

a more stable and reliable regulatory process and give the people we represent more opportunity.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN STRAAYER

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, in Denver today, the Colorado General Assembly will gather to pay tribute to Colorado State University professor John Straayer, whose 50-year teaching career included 37 years of managing a legislative intern program during the spring semester. Every Tuesday and Thursday, rain or snow, Dr. Straayer, a van or two, and an over caffeinated, sleep-deprived, ambitious crew of college juniors and seniors would travel to Denver from Fort Collins under the tutelage of Dr. Straayer to learn the “art of legislation.”

After publishing several seminal books on Colorado politics, accumulating roughly 140,000 miles back and forth to the State capitol, and supervising over 1,000 interns over the years, he is retiring from his service as Colorado’s legislative professor emeritus.

Dr. Straayer has a true love of politics—the process, the policy, the people, and the place. He has a passion for every ounce of it, the kind of healthy obsession with a place that means so much to the lives of its citizens. He has seen it all—the good and the bad, the fights and the endearing moments. He watched the impacts of constitutional battles, term limits, and reforms, and 50 years later, he has never lost his passion.

To be a part of his intern program, students were required to take his class on the legislative process. As a young CSU Ram myself, I remember his class vividly, absorbing his drive and drawn into the intrigue of policy. We talked about the cowboy coalition and the Sagebrush Rebellion; about Speaker Bev Bledsoe and Roy Romer; about Anne Burford, who served in the legislature as one of the self-identified “House Crazies,” who in the 1980s became known as Ronald Reagan’s EPA Administrator but who this past month became known as Neil Gorsuch’s mom. We talked about the high-water mark of rural power and the rise of the suburban legislator.

Dr. Straayer introduced new generations of students to oatmeal with vanilla ice cream and topped with maple syrup.

Dr. Straayer introduced people to public service, including congressional and legislative staffers and many members of my own staff. According to a recent article in the Denver Post, those staffers and interns included former Democratic Governor Bill Ritter, Democratic State Senator Matt Jones, and Republican State Representative Dan Nordberg. They were all proteges of Dr. Straayer’s. The article goes on to state that Straayer had arranged these internships, monitored them, and graded the reports of their experiences.

Dozens of Straayer interns have risen to high electoral office or become key legislative lobbyists—and not just in Colorado; one of his former students is a city alderman in Chicago.

I remember visiting Dr. Straayer when I first joined the program and was getting ready to be assigned to a legislator. When I received the assignment, I was disappointed to learn that I hadn’t been appointed to the legislator I was hoping to be assigned to. Instead, I was assigned to a legislator from the Western Slope of Colorado. I am from the Eastern Plains, and I wasn’t used to the Western Slope issues. Soon I would discover that Dr. Straayer had placed me with an incredible legislator named Russell George, who went on to become Colorado’s speaker of the house—an individual who Dr. Straayer knew would be an incredible tutor and an inspiration to me. Dr. Straayer was right. Speaker George taught me about issues I work on each and every day here in the U.S. Senate—about public lands, water, and the West. He was and is an inspiration to me, and it is because Dr. Straayer had the discernment to go above and beyond for his students.

After graduation, Dr. Straayer invited me to speak to his class and later would tease me in the State legislature that perhaps I talked too much from the well. He provided me interns from the very same program I was a part of 10 years before. Most of all, he reminded me of the good that comes from our teachers and mentors, those who look out for us because, from a special place in their heart, they know that through the gift of their teaching, they will have a lasting impact for generations to come.

Congratulations, Dr. Straayer. Thank you for your service to Colorado State University and to the State of Colorado, and thank you for impacting the lives of so many people. From this U.S. Senator, thanks for being that life-changing spark.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, on Monday night we confirmed former Georgia Governor Sonny Perdue to be President Trump’s Secretary of Agriculture, and I am here for my 164th “Time to Wake Up” speech to urge Secretary Perdue to listen to his agency, to scientific researchers in farm States across the country, to our major food and agricultural producers, and to farmers, fishermen, ranchers, and foresters about the serious and growing effects of climate change.

Carbon dioxide from burning fossil fuels is changing the atmosphere and the oceans. We see it everywhere. We see it on drought-stricken farms and in

raging wildfires. We see it in fish that are disappearing from warming, acidifying waters. We see it in our dying pine forests. We see it in extreme weather events.

