MR. CARPER.** Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his kind words, and to him and our colleague, Senator McCASKILL from Missouri, for their persistence and leadership on an important issue.

I oftentimes describe myself on this floor as a recovering Governor and one who focuses on how to create a more nurturing environment for job creation and job preservation. There are a lot of attributes—access to capital, infrastructure—which Senator INHOFE leads us on every day. Another one is a reasonable tax burden. Another is commonsense regulation.

My dad always used to say: Use some common sense. And I think, with the legislation we moved out of committee, and hopefully through this Senate Chamber, that will show a lot of common sense and provide a more nurturing environment.

So I thank Senator INHOFE.

PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK  
TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH "BETH" LESKI AND  
CAROL RICHEL

Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the efforts of the men and women who serve their neighbors every day as Federal, State, county, and municipal workers.

In 1985, the Public Service Roundtable, with support from Congress, started the very first Public Service Recognition Week to honor the hard work of public employees on our behalf and the sacrifices they often make in doing so. Since then, the first week of May has been officially designated by Congress as Public Service Recognition Week. This week is the 30th anniversary, and I think a perfect opportunity for each of us to show our appreciation to the millions of public servants in our communities and across the country.

Over the past several months, I have been coming to the Senate floor, as my colleagues know, to highlight the im-

portant work being done by public employees at the Department of Homeland Security, in particular.

Over 200,000 men and women work at the Department of Homeland Security. While their jobs are diverse, they share one common mission; that is, to keep our country a safe, secure, and resilient place where the American way of life can thrive. Whether they are patrolling our borders, responding to natural disasters or bolstering our defenses in cyber space, these public servants touch the lives of Americans every day.

Today, I rise to recognize two more outstanding public servants at DHS, this time from the Transportation Security Administration, which we call TSA.

As we may recall, TSA was established after the devastating September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks with the mission to better protect our Nation's transportation systems. Today, TSA employs some 47,000 transportation security officers at over 440 airports nationwide. Each year, those officers screen about 660 million travelers and nearly 1.5 billion bags.

TSA is also the lead agency in securing our surface transportation networks, including our roads, bridges, tunnels, railroads, and maritime ports. For anyone who has ever taken a flight, chances are they have seen the men and women of TSA in action. If they haven't seen them, they certainly enjoyed the benefit of the important work they often do behind the scenes to keep us safe.

I would like to take a moment today to recognize one of those TSA employees who is keeping our skies safer. Her name is Elizabeth "Beth" Leski.

Beth is one of those TSA employees who are usually out of sight but whose work, nonetheless, is vital. She is a Secure Flight Program analyst in the TSA Office of Intelligence and Analysis. Originally from Michigan, she has lived in Severn, MD, for the last two decades with her husband David. After graduating with a B.S. in aviation management, Beth worked in the airline industry for 21 years before joining the Secure Flight Program.

Over the past 4 years, Beth has worked at TSA as a customer service agent, customer service supervisor, and now as a program analyst at the Secure Flight Operations Center.

Here she is in a picture, between Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson and Deputy Secretary Mayorkas.

As I said, over the past 4 years, Beth has worked in different roles at the Secure Flight Operations Center. Secure Flight is a program that enhances aviation security by running the names of passengers against the government's watch list of known or suspected terrorists. In other words, Beth helps to keep bad people off of planes by ensuring that those who receive boarding passes are not on our government's list of individuals prohibited from flying.

According to her colleagues, Beth works tirelessly to synchronize all the moving parts at her operations center. They say that Beth always goes above and beyond the call of duty. She strives to make life easier for fellow analysts, developing checklists, spreadsheets, and calendar invitations to keep individuals accountable and organized. Her colleague James Billups says that Beth "inspires everyone around her, and truly brings the best out of people." I can see why.

In addition to her positive energy in the workplace, she has been widely recognized at TSA and the Department for always lending a helping hand at employee morale events. She is also known for welcoming new recruits to the national capital region with a unique "Welcome Aboard" package. It is actions such as these that show that Beth has truly embodied TSA's core value of team spirit.

In 2014, Beth received the Secretary's Award for her steadfast and outstanding assistance to the entire team in the Secure Flight Operations Center.

When she is not securing our skies, Beth likes to run and travel the world—pursuits she and I actually share in common. We have another very important thing in common—the U.S. Navy. Beth is a retired yeoman chief petty officer with 21 years of service with the U.S. Navy Reserve. I retired as a captain and spent a couple of years in an airplane with the Navy around the world, and my dad was a chief in the Navy, as well. But on behalf of the Senate—and, really, on behalf of all Americans—Beth, I just want to thank you. We thank you for your exemplary service to our country.

