

We have an obligation to “do unto others as we would have them do unto us.”

So I welcome the Pope’s words this week as a valuable voice in an important discussion. I realize we will have differences about how to solve this problem. We will have differences about the exact dimensions of it. We will have differences about what the resolution should be and the technology we should use and how we should get there and transitions and all those kinds of things. That is perfectly legitimate. But, fundamentally, we have to think of this as a moral and ethical issue—as a moral and ethical issue—the obligations we owe to other people in this country, to other people in the world who have no voice in the use of the resources that are being taken away from them, and particularly to the people whom we don’t yet know who are going to follow us on this wonderful home we have been given to steward, to preserve, to use but to pass on in as good or better shape than we found it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

TRAGEDY IN CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I wish to begin by extending my deepest condolences and prayers to the families and loved ones of those lost in the heinous church shooting in Charleston, SC. Our hearts break for the people of Charleston and especially for the congregation of this house of God—a place of refuge, a place of peace, a place of love. The perpetrator of this hate crime must be found and swiftly brought to justice.

Tragedies like this remind us that we are all interconnected, in our hometowns, in our country, across the planet. Whether it is our common home of worship or the common home of our planet, we are called every day to care for one another, especially those who are most in need.

PAPAL ENCYCLICAL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, today, Pope Francis released a historic encyclical—a message to the world to preserve the planet from climate change and environmental degradation. In giving us his message to protect what he calls “our common home,” Pope Francis has also given us a common goal—we must act now to stop climate change.

Pope Francis’s encyclical calls all people of conscience to examine our own lives, our relationships to people and the planet, and our duty to take action. The Pope’s message is clear: Mankind created the problem of climate change and now mankind must solve it.

Pope Francis delivered this message to the world, but the world needs America to lead.

As the wealthiest Nation in the world and one of its largest pollution emitters, it is our economic and moral responsibility to act now. There is time to avoid the worst effects of climate change, but we must act now.

Global temperatures are warming, glaciers are melting, sea levels are rising, extreme downpours and weather events are increasing, the ocean is becoming more acidic. Last year was the warmest year ever recorded, and it is the poorest and the most vulnerable in developing nations who have suffered the most from the developed world’s pollution. By reducing U.S. carbon pollution, the United States can be a leader, not a laggard, in answering Pope Francis’s call.

Climate change deniers may be the doubting Thomases of the 21st century, but there is no doubting the science anymore when national academies of sciences across the globe, including the Vatican’s, all agree that burning fossil fuels is changing the Earth’s climate.

So to all of the critics of Pope Francis’s message, let’s stop denying the science and let’s start deploying the solutions. Let’s deploy more wind and solar energy and renew tax breaks for these projects. Let’s make our cars and trucks even more fuel efficient. Let’s fully implement and defend President Obama’s Clean Power Plan that will reduce carbon pollution from America’s powerplants.

The United States can be the leader in the clean energy revolution to reduce the pollution imperiling this planet, and then we can partner with other nations to share this technology and protect the most vulnerable. The United States has the technological imperative to lead on clean energy. We have the economic imperative to engage in massive job creation that will make it possible to save all of creation. We have the moral responsibility to protect our planet for future generations.

The Pope has given us the guidance—the moral guidance—in his encyclical, and we know, ultimately, science and technology will be the answer to our prayers. But the leadership must begin here. This cannot happen without leadership from the U.S. Senate, from the United States of America. If we want to see more solar and wind deployed in our country, then we must put the tax credits on the books that incentivize the private sector and individuals across the country to deploy it.

Last year, there were 5,000 new megawatts of solar installed in the United States. That is twice as much as has been deployed in the whole history of the United States up until 5 years ago. This year, there is going to be 7,500 new megawatts of solar installed in the United States. That is triple the whole history of the United States up until 5 years ago. Next year, there is going to be 10,000 new megawatts of solar installed in the United States. That is four times as much as had ever been deployed in the

whole history of our country cumulatively. So this is a revolution that is absolutely helping to transform the way in which we generate electricity in the United States.

The same thing is true for wind. Wind is expanding at the same exact pace, in terms of generating sources of electricity from a place that has always been there, using God’s energy in order to provide electricity for American homes and businesses.

What is happening in both areas? Well, the Republican Senate has allowed the wind tax breaks to already expire. Already they have expired. The solar tax breaks expire at the end of next year. We have no agreement, no signal that this Senate is sending to the investors and solar consumers across the country that solar will be given any incentives past the end of next year.

Similarly, we have seen a dramatic increase in the fuel economy standards of the vehicles which we drive. In fact, much of the problem we have in finding a source of revenues for a robust transportation bill comes from the fact that people are now consuming less gasoline in their much more fuel-efficient cars since President Obama took the authority—by the way, which this Senate gave to him in 2007—to dramatically increase the fuel economy standards for those vehicles. We have to go all the way up to the 54.5 miles per gallon which the President has proposed. That will dramatically reduce greenhouse gases.

And we must ensure that the President’s clean power rules, which he is going to promulgate within the next month, stay on the books. There are already those in the Senate who are saying they are going to try to vitiate, to overturn, to make impossible the implementation of those powerplant rules which will keep the greenhouse gases coming out of coal-burning plants—especially across our country—to a minimum, to reduce by 30 percent the amount of greenhouse gases, carbon, that comes out of powerplants generating electricity in our country by the year 2030. We can do this. We are a technological power. The Pope, the world, they look to us.

They say to us: President Kennedy challenged the Nation to put a man on the Moon in 8 years in order to say to the Soviet Union that we would not allow them to dominate outer space, and in 8 years our country invented new metals, invented new propulsion systems, returned that crew from the Moon safely. And we, with our American flag, said we are going to use outer space for peaceful purposes. Well, the flag that flew on the Moon is now in the Capitol. That is the return on investment in science and technology in the United States to help the rest of the world ensure that outer space would be used for peaceful purposes.