Secretary Perdue is taking the helm of an agency with a key role in mitigating those very effects. The USDA provides farmers, foresters, commodities markets, and State and local officials with analyses of trends and emerging issues affecting agriculture, the food supply, the environment, and rural communities. In its own Climate Change Adaptation Plan, the Department notes: “Climate change has the potential to confound USDA efforts to meet these core obligations and responsibilities to the Nation.”

During his tenure as Governor, Secretary Perdue issued a State energy strategy, stating: “Strong scientific evidence exists that increasing emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases are affecting Earth’s climate.”

That is encouraging. Yet, when asked by Senator LEAHY about climate change during the Secretary’s confirmation process, he backpedaled and said: “It is clear that the climate has been changing,” but there is “significant debate within the scientific community” on whether human activities play a role in that.

Whoops, that is the classic denier dodge, and it is just not true.

Secretary Perdue said several times during his confirmation process that he will use the “best scientific and statistical data available” to make decisions. The National Climate Assessment uses the “best scientific and statistical data” to conclude this: “In the long term, combined stresses associated with climate change are expected to decrease agricultural productivity.”

In the Midwest, for instance, the National Climate Assessment reports that temperatures are increasing, and the rate of warming tripled between 1980 and 2010. Under the assessment’s worst-case scenarios, temperatures across the Midwest are projected to rise 8.5 degrees Fahrenheit by the year 2100. If you are a farmer, 8.5 degrees changes everything.

In the western mountains, massive forests stand dead on the mountain-sides as warmer winters allow the killer bark beetle to swarm into higher latitudes and higher altitudes. Over 82 million acres of national forests are under stress from fires, these insects, or both. Ominously, the assessment says that the combined effect of increasing wildfire, insect outbreaks, and diseases is expected to cause an “almost complete loss of subalpine forests.”

The cost to taxpayers of fighting fires in those dead and dying forests is growing dramatically. Firefighting has gone from just 13 percent of the Forest Service’s budget in 2004 to over 50 percent in 2015. The Forest Service estimates that by 2025 fighting fires will take up to two-thirds of its budget.

Forest Service Chief Tom Tidwell testified to the Senate: "This increase in the cost of wildland fire suppression is subsuming the agency's budget and jeopardizing its ability to implement its full mission."

One place Secretary Perdue can go to find out a little bit about this is from our State universities.

The University of Wyoming's Center for Environmental Hydrology and Geophysics, for example, reports: "Many of the most pressing issues facing the Western United States hinge on the fate and transport of water and its response to diverse disturbances, including climate change."

At Kansas State University, professor of agronomy Charles Rice is using climate modeling to help anticipate climate effects in the Great Plains and to help the region mitigate and adapt to those effects.

In Wisconsin, Victor Cabrera, an assistant professor in the University of Wisconsin-Madison Dairy Science Department, says that higher summer temperatures and increasing drought will interfere with both livestock fertility and milk production, and dairy cows could give as much as 10 percent less milk. Secretary Perdue's own Department of Agriculture predicts that by 2030 climate change will cost the United States' dairy sector between \$79 million and \$199 million per year in lost production.

South Dakota State University professor Mark Cochrane is working with the Forest Service to better understand how a changing climate is affecting our forests. Professor Cochrane reported: "Forest fire seasons worldwide increased by 18.7 percent due to more rain-free days and hotter temperatures."

Secretary Perdue could travel to Iowa and hear from Gene Takle, an Iowa State University professor of agronomy and geological and atmospheric sciences, who told a United Nations conference recently that climate change is already affecting Iowa farmers. "This isn't just about the distant future," he said. At Iowa State's Leopold Center for Sustainable Agriculture, Secretary Perdue could also hear about what the center calls "aggravated and unpredictable risk that will challenge the security of our agricultural and biological systems."

I am from the Ocean State. So let's turn to the oceans, where the National Climate Assessment predicts: "Fishing costs are predicted to increase as fisheries transition to new species and as processing plants and fishing jobs shift poleward." In the Pacific Northwest, ocean acidification caused a 70-percent loss of oyster larvae from 2006 to 2008 at an oyster hatchery in Oregon. Wild oyster stocks in Washington State have failed as weather patterns have brought more acidic water to the shore. This is an industry worth about \$73 million annually. So we ought not to laugh this off.