I wish to take a couple more minutes to recognize the service and sacrifice of another TSA employee. Her name is Carol Richel.

As we can see, even though TSA is often the target of criticism and frustration, their mission at the end of the day is to save lives—our lives. Carol reminded us of this mission just a couple of months ago when a man wielding a machete attacked her and her colleagues at the Louis Armstrong Airport in New Orleans.

A native of St. Ignace, MI, Carol has worked as a TSA officer at the New Orleans airport since October 2003 and has been a TSA supervisory officer since October 2005. She is known by her colleagues to step up on a moment's notice. This latest incident was no exception. As many of us may remember from the news stories, in March, a deranged man began to attack a number of TSA agents at a security checkpoint at the New Orleans airport. The man sprayed insect repellent in the face of an officer, pulled a machete from the waistband of his pants, and began swinging the weapon in the direction of other TSA officers. Watching from her post, Carol yelled at the passengers in the area to run.

But her warning also attracted the attention of the attacker, and at the

moment, he started to run toward Carol. As the man got closer to her, Lieutenant Heather Sylve of the Jefferson Parish Sheriff's Office began firing at him. Lieutenant Sylve shot the assailant three times, wounding and incapacitating him on site. He later died as a result of those wounds.

Unfortunately, one of those shots also hit Carol in the arm. Injured but undeterred, she reported to her post the very next day, ready to work—not the next week, not the next month, the next day.

When asked about her work, by the St. Ignace News, she said:

I enjoy my job, and I feel that what we do is a necessary thing. . . . This is an example of why it's necessary.

According to her colleagues, Carol is known for her hard work, her dedication to TSA's mission, and her sincere interest in the well-being of the entire team.

Our colleague from Oklahoma will enjoy this. When she is not at work, Carol enjoys caring for her animals and dedicating herself to Bible studies.

Carol's bravery and commitment to her colleagues and the public she serves truly exemplify TSA's core values of integrity, innovation, and team spirit.

To Beth and Carol, let me say this. Every day you go to work, we want you to know that you help to ensure the safety of your fellow Americans and the security of our transportation system, which serves us all. We are grateful for that. Thank you both for your tireless dedication and your invaluable service to our Nation and its people.

And to all of the public servants across this country and beyond our borders who give us 110 percent every day, let me close by saying that I want you to know that what you do every day is important to me and to all of my colleagues with whom I am privileged to serve here in this body. We hope your work and your service fills your life with meaning and with happiness. On behalf of the people that we serve together, thank you for what you do. May God continue to bless each of you and this country we love.

I yield the floor, and thank my colleague from Oklahoma for his kindness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Delaware, I appreciate his remarks. It is seldom people will thank people for the time and effort they spend and the successes they have.

Even though he is located so close to Washington that he is not exposed as much as I am—twice a week—I actually learn personally to know these people. I feel the commitment they make. Certainly in Tulsa, Dallas, and here are the ones whom I know well. So I appreciate the fact that the Senator is paying attention to them. That means a lot.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. President, since 2002, I have come to the floor to talk, after we discovered the truth about the whole global warming thing and who is behind it and all this stuff. I don't want to say anything that would be interpreted as not respectful, but I can remember back in 2002, it was a difficult thing to tell the truth about this to the American people because at that time most of the American people felt that—yes, they bought into this idea that the world is coming to an end, and it is all man-made gases that are causing this. So it was difficult.

The Gallup poll of 2002 said at that time that, of all the environmental concerns, No. 1 was global warming. Now, that is not true today. Today, it is almost dead last. Last March, there was a poll that came out from Gallup, and it was next to the last. It was down from some 20 different environmental concerns.

So the people have realized that this largest tax increase in the history of America, if it were to take place, is not going to solve a problem—a problem that really doesn't exist to the extent it has been represented. Today, they are still debating this.

I want to bring people up to date on where we are now—the fact that climate change is not based on hard evidence and observation, but rather on a set of wishful beliefs, a well-scripted dialogue with which President Obama and the environmental alarmists are intending to scare the American people into accepting this thing that would be so devastating economically to America.

The other day a good friend of mine, LAMAR SMITH from the House—I like LAMAR. He and I were elected actually the same day many years ago. LAMAR is the chairman of the committee that has a lot of this jurisdiction, and he published an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal that was entitled, "The Climate-Change Religion." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I thank LAMAR SMITH for his continued leadership and support on this issue. As LAMAR highlights in the op-ed, the debate about global warming is predicated more on "scare tactics than on fact based determinations."