The rest of the world expects us to be able to invent new technologies, new batteries, solar, wind, geothermal, energy efficiency, vehicles, metals that

will dramatically reduce the amount of pollution we are sending up into the world but simultaneously spread these technologies across the planet.

In the 1990s, we invented new digital technologies. It was first just a very plain phone, but no one had one in their pocket until 1995 and 1996 because the phone was the size of a brick and it cost 50 cents a minute. No one had one. It was too expensive. But then this Congress moved over 200 megahertz of spectrum. It incentivized the private sector to begin to move. Within 3 years, everyone had one of these phones in their pocket. Within another 8 years, it moved to a smartphone because we had begun the revolution. Where was the smartphone invented? Right here in the United States.

Let's take Africa, for example. Twenty years ago did anyone believe that 700 million people in Africa would have a wireless device in their pocket? No. Why do they? Because the United States invented—the United States put the policies on the books that generated this revolution. They skipped telephone poles. They went right to wireless, right to cell phone towers. We did that. We gave the leadership.

That is leading to a lot of economic development in Africa and in continents around this world. We have to do the same thing in energy technology. They can envision a day where they bypass having to put wires down the street for electricity as well and solar panels could be on their roofs, providing electricity to power their cell phones, their refrigerators, their stoves, their air-conditioning.

We can do this. We have the capacity to do it, but we have to set our mind to doing it because there is an economic incentive for us. Oh, yes, there is a national security incentive for us. Oh, yes, we can tell the Middle East we don't need their oil anymore than we need their sand. We are going to provide our own power, and we are going to give other countries in the world the capacity to produce their own power. But we can do it as well because it is a moral imperative, because God's Earth, his creation is, in fact, now in jeopardy.

We have to be the leaders. We have to answer this moral cause. We cannot say we can't do it. We can't say we can't invent our way out of this potential catastrophe for the entire planet. The Pope is calling upon us to be the world's leader, morally and economically. We can do it.

Today is an important day, I think a watershed moment. I am a Catholic. The Pope is a Jesuit who is trained as a chemist. For those who say the Pope has no business talking about climate, he is a chemist. There are many people who say: Well, I don't have a view on climate because I am not a scientist.

The Pope is a scientist. He has looked at the evidence. He has asked the Vatican academy of arts and sciences to study this issue. They have come back with their conclusions. Man

is creating the problem and mankind now must solve the problem, but it is those who have created the pollution that the greatest responsibility falls.

You cannot preach temperance from a barstool. You cannot tell people to reduce what they are doing—smoking or drinking or engaging in dangerous activities—if you, too, are engaging in them. The leadership must come from this Chamber. The leadership must come from the United States of America. Pope Francis's message must resonate throughout this Chamber in the months and years ahead. If we do it, we will have been doing—as President Kennedy said in his inaugural address—truly God's work here on Earth.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I hope we are in the final hours of a 2½-week consideration of the Defense authorization bill. Not all amendments were debated and not as many were reported yet. We still have hopes that there could be a managers' package, which is composed of agreed-upon amendments by both sides, equally divided by both sides of the aisle, both Republican and Democratic. There are some important amendments, so I hope we are able to get approval of at least some of them prior to the votes that I believe will be scheduled for this afternoon in order to conclude debate and consideration of the Defense authorization act.

As we enter the final throes—and there are Members on the other side of the aisle and maybe even on this side of the aisle who are deeply concerned about the OCO funding for this authorization—I repeat again to my colleagues, I don't like the use of OCO. I

would like to follow the advice of every one of our military leaders who say that continued sequestration puts the lives of the men and women who are serving in the military in greater danger. I am not sure we have a greater obligation than to do everything possible to prevent the lives of our men and women serving in uniform from being put in greater danger. To get hung up on the method of funding, which many will use as a rationale for opposing this bill, seems to me an upside down set of priorities—badly upside down.

If we don't fund, if we don't authorize, if we don't make possible for us to equip and train and retain the finest military force in the world, why is it a higher priority to object to the method of funding? As I said, in a perfect world, I would argue vigorously—and have continued to—about the harmful effects of sequestration.

I am not talking about a political opinion. I am talking about the view of the uniformed leaders of our Nation who have the respect and admiration of all of us. They are telling us that if we continue sequestration, which would be the effect of not including the additional funding of the overseas contingency operations, then obviously in this world that becomes more and more dangerous as we speak—and I continue to quote probably the most respected man in America, in many respects, Henry Kissinger, who testified before our committee that he has never seen more crises around the world since World War II, as is the case today.

I would entreat my colleagues who may be contemplating voting against this legislation on the grounds that the funding is a disqualifying factor—it is a troubling factor and it is troubling to me—but shouldn't we care more about the men and women who are serving in the military than the problem you might have with a certain process that was followed in order to get there? I would think not.

If you look at the world in 2011, when the unthinkable happened; that is, that sequestration automatically kicked in because both sides were unable to agree on a process that would reduce the deficit and put us on a path to a balanced budget. Everyone said sequestration will not happen because they will come to an agreement. Obviously, sequestration did happen. But if you look at the world in the year of 2011, when sequestration kicked in, and the world today, I think—I think—there is a compelling argument that national security and national defense is far more important than it was then. Because of a series of events that began in 2011—including an incredibly misguided decision by the President of the United States to withdraw all forces from Iraq, which then, inevitably, as some of us predicted, led to the situation as it exists today—the world is now and the Middle East is now literally on fire.

What are the results of the misguided policies and the commitment on the