In Alaska, the University of Alaska has an Ocean Acidification Research

Center. That is how seriously they take it. The Ocean Acidification Research Center warns that ocean acidification "has the potential to disrupt (the Alaskan seafood) industry from top to bottom"—a top-to-bottom disruption of one of Alaska's major industries, and we cannot get a word on climate change out of the Republican side of the aisle in this building.

It is, of course, not just scientists. Some of the largest agriculture and food companies are speaking out as well. For these companies, climate change is not a partisan issue. It is not even a political issue. It is a business survival issue. It is their new reality. In 2015, major food and beverage companies visited Congress to tell us how climate change is affecting their industry.

"Climate really matters to our business," said Kim Nelson, of General Mills. "We fundamentally rely on Mother Nature." The choices we make to protect or forsake our climate, she said, will be "important to the long-term viability of our company and our industry."

Paul Bakus, of Nestle, agreed, saying that climate change "is impacting our business today." His company cans pumpkins under the Libby's brand. They have seen pumpkin yields crash in the United States. Mr. Bakus told us: "We have never seen growing and harvesting conditions like this in the Midwest."

Chief sustainability officer for the Mars Corporation, Barry Parkin, was blunter in his assessment: "We are on a path to a dangerous place."

Greg Page, the former CEO of Cargill, has publicly stated that climate change must be addressed to prevent future food shortages. Specifically, he said:

U.S. production of corn, soybeans, wheat, and cotton could decline by 14 percent by mid-century, and by as much as 42 percent by late century. From an agricultural standpoint, we have to prepare ourselves for a different climate than we have today.

In advance of the Paris climate conference, the heads of Mars, General Mills, Nestle USA, Unilever, Kellogg Company, New Belgium Brewing, Ben & Jerry's, Cliff Bar, Stonyfield Farm, Danone Dairy, PepsiCo, Coca-Cola, Hershey, and Hain Celestial signed a public letter—this one here—that said:

Climate change is bad for farmers and agriculture. Drought, flooding, and hotter growing conditions threaten the world's food supply and contribute to food insecurity.

They continued:

Now is the time to meaningfully address the reality of climate change. . . . We are ready to meet the climate challenges that face our businesses.

These big, successful companies don't take climate change lightly, and neither do our farmers, loggers, ranchers, and fishermen.

In South Carolina, farms that have been in families for generations, like that of Representative MARK SANFORD's, are under threat from climate

change. Congressman SANFORD said: "At our family farm in Beaufort, I've watched over the last 50 years as sea levels have risen and affected salt edges of the farm."

Out West, ranchers are experiencing longer and more severe droughts. In a 2012 survey of Southern Colorado ranchers, roughly one-quarter of respondents said they would likely leave the industry if the drought persisted. Carlyle Currier, who owns a ranch in Molina, CO, said: "We just can't grow enough to feed the cattle ourselves."

In New Hampshire, Jamey French, President of Northland Forest Products, has seen hardwood tree species begin to migrate, with less valuable timber trees like oak and hickory beginning to take the place of sugar maple and yellow birch.

I sure hope Secretary Purdue will come to Rhode Island and meet our fishermen. Chris Brown is the owner of Brown Family Seafood and the president of the Rhode Island Commercial Fishermen's Association. He has fished in the waters of Rhode Island Sound for years: "We used to come right here and catch two, three, four thousand pounds [of whiting] a day, sometimes 10," he told the New York Times. But the whiting have moved north to cooler waters. "Climate change is going to make it hard on some of those species that are not particularly fond of warm or warming waters," Chris said.

And he is not alone. I have been told by other fishermen that it is getting weird out there in Rhode Island's waters, that this is not our grandfathers' ocean. These changes are serious for this industry.

So I hope Secretary Perdue will hear the message of our farmers, foresters, ranchers, and fishermen. They are sending this message loud and clear. Climate change is happening now, and they count on us to face the challenge.

The problem, of course, is the fossil fuel-funded denial machine that has so much influence over the Republican Party in Congress today. That fossil fuel-funded denial machine will do its best to change the subject, to muddy the waters, to create artificial doubt, and to use its anonymous dark political money to break up and thwart any signs of progress, but all the dark money in the world can't change the things that Iowa farmers, Wyoming ranchers, South Dakota forest managers, and Rhode Island fishermen see.