Global warming alarmism has evolved into a religion where one is either an alarmist or a skeptic. Some people are not aware of those two terms. Someone who has bought into this "the world is coming to an end"—they are the alarmists. People who do not believe that, as myself, are skeptics. And being a skeptic is akin to heresy of the highest order. Good policy has to be based on good science, not on religion, and that requires science free from bias, whatever its conclusions may be.

The modern-day religion of climate change has been very artful in establishing and controlling carefully

scripted talking points intended to scare the American people under the guise of environmental protectionism.

There are three main tenets of climate change alarmism that can be found in any related speech, which we heard the President recite during his recent Earth Day speech. Those three tenets are: No. 1, climate change is human caused. No. 2, climate change is already wreaking havoc across the globe. And No. 3, we must act today—now—before terrible things happen—the world coming to an end.

These three main tenets of climate change can be found on just about every administrative agency page, and they are creeping into every Federal policy determination.

As wise as the Presiding Officer is, something that he is not aware of that is happening in America today is that the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, adjusted its policy for receipt of disaster preparedness resources to require States that are to be accepting these FEMA funds to first accept the undeniable "challenges posed by climate change" and then spend State resources figuring how to plan for them before becoming eligible for disaster preparedness funds.

Look, I come from Oklahoma, a State that has tornadoes, called Tornado Alley. When this happens, as it did very recently in the south-central part of Oklahoma, for us to get the funds that we are entitled to from FEMA, the State of Oklahoma has to accept the policy that we as a State accept the undeniable challenges posed by climate change and then spend our State resources figuring out how to plan for them before becoming eligible for disaster relief. That is impossible.

People can't believe that is true when I tell them this is being done through the administration and this is adopted by these agencies. FEMA is supposed to be there to assist States in areas of the country for disaster relief. But they cannot get it. They are held hostage until they say something that they know is a lie and are held to that and spend State money. Again, that is not really believable, what I just stated, because it is so inconceivable that that could happen.

Now, the reality of this debate, however, is that the climate has been changing since the Earth was formed. I said the other day—a good friend of mine had an amendment on the floor. The amendment made comment to the fact that the climate is changing. Yes, it is changing. I think what the proponents of this idea are trying to do is to try to change it over to say that those people who are not blaming human emissions as the cause of all these problems are denying that climate changes.

I said on floor at that time, all evidence, archeological evidence, scriptural evidence, historical evidence is that climate has always, always changed. We all accept that. The big issue is, is it because of human emissions. That is where the science now

shows clearly that it is not. You are going to keep hearing it, though, but it is not.

Further, the scientific debate around the role of climate change, its causes and projected impacts, is ongoing. There is no consensus, and the Wall Street Journal recently produced a great opinion piece that highlights a multitude of discrepancies in the assertion that 90 percent of the scientists believe this to be true. This is kind of interesting because any time you do not have science behind you, what you say is science is settled, science is settled. And sooner or later, people believe it, and they have not offered any evidence that would support that. That is what has happened.

This item really suggests that the Wall Street Journal opinion piece that highlights the discrepancies in the 97 percent, when they say 97 percent of the scientists believe manmade gas is causing global warming—the article points out that the myth of a scientific consensus is predicated on—and I am quoting now—“a handful of surveys and abstract-counting exercises that have been contradicted by more reliable research.”

Over the years, I have quoted a number of scientists. In fact, my Web site way back in the—probably 10 years ago, I started accumulating the number of scientists and their credibility and their qualifications and statements they have made. One I remember, from my head now, is Richard Lindzen. Richard Lindzen is a professor from MIT. He is recognized as one of the top climatologists in the country. When asked the question, he says, of course it is not true. But the reason people, the bureaucracy, are so concerned about it is that regulating carbon is a bureaucracy’s dream. If you regulate carbon, you regulate life. That is what the motivation is around this.

I think that is a good article to read so people will realize that there is no consensus, scientific consensus. Some of them believe it, some of them do not.

As climate research continues to develop, limitations in the overall understanding of our climate and the limitations of scientific research have become increasingly evident. This could not be more evident than by the growing discrepancy between climate model predictions and actual observations. For example, alarmists failed to foresee the ongoing warming hiatus.

What is a warming hiatus? There has not been a change in that temperature in the last 15 years. This is something that is incontrovertible. Everybody understands that. They admit they didn’t foresee this happening, but that hiatus is actually going on today. It is still continuing. It further explained that the source of such a discrepancy could be caused by the “combinations of internal climate variability, missing or incorrect radiative forcing, and model response error.”

In other words, climate modeling cannot accurately project, much less

predict, the climate of the future as climatologists and the broader scientific community have yet to fully understand how our climate system actually works today.