If this body—if our Republican friends here—will not listen to Mars Corporation, to General Mills, to Nestle USA, to Unilever, to Kellogg, to Coke and Pepsi and Hershey, it is really time to wake up.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

**MR. MORAN.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to address the Senate as in morning business.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

**INCREASING THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ACCOUNTABILITY TO VETERANS ACT**

**MR. MORAN.** Mr. President, this afternoon, the President will be signing an Executive order to increase accountability within the Department of Veterans Affairs. For several years, I have been calling on the VA to hold bad actors within the VA accountable. In my view, in too many instances, that has not occurred. There are far too many examples of those who commit wrongdoing while working at the VA, and even crimes against veterans and other VA employees have occurred without any consequence.

On his first day in office, I wrote the President urging him to make accountability within the Department of Veterans Affairs one of his top priorities. We see too many examples, and unfortunately one of those examples—one of those egregious examples—is in my home State of Kansas, where we face a terrible example of a VA employee violating the trust of veterans. Yet the VA seems to have no real sense of urgency in holding this person accountable or committing to fix the process by which he got into the position that he could commit the acts he did.

In 2015, we learned from local newspaper reports—not from the VA—that a physician’s assistant at the Leavenworth VA hospital had been sexually abusing veterans. Shortly after that news broke, Leavenworth County prosecutors charged this individual with multiple counts of sexual assault and abuse against numerous veterans. He is currently awaiting trial.

The stories continue to come into our office and to the prosecutor about other victims. Veterans who sought services at the VA—the place they would expect to be cared for, respected, and the place they certainly should find safe—found something exactly the opposite.

As the story unfolded, we learned that Mr. Wisner—the person now charged with crimes—targeted vulnerable veterans suffering from PTSD, post-traumatic stress syndrome; he prescribed opioids that inhibited their thinking, and he used his position to deepen their wounds of war rather than to heal them.

Although Mr. Wisner is now beyond the reach of the VA, he and others like him who fail our veterans are not beyond the reach of Congress. It is ridiculous that taxpayers continue to fund pensions of VA senior executives and personnel convicted of crimes that harmed our Nation’s veterans when they should have been serving and caring for them.

In the last Congress, we led significant efforts to develop, introduce, and

pass legislation. Most of those efforts were with the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and we passed some legislation unanimously here in the Senate. That legislation increases the accountability of the Department of Veterans Affairs to make certain that senior VA executives and certain healthcare employees convicted of a felony do not receive the same benefits as those who diligently and honorably serve our Nation’s veterans.

Not as an aside but as a separate sentence, let me take this moment to say thank you to those people within the Department of Veterans Affairs who conscientiously care for and fulfill their responsibilities to our Nation’s veterans each and every day. How saddening it must be that they have to work side by side with people who commit crimes—and other failures for our veterans—and receive no consequence for that behavior.

We want to protect our veterans. We also want to make sure that those who work at the Department of Veterans Affairs know that their profession is honorable and that they are doing the right thing. It is difficult to reach that conclusion when surrounded by individuals who have not fulfilled that responsibility.

In light of the situation with Mr. Wisner—and other cases of wrongdoing so awful that they have been found guilty of a felony—we will not tolerate crimes against veterans that cause harm to their personal safety or that involve corrupt, backroom dealings with senior VA executives.

That legislation passed the U.S. Senate on the final day of our session last year. It passed unanimously. Unfortunately, that legislation did not then pass the House of Representatives, despite what we were told was significant support for it. It just didn’t work in the schedule. So today I am back on the Senate floor. A hotline request is pending in which we ask—I ask—that legislation unanimously passed by the U.S. Senate on the final day of the previous session would pass today. That will then give the House of Representatives the time and the mechanics to see that this legislation becomes law.

In fact, the very first piece of legislation I introduced in this session, the 115th, was Increasing the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability to Veterans Act of 2017. We today call for its swift passage. I am hopeful this legislation will provide an ounce of justice to those victims who have suffered at the hands of this VA employee, and I call on my colleagues to once again stand with me in passing this legislation.

In addition to the issues of accountability of wrongdoing employees of the Department, this legislation also has additional provisions. Those provisions include holding VA leaders accountable for Department mismanagement, hiring well-qualified people and addressing employee performance, preventing

employees from conflicts of interest, and improving manager training.