There is also a growing body of scientific studies suggesting that variations in solar radiation and natural climate variability have a leading role in climate change. Surprise, everybody, the Sun warms us. That is a shocker to a lot of people. It is not manmade gas. It is not CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. It is the Sun.

A number of independent studies assessing the impact of clouds have even suggested that water vapor feedback is entirely canceled out by cloud processes. Yet when the facts of reality do not appropriately align with the religion of climate change, the alarmists will simply try to explain these things away or conveniently exclude any science that shows they are wrong.

A favorite talking point of the climate change religion that is often used by senior officials within the Obama administration is that hurricanes, tornadoes, droughts, floods—you name it—are proof of harm being caused by global warming. They all say that. I have yet to hear a speech by any of the alarmists where they do not talk about the fact that all the hurricanes and tornadoes—the nature of them, the severity of them, the occurrences—are proof of harm being caused by global warming. But the global data shows no increase in the number or intensity of such events, and even the IPCC itself acknowledges the lack of any evident relationship between extreme weather and climate.

This is interesting because the IPCC—I know most people are aware of this who are into this issue. But the IPCC is the Intergovernmental Panel On Climate Change. This is the United Nations. I even wrote a book about it. The longest chapter is talking about the United Nations, how they put this together. But they are the ones who have supposedly the science behind this whole thing, and they are the ones who are now admitting that there is no increase in intensity or occurrences of hurricanes, tornadoes, droughts or floods.

In fact, Roger Pielke was before our committee in July of 2013. He said the oft-asserted linkage between global warming and recent hurricanes, floods, tornadoes, and drought is “unsupportable based on evidence and research.”

I am still quoting now.

It is misleading, and just plain incorrect, to claim that disasters associated with hurricanes, tornadoes, floods or droughts have increased on climate timescales either in the United States or globally.

Hurricane landfalls have not increased in the United States “in frequency, intensity or normalized damage since at least the year 1900.”

That is now an accepted fact. But in spite of that, every speech you hear, they talk about all the hurricanes and

all the disasters taking place and the intensity that has come to us because of global warming.

The IPCC—again, this is the U.N. 2013 “Fifth Assessment Report.” Now, the assessment report that they come out with is—they will come out with a long, complicated report every so often, but then they will have kind of abbreviated ones for people like us to use to spread their propaganda. Their “Fifth Assessment Report” concluded that “current data sets indicate no significant observed trends in global tropical cyclone frequency over the past century. . . . No robust trends in annual numbers of tropical storms, hurricanes and major hurricane counts have been identified over the last 100 years in the North Atlantic Basin.”

But let’s just keep in mind everyone is now in agreement on that. Yet you still hear in the speeches that the world is coming to an end, and all the tornadoes—all this intensity is going to be disastrous to America.

Counter to the doomsday predictions of climate alarmists, increasing observations suggest a much reduced and practically harmless climate response to increased amounts of atmospheric carbon dioxide. Also missing from the climate alarmists’ doomsday scenarios and well-scripted talking points are the benefits from increased carbon that has led to a greening of the planet and contributed to increased agricultural productivity.

People do not realize that you cannot grow things without CO<sub>2</sub>. CO<sub>2</sub> is a fertilizer. It is something you cannot do without. No one ever talks about the benefits. The people are inducing that as a fertilizer on a daily basis.

Despite admitted gaps to the scientific understanding of climate change and a track record of climate modeling failures, President Obama and his environmental allies are holding fast to their bedrock beliefs. They are intent on selling the President’s so-called Climate Action Plan to the American people that is less about protecting the environment and more about expanding the role of the government while enriching, I should say, some campaigns of some of our friendly Democrats. There is a guy named Tom Steyer. Tom Steyer lives in California. He is very, very wealthy. He is all wrapped up in this issue. He claims that he spent in the last election to elect people who go along with global warming \$75 million of his money. Originally, he was going to spend \$100 million, \$50 million of his money and \$50 million that he was going to raise. He found out he couldn’t raise it, so that did not work.

I would say that his effort was not all that successful, judging from the results of the last election. But he is still out there. He still has a lot of money. He will not even miss the \$75 million.

For the President’s core domestic plan policy, the Clean Power Plan, let’s look at what this is. Starting back in 2002, when it was perceived to be a very

popular issue, Members of this Senate started introducing bills that would be cap-and-trade bills that would address this issue. It is very similar to the plan the President is putting out now. At that time, I was the chairman of the committee—I think it was the Subcommittee on Clean Air in the Senate. I was a believer because everybody said that was true, until they came out—and there is a study made by the Charles River Associates and MIT that said if we comply with the cap and trade, the cost to the American people would be in the range of \$300 billion to \$400 billion every year. That, again, would be the largest tax increase in history. I thought, if the world is coming to an end, maybe we need to do that.