We have a duty. Of all people in this country, whom should we pay respect and honor to? Whom should we care for? For whom should we make certain we live up to the commitments that were made? One would think that those who served in our military, who protected our freedoms and liberties are the ones we would put on a high pedestal and make sure everything possible to protect them is done.

We have a duty to taxpayers, as well, to make sure funds are not going to employees who are convicted of crimes against those veterans that they are charged to protect and to serve.

There have been a number of VA scandals, corruption, and illegal activity in nearly every State. Whether it has been a secret wait-list in a hospital that delayed critical care, opioid over-medication that led to death or suicide, or physical abuse and neglect, crimes must come to an end. There must be accountability for us to be able to say we are doing everything possible to bring those crimes to an end.

This legislation is an important step in making the VA worthy of the service of those who have sacrificed for this Nation. Given the previous unanimous support, I can’t imagine—I hope there is no reason this legislation should not again pass today. I call upon my colleagues in the U.S. Senate to stand with me and Senator BLUMENTHAL and others as we work to make certain the VA is a department worthy of the veterans it serves.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

**MR. ALEXANDER.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

**MR. ALEXANDER.** Mr. President, later this afternoon the Senate will vote on the President’s nomination of Alexander Acosta to serve as the U.S. Secretary of Labor. Mr. Acosta has excellent credentials and is well qualified for the position. He understands that a good-paying job is critical to helping workers realize the American dream for themselves and for their families.

After immigrating to the United States from Cuba, Mr. Acosta’s parents worked hard to create more opportunities for their son. Alexander Acosta became the first person in his family to go to college, and from there he has had quite an impressive career.

He has already been confirmed by the U.S. Senate three different times: He served as a Republican member of the National Labor Relations Board, he

served as Assistant Attorney General for the U.S. Justice Department's Civil Rights Division, and he served as U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of Florida.

Mr. Acosta's most recent role was serving as dean of Florida International University's law school. The school's president told the Miami Herald recently, "Alex has a destiny in public service. . . . He's a person of integrity, conscientious, thoughtful, he doesn't overreach."

On March 22, Mr. Acosta had a hearing in the Senate Labor Committee that lasted two and a half hours. Following his hearing, he answered 380 follow-up questions for the record—604 questions if you count the sub-questions. Then, on March 30, our committee approved Mr. Acosta's nomination, readying the nomination for consideration by the full Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of 140 groups, which includes business groups and labor unions, which support Mr. Acosta's nomination.

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

140 GROUPS THAT SUPPORT MR. ACOSTA'S NOMINATION

Aeronautical Repair Station Association; Air Conditioning Contractors of America; Alaska Chamber; Alliance of Wyoming Manufacturers; American Apparel & Footwear Association; American Bakers Association; American Beverage Association; American Coatings Association; American Coke and Coal Chemicals Institute; American Concrete Pressure Pipe Association; American Fiber Manufacturers Association; American Fire Sprinkler Association; American Foundry Society; American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers; American Home Furnishings Alliance; American Hotel & Lodging Association; American Iron and Steel Institute; American Moving & Storage Association; American Staffing Association; American Supply Association; American Trucking Associations; AmericanHort; Americans for Tax Reform; Argentum.

Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry; Arizona Manufacturers Council; Arkansas State Chamber/Associated Industries of Arkansas; Asian American Hotel Owners Association; Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc.; Associated Equipment Distributors; Associated General Contractors of America; Associated Industries of Missouri; Auto Care Association; Brick Industry Association; Can Industry Association; Center for Worker Freedom; Coalition of Franchisee Associations; Colorado Association of Commerce and Industry (CACI); Council of Industry of Southeastern New York; Corry & Associates; Delta Industries, Inc.

Fabricators and Manufacturers Association, International; The Fertilizer Institute; Franchise Business Services; Georgia Association of Manufacturers; Global Cold Chain Alliance; Harsco; Heating, Air-conditioning & Refrigeration Distributors International (HARDI); Hispanic National Bar Association; Hispanic Leadership Fund; HR Policy Association; INDA, The Association of the Nonwoven Fabrics Industry; Independent Electrical Contractors; Independent Lubricant Manufacturers Association; Insured Retirement Institute; International Association of Bridge, Structural, Ornamental and Reinforcing Iron Workers; International Association of Fire Fighters; International Foodservice Distributors Association.