I started questioning the science behind it. I started getting responses from scientists all over America. First of all, 10 of them came in. Then it went up to 400 and then 1,000. I started publishing these on my Web site so people would know that there is another side to what they were calling this determined science by IPCC. They tried from that time—this is 2002—until last year to pass legislation that would legislatively give us a cap-and-trade system, but it got defeated more and more each year because the people have actually caught on. They have caught on that it is not a real thing, the science is not settled. That has led the President to say, all right, if you guys are not going to pass legislation, I am going to do it through regulation.

Where have we heard that before? That is everything the President has been doing that he can't get through in his policy that is through the legislature. Right now, you probably cannot get 20 votes in the whole Senate on this issue. He is trying to do it through regulation. We have a Clean Power Plan.

We had a hearing on this just last week. The President is no longer satisfied with the fact that he can now tell you what doctor you can use under ObamaCare, what type of investments you can use under that regulation or how fast your Internet will be. I understand that is coming up next. He would like to dictate what type and how much energy you can use.

With such high costs on the line, one would think there must be an equal amount if not greater number of benefits. What are the benefits? In reality, according to various impact assessments, the environmental benefits of the Clean Power Plan—again, admittedly, it is going to be \$479 billion initially, the cost of this, and the core domestic policy of the President's Climate Action Plan that is supposed to protect this country from the impending impacts we are facing, the climate change—all of these costs will reduce CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations by less than 0.5 percent. The global average temperature rise will be reduced by only 0.01 degree Fahrenheit, and sea level rise will be reduced by 0.3 millimeters. That is the thickness of three sheets of paper.

Further, these minuscule benefits would be rendered pointless by the continued emissions growth in India and China. The chart is up now. It is very significant.

Because we look at this and look at what China and India are contributing to the atmosphere by their emissions. Now, there is the United States. In fact, the figure is that China alone produces more CO<sub>2</sub> in 1 month—that is 800 million tons—than the Clean Power Plan will reduce in 1 year, and that is 500 million tons.

Perhaps what is most telling is that President Obama's EPA didn't even bother to measure what impacts the proposed Clean Power Plan would have on the environment. This is something which has been very well documented.

I guess what we are saying here is that it doesn't really matter what we are doing here in the United States. This is not where the problem is. But that is to be expected under the religion of climate change. When the science doesn't add up and the projections don't pan out and the weather won't cooperate, alarmists will refer to their commitment to a higher moral authority or obligation. As evidenced by the Clean Power Plan, it doesn't matter if these policies provide any benefit in climate change; crusaders certainly will not be dissuaded by the exorbitant costs.

It is ironic, however, that while tout-ing a commitment to a moral obligation, which we have heard time and again from this administration, the resulting policies will cause real economic hardship to this country and to the most vulnerable populations. This is something people need to pay attention to. The increase in the cost of fuel for Americans would be—and it has already been documented—the electricity cost will go up by double digits in 43 States. And whom does it hurt the most? It hurts the poor people. Those individuals who spend the highest amount of their expendable income on heating their homes will be hit the worst. This hypocrisy is kind of akin to jetting around the country in a 232-foot private plane on Earth Day to warn global citizens of the harm caused by increased CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the atmosphere.

The President's international discussions around climate change stand to be equally harmful to the American people. The President likes to point to his recent agreement with China as evidence of international cooperation on climate change, but this agreement is nothing more than an exercise in theatrics.

China is sitting back right now licking its chops and hoping America will start reducing its emissions and drive its manufacturing base overseas to places where they don't have these emission restrictions. The farce of an agreement lets China continue business as usual, and that is 800 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> a month until 2030. Boy, that is until 2030, while hard-working Amer-

ican taxpayers are going to foot the cost of the President's economically disastrous climate agenda.

Despite what the President might say to the international community, without the backing of the U.S. Congress, which the President does not have, he has no authority to reach binding or legally enforceable agreements with other countries. I will remind the President of this again in December.

Some people don't know that the United Nations has a big party every year in December, and it has been going on now for 15 years. Every year, they invite all the countries—this is all through the United Nations—from all around the world, some 192 countries, to this big party. I am talking about caviar and all you can drink and all that. All they have to do is say they will agree to try to lower their emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>.

I remember the party in Copenhagen 2 years ago. As I recall, Obama was there, Kerry was there, PELOSI was there, and BOXER was there. All the far-left liberals were there to try to convince the people from these other countries that we were going to pass a cap-and-trade bill, so they better do it too.