International Franchise Association; International Housewares Association; International Sign Association; International Sleep Products Association; International Warehouse Logistics Association; Investment Casting Institute; ISSA—The Worldwide Cleaning Industry Association; Laborers' International Union of North America; The Latino Coalition; Leading Builders of America; League of United Latin American Citizens; The Linen, Uniform and Facility Services Association (TRSA); Manufacturer & Business Association; Metal Powder Industries Federation; Metals Service Center Institute; Michigan Manufacturers Association; Miles Sand & Gravel; Missouri Association of Manufacturers; MMC Materials, Inc.; Montana Retail Association.

Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association (MEMA); MSPA Americas; National Association of Home Builders; National Association of Manufacturers (NAM); National Association of Printing Ink Manufacturers (NAPIM); National Association of Professional Employer Organizations; National Automobile Dealers Association; National Christmas Tree Association; National Club Association; National Council of Chain Restaurants; National Federation of Independent Business.

National Franchisee Association; National Grocers Association; National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association; National Oilseed Processors Association; National Precast Concrete Association; National Ready Mixed Concrete Association; National Restaurant Association; National Retail Federation; National Roofing Contractors Association; National Stone, Sand & Gravel Association; National Wooden Pallet and Container Association; Nebraska Chamber of Commerce & Industry; Nevada Manufacturers Association; New Mexico Business Coalition; North American Building Trades Union; North American Concrete Alliance; Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association; Plastics Industry Association; Port Aggregates, Inc.; Precast/Prestressed Concrete Institute; Private Care Association.

Puerto Rico Manufacturers Association; Retail Industry Leaders Association; Rhode Island Manufacturing Association; San Jose Police Officers' Association; Seafarers International Union of North America; Sergeants Benevolent Association, Police Department, City of New York; Shipbuilders Council of America; Sioux Corporation; Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council; SNAC International; The Society of Chemical Manufacturers and Affiliates; Society for Human Resource Management; South Carolina Chamber of Commerce; Southeastern Lumber Manufacturers Association; Specialty Equipment Market Association; Spurlino Materials.

Technology & Manufacturing Association; Texas Association of Business; Texas Association of Manufacturers; Tile Roofing Institute; Tree Care Industry Association; Truck Renting and Leasing Association; United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners; United Motorcoach Association; U.S. Chamber of Commerce; United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce; The Vinyl Institute; Water & Sewer Distributors of America; Wine & Spirits Wholesalers of America; Workforce Fairness Institute.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, the supporters include the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Retail Federation, the National Federation of Independent Business, the National Association of Manufacturers, the International Franchise Association, the Associated Builders and Contractors,

and the American Beverage Association.

Here are some examples of what these groups had to say about Mr. Acosta. The International Franchise Association said, "Franchise owners around the country are facing a great deal of regulatory uncertainty as a result of the wreckage created by the previous administration's out-of-control Department of Labor. Mr. Acosta's exemplary record handling labor issues as a member of the NLRB has shown the appropriate balance needed to protect the interests of employees and employers."

The National Federation of Independent Business said, "Alexander Acosta is an experienced public servant with a distinguished record. His knowledge of labor issues and his service as U.S. Attorney make him an especially strong candidate to take on the entrenched bureaucracy, which has imposed unbelievably severe and costly regulations on small business in the recent years."

The National Retail Federation said, "Mr. Acosta's diverse experiences in both public service and the private sector position him well to be an effective and pragmatic leader at the Department of Labor."

Why is this nomination so important? In his new book, New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman uses the term "Great Acceleration" for all of the technological, social, environmental, and market changes simultaneously sweeping across the globe and argues that we are now "living through one of the greatest inflection points in history" as a result. Add Ball State University's finding that automation is responsible for the loss of 88 percent of our manufacturing jobs. Add globalization. Add social, cultural, climate changes, and terrorism, and you get a big mismatch between the change of pace and the ability of the average American worker to keep up and fit in the accelerating forces shaping the workplace.

Earlier this year, after a group of senators listened to a group of scientists talk about the advances in artificial intelligence, one Senator asked, "Where are we all going to work?"

Tom Friedman says that probably the most important governance challenge is a great need "to develop the learning systems, training systems, management systems, social safety nets, and government regulations that would enable citizens to get the most out of these accelerations and cushion their worst impacts."

One of the federal government's chief actors in this drama should be the U.S. Secretary of Labor. In fact, as many have suggested and the House of Representatives has done, the title of the job for which Alexander Acosta has been nominated should be changed to the Secretary of Workforce, not Secretary of Labor.

Labor union membership in the private sector today is down to less than

7 percent. The issue for workers today is not whether they belong to a union. It is whether they have the skills to adapt to the changing workplace and to find and keep a job. To be accurate, to create and keep a job. My generation found jobs. This generation is more likely to have to create their own jobs.

In his inaugural address, President Trump said he heard “forgotten men and women” who are struggling to keep up and fit into today’s changing world: “[F]or too many of our citizens, a different reality exists: mothers and children trapped in poverty in our inner cities; rusted out factories scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our nation . . .” That is what President Trump said in his inaugural address.

Ten days earlier, in his farewell address, President Obama said he, too, heard those same voices: “[T]oo many families, in inner cities and in rural counties, have been left behind . . . if we don’t create opportunity for all people, the disaffection and division that has stalled our progress will only sharpen in years to come. . . .”

That was President Obama.

What can we do about this? The most important thing is to work with employers and community colleges and technical institutes and find ways to increase the number of Americans earning post-secondary certificates and two-year degrees or more.

Georgetown University’s Center on Education and the Workforce says that by 2020—3 years from now—65 percent of the jobs in this country will require some college or more. And at the rate we are going, Georgetown predicts the United States will lack 5 million workers with an adequate post-secondary education by 2020.

Unfortunately, too many of the federal government’s actions over the last few years have made it harder for American workers to keep up, to adjust to the changing world, and to create, find, or keep a job.

President Obama’s Department of Labor issued 130 percent more final rules than the previous administration’s labor department. Overall, the Obama Administration issued an average of 85 major rules. These are rules that may have an impact of \$100 million or more a year on the economy. Eighty-five major rules a year. President Bush, on the other hand, averaged about 62 a year. That is a 37-percent increase under President Obama.

Take the overtime rule. In my state, its costs would add hundreds of dollars per student in college tuition and it would force small businesses across the country to reduce the jobs that provide the stability that families need. This rule has been delayed by the courts until at least June 30th of this year.

Take the so-called joint employer policy. This is a policy that affects franchising and makes it more likely that a parent company will own and operate its stores instead of allowing

franchisees to own and operate those stores. A Republican majority at the National Labor Relations Board can start undoing the damage caused by this harmful decision.

Then, there is the fiduciary rule, which is going to make it too expensive for the average worker to obtain investment advice about retirement benefits—again making it harder, not easier, to adjust to the changing world of work. The Department of Labor under the Trump administration has delayed this rule for 60 days, until June 9, 2017. Some parts of the rule are delayed until January 1, 2018.

One rule after another from the Obama administration has stacked a big wet blanket of costs and time-consuming mandates on job creators, causing them to create fewer jobs.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission’s EEO-1 form will require employers to provide to the government 20 times as much information as they do today about how they pay workers. Earlier this month, the Senator from Kansas, Senator PAT ROBERTS, and I asked the Office of Management and Budget to rescind this time-wasting mandate.

There is the ridiculously complex 108-question FAFSA, the federal aid application form that 20 million families fill out every year as students go to college. It turns away from college many of the very students who most need to adjust to this changing world.

The Affordable Care Act defined full-time work as only 30 hours, forcing employers to cut their workers’ hours or reduce hiring altogether in order to escape the law’s mandate and its unaffordable penalties.

Many of these rules, like the persuader rule, which chills the ability of employers to retain legal advice during union organizing activities, seemed designed for the purpose of strengthening the membership and the power of labor unions.

We are fortunate to have a nominee in Mr. Acosta who can use his good judgment to reevaluate labor policies that make it much harder to create jobs and to find jobs.

We know that Mr. Acosta has support from members of both political parties, and that raises a question for me: Why did the Senate yesterday have to vote to invoke cloture on Mr. Acosta’s nomination? The vote was bipartisan, with 61 senators voting to end debate so Mr. Acosta could have had an up or down vote. He could have been approved by majority vote yesterday. That has been the tradition in the U.S. Senate for 230 years. There never has been a Cabinet member denied his or her position by requiring them to get more than 51 votes. There have been some cloture votes for delay or to take some extra time, but no one has ever been denied the position by requiring more than 51 votes.