Well, I waited until they were all through with their things, and I went over to Copenhagen. I tell the Chair, I was the one-man truth squad. I went over to explain the truth to the other 191 countries. I told them that these people are lying to them by saying we will pass legislation. I said we are not going to pass legislation, and of course we did not pass legislation.

I have to say this. The 191 countries over there all had one thing in common: They all hated me, but they all understood that I was right and that there weren't the votes in this country to pass it.

The American people are starting to catch on, and that is why I am not surprised, as I mentioned, that the Gallup Poll that was released just last March concluded that the current level of worry on environmental issues remains at or near record lows, and among those concerns on the environmental issue, global warming is second to last. What Americans do care about is the economy and Federal spending and the size and power of the Federal Government.

The disintegrating case for climate alarm coupled with an American public that is quickly losing interest does not pan well for the President's climate agenda or his self-acclaimed environmental legacy. Climate alarmists have spent just as much energy, if not more, convincing the world that it is bad to be a skeptic of what was once referred to as global cooling and then became global warming and is now global climate change. The tenet of the modern climate change religion cannot withstand the scrutiny of the merits, primarily because it is a result of political design and not scientific revelation. And that is why anyone who is

willing to point out discrepancies within the climate change debate or raise legitimate concerns will be subjected to a barrage of arrogant sarcasm and personal attacks.

Whether the alarmists call it global warming or climate change, the American people understand that the President's climate agenda is not about protecting the public; it is about a power grab.

I will make three final points.

First of all, I think we all know that the climate is always changing. I remember—and I will go from memory on this. We have cycles, and the cycles have been taking place all throughout history. In 1895, we went into a period of cooling, and that was when they first started saying that another ice age was coming, and that lasted 30 years, until about 1918. In 1918, a change came about. It started getting warmer, and we went into a 30-year warming period. It was the first time the phrase “global warming” was used. In 1945, that changed, and we went into a cooling spell, and the same thing has happened since then. Right now, of course, we are in kind of a remission era.

This is what is interesting: No one can deny that 1945 was the year when we had the largest surge in the emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> in the history of this country, and that precipitated not a warming period but a cooling period. That is first.

The second thing is, in Australia—I wasn't going to mention this until I talked yesterday to one of the members of Parliament in Australia. Several years ago, Australia bought into this argument and said: We are going to lead the way, and we will start restricting our emissions.

They imposed a carbon tax on their economy a few years ago, and it cost \$9 billion in lost economic activity each year and destroyed tens of thousands of jobs. It was so bad that the government recently voted to repeal the carbon tax, and their economy is better for it. In fact, it was announced just following the repeal that Australia experienced a record job growth of 121,000 jobs—far more than the 10,000 to 15,000 jobs economists had expected.

There is a country that tried it, and they found out what it cost, and you would think we could learn from their mistakes.

The third thing is to ask the question. What if I am wrong and they are right? There is an answer to that. I remember when President Obama was first elected. He appointed Lisa Jackson, and she became the Director of the Environmental Protection Agency. During the time she was there, they were building this thing up, and we were holding hearings in the committee I chaired at that time.

I asked her: In the event that one of these bills passes on cap and trade or the President comes up with some kind of proposal or a regulation that does the same thing, will that have the ef-

fect of lowering CO<sub>2</sub> emissions worldwide?

Her answer: No, it wouldn't.

And the reason it wouldn't is because this is where the problem is. The problem is in China, Mexico, and India. So the mere fact that we do something just in our country has a reverse effect because as we chase away our manufacturing base and it goes to one of those countries—and China is hoping to be one of those countries—where they have no emission requirements, it would have the effect of not decreasing but increasing emissions.

If you bought into this and you agree that I am wrong and they are right, just keep in mind that by their own emission this would not reduce CO<sub>2</sub>, and that is what we are supposed to be concerned with.

The people of America have awakened. The economy and the Obama foreign policy of appeasement have captured their interest, and these are concerns that are real concerns and things we ought to do today.

With that, I yield the floor.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 23, 2015]

#### THE CLIMATE-CHANGE RELIGION

(By Lamar Smith)

Earth Day provided a fresh opening for Obama to raise alarms about global warming based on beliefs, not science.

“Today, our planet faces new challenges, but none pose a greater threat to future generations than climate change,” President Obama wrote in his proclamation for Earth Day on Wednesday. “As a Nation, we must act before it is too late.”

Secretary of State John Kerry, in an Earth Day op-ed for USA Today, declared that climate change has put America “on a dangerous path—along with the rest of the world.”

Both the president and Mr. Kerry cited rapidly warming global temperatures and ever-more-severe storms caused by climate change as reasons for urgent action.

Given that for the past decade and a half global-temperature increases have been negligible, and that the worsening-storms scenario has been widely debunked, the pronouncements from the Obama administration sound more like scare tactics than fact-based declarations.

At least the United Nations’ then-top climate scientist, Rajendra Pachauri, acknowledged—however inadvertently—the faith-based nature of climate-change rhetoric when he resigned amid scandal in February. In a farewell letter, he said that “the protection of Planet Earth, the survival of all species and sustainability of our ecosystems is more than a mission. It is my religion and my dharma.”

Instead of letting political ideology or climate “religion” guide government policy, we should focus on good science. The facts alone should determine what climate policy options the U.S. considers. That is what the scientific method calls for: inquiry based on measurable evidence. Unfortunately this administration’s climate plans ignore good science and seek only to advance a political agenda.

Climate reports from the U.N.—which the Obama administration consistently embraces—are designed to provide scientific cover for a preordained policy. This is not

good science. Christiana Figueres, the official leading the U.N.’s effort to forge a new international climate treaty later this year in Paris, told reporters in February that the real goal is “to change the economic development model that has been reigning for at least 150 years.” In other words, a central objective of these negotiations is the redistribution of wealth among nations. It is apparent that President Obama shares this vision.

The Obama administration recently submitted its pledge to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. The commitment would lock the U.S. into reducing greenhouse-gas emissions more than 25% by 2025 and “economy-wide emission reductions of 80% or more by 2050.” The president’s pledge lacks details about how to achieve such goals without burdening the economy, and it doesn’t quantify the specific climate benefits tied to his pledge.

America will never meet the president’s arbitrary targets without the country being subjected to costly regulations, energy rationing and reduced economic growth. These policies won’t make America stronger. And these measures will have no significant impact on global temperatures. In a hearing last week before the House Science, Space and Technology Committee, of which I am chairman, climate scientist Judith Curry testified that the president’s U.N. pledge is estimated to prevent only a 0.03 Celsius temperature rise. That is three-hundredths of one degree.

In June 2014 testimony before my committee, former Assistant Secretary for Energy Charles McConnell noted that the president’s Clean Power Plan—requiring every state to meet federal carbon-emission-reduction targets—would reduce a sea-level increase by less than half the thickness of a dime. Policies like these will only make the government bigger and Americans poorer, with no environmental benefit.

The White House’s Climate Assessment implies that extreme weather is getting worse due to human-caused climate change. The president regularly makes this unsubstantiated claim—most recently in his Earth Day proclamation, citing “more severe weather disasters.”

Even the U.N. doesn’t agree with him on that one: In its 2012 Special Report on Extreme Events, the U.N.’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change says there is “high agreement” among leading experts that long-term trends in weather disasters are not attributable to human-caused climate change. Why do the president and others in his administration keep repeating this untrue claim?

Climate alarmists have failed to explain the lack of global warming over the past 15 years. They simply keep adjusting their malfunctioning climate models to push the supposedly looming disaster further into the future. Following the U.N.’s 2008 report, its claims about the melting of Himalayan glaciers, the decline of crop yields and the effects of sea-level rise were found to be invalid. The InterAcademy Council, a multi-national scientific organization, reviewed the report in 2010 and identified “significant shortcomings in each major step of [the U.N.] assessment process.”

The U.N. process is designed to generate alarmist results. Many people don’t realize that the most-publicized documents of the U.N. reports are not written by scientists. In fact, the scientists who work on the underlying science are forced to step aside to allow partisan political representatives to develop the “Summary for Policy Makers.” It is scrubbed to minimize any suggestion of scientific uncertainty and is publicized before the actual science is released. The Summary for Policy Makers is designed to give

newspapers and headline writers around the world only one side of the debate.

Yet those who raise valid questions about the very real uncertainties surrounding the understanding of climate change have their motives attacked, reputations savaged and livelihoods threatened. This happens even though challenging prevailing beliefs through open debate and critical thinking is fundamental to the scientific process.

The intellectual dishonesty of senior administration officials who are unwilling to admit when they are wrong is astounding. When assessing climate change, we should focus on good science, not politically correct science.

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. INHOFE. 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.

#### CELEBRATING ASIAN AMERICAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today in celebration of Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month. In 1979, President Jimmy Carter established Asian Pacific Heritage Week. This week of recognition was expanded to a month-long celebration in 1992. Every May, Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month provides Americans the opportunity to reflect upon the many contributions made by the Asian American and Pacific Islander community in Nevada and across the Nation.

May is a significant month in Asian American and Pacific Islander history. The first 10 days of May coincide with the arrival of the first Japanese immigrants in the United States on May 7, 1843, and the completion of the transcontinental railroad on May 10, 1869, which relied heavily on the work of Chinese immigrants. But Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month does not only recognize the past achievements of this vibrant community; this month is also a chance to honor the civil rights activists, farmers, scientists, entrepreneurs, health professionals, educators, and other members of the Asian American and Pacific Islander community, who continue to help shape our Nation into an even better place culturally, economically, and politically.

In Nevada, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders are among the fastest

growing populations and have enriched Nevada's history and culture. Hundreds of thousands of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders live in Nevada, and contribute to small business development and boost our economy. I am proud to represent such strong and innovative people, and I continue to work hard to enact legislation that positively impacts the Asian American and Pacific Islander community. For instance, I joined my colleague, Hawaii Senator MAZIE HIRONO, earlier this year in fighting for legislation that would reunite children and families of Filipino World War II veterans, and I will continue my steadfast support of family reunification efforts.

America is a nation of immigrants with diverse backgrounds and united common principles, which is part of what makes us strong, resilient, and unique. This month, we celebrate the wonderful and important contributions of the Asian American and Pacific Islander community in Nevada and throughout the Nation, and I extend my best wishes for a joyous Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month.

#### RECOGNIZING THE DIGITAL INVESTIGATION CENTER AT CHAMPLAIN COLLEGE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last month, I had the opportunity to visit the award-winning Leahy Center for Digital Investigation at Champlain College in Burlington, VT. One of the Nation's top law enforcement officers, Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey, joined me for a tour of this impressive facility. It was a fitting time to visit the center; earlier in the week, the LCDI was recognized as the Best Cybersecurity Higher Education Program in the country by SC Magazine.

We all know that computers and technology have changed not only the way people commit crimes, but also the way law enforcement investigates and prosecutes criminals. Students here are learning firsthand how to help law enforcement agencies across the country in areas related to computer forensics and other forms of digital investigation. By giving them this hands-on experience, Champlain College and the Leahy Center are training the next generation of analysts who will work to combat cyberthreats and other digital threats.

I was especially pleased that the FBI Director joined me in visiting the LCDI. Both of us left with a deep appreciation for the excellent education the next generation of cybersecurity professionals are receiving at the Leahy center. These students receive intense hands-on experience, dealing with the same issues that practitioners in the field work on every day. With a 90 percent placement rate in relevant fields, the center is a critical part of ensuring that law enforcement has the expertise and resources it needs to face the cyberthreats of the future.

The cyberthreats we face are real, and the training students receive from the Leahy Center for Digital Investigation will help us face those threats head on. I congratulate Champlain College and the center for this achievement, and look forward to years of success to come.

#### RECOGNIZING RED HEN BAKING COMPANY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Red Hen Baking Company was founded in 1999 by Randy George and Eliza Cain in the Mad River Valley of Vermont. They started as a small operation, baking and delivering fresh bread to nearby stores and restaurants. They used pure ingredients, baked around the clock, and soon, with the support of the surrounding community, and as the word-of-mouth testimonials spread, their small operation grew into the Hen we know today. They moved their operation to the popular Camp Meade location, in my hometown of Middlesex.

Red Hen Baking Company exemplifies the spirit and the vision of Vermont business. Randy often says that Vermont is the only State in which he could imagine starting and running a successful bakery of this kind. They tend to do things the right way, rather than the easy way—from the selection of the essential elements of their bread, to their employee treatment policies and practices. Randy, Eliza and the Hen's "barnyard animals" take pride in their product, and it shows.

Randy always reminds his customers that his employees are the most important part of his bakery business, so it was no surprise when he was invited by President Obama and Labor Secretary Tom Perez to join them at the White House as a "Champion of Change" for working families. Employers from across the country shared their success stories, and the devastating and impossible choices working families face when paid sick leave is not among their benefits. The panel was a tremendous success, and I was proud to have Vermont represented by such a steadfast supporter of fair treatment for employees.

Randy and Liza's message is clear. Put the people in your business at the core of everything you do, and they will work hard for you for years to come—in the Hen's case, even decades. Randy and Liza offer health coverage, fair, livable wages, and paid sick days. They want their employees to thrive both personally and professionally, and they have encouraged other businesses to adopt similar standards.

Marcelle and I are so happy to live in Middlesex and to have our neighbors setting such high standards for the treatment of a dedicated workforce. I want to congratulate Randy and Liza on their successful business, and to thank them. Happy, healthy employees are productive employees, and it is right to invest in each other's success.