During most of the 20th century, when one party controlled the White House and the Senate seventy percent

of the time, the minority never filibustered to death a single presidential nominee. The practice in the Senate since the Senate’s beginning has been that the President nominates and the Senate decides by majority vote whether to approve the nomination. Why are we having these cloture votes? We are getting into more and more of a difficult situation with these votes. It is a bad habit and both sides, Republicans and Democrats, have caused the problem.

During the Obama administration, over the 8 years, there were 173 cloture votes on nominations, and I voted to invoke cloture 41 of those times. For 10 of those nominees, I voted to end debate so that their nomination could have an up or down vote even though I opposed their confirmation.

No one has ever disputed our right in the Senate, regardless of who was in charge, to use our constitutional duty of advice and consent to delay and examine, sometimes causing nominations to be withdrawn or even defeating nominees by a majority vote.

What I would like to suggest today is that if we continue the trend of requiring cloture votes on presidential nominees—cabinet members and others—that may work fine as long as we have a president and a Senate of the same political party, but if we have a president and a Senate of different political parties and everybody has become accustomed to voting no on cloture, to requiring a cloture vote and voting no, the Senate may never be able to confirm any cabinet members or any sub-cabinet members when the Senate and the president are of different political parties.

I would suggest to my friends on the other side of the aisle that the Senate is a body of precedent, and I think it would be wise for us to stop and think, as we proceed, about whether it is wise to require cloture votes for presidential nominees. Why don’t we simply go ahead and approve them or not approve them by majority vote?

We have an excellent nominee in Mr. Acosta. We are fortunate that someone of his intelligence and experience is willing to serve as our U.S. Secretary of Labor. I look forward to voting for and to the Senate approving his confirmation later today.

I yield the floor.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I oppose the nomination of Alexander Acosta to be Secretary of the Department of Labor.

Our Nation’s Labor Secretary has a responsibility to protect the safety and legal rights of the American workforce. From prosecuting civil rights violations to monitoring workplace safety, the Department of Labor ensures fair treatment. The Labor Secretary must also evaluate our economy and advocate for fair and equal pay and benefits for American workers. The Department provides the data and expertise for policymakers, employers, and workers to make economic decisions.

Unfortunately, Mr. Acosta's testimony on these points at his confirmation hearing was disappointing. He would not commit to support updating overtime rules to make sure that employees get fair pay for the hours they work. He would not commit to prioritize closing the gender pay gap. He would not commit to keeping workplace safety inspectors on the job.

Moreover, when Mr. Acosta led the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice during the George W. Bush Administration, the GAO reported that there was a "significant drop in the enforcement of several major antidiscrimination and voting rights laws." The Secretary of Labor must be a vigilant defender of the rights of workers.

In a Cabinet where too many department heads are looking out for millionaires and billionaires, we need a Secretary of Labor who will look out for the American worker. I am not convinced that Mr. Acosta will do that job.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

#### COAL MINER PENSION AND RETIREE HEALTH BENEFITS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, it is no great secret that the American people do not have a great deal of confidence in their government. It is no secret that the American people think the Congress is way out of touch with their needs and aspirations. In fact, just confirming that point, a recent poll appeared in the Washington Post and ABC News, and it found that 58 percent of the American people believe that President Trump is out of touch with the concerns of most people in the United States today; 62 percent of the American people believe that the Republican Party is out of touch with the concerns of most people in the United States; and 67 percent of the American people believe that the Democratic Party is out of touch with the concerns of most people in the United States today. Those are numbers that should cause a great deal of concern to Members of the Senate and the House, to Democrats and Republicans, to everybody.

I think one of the reasons is that there is a world outside of Capitol Hill where people are in pain; where people are working longer hours for lower wages; where people are scared to death about facing retirement because they have, in many cases, no money in the bank; where people today are paying 40 percent, 50 percent of limited incomes for affordable housing; where single moms can't afford childcare for their kids; where young people can't afford to go to college; where other people are leaving college deeply in debt. And all of that is taking place within the context of almost all new wealth and income going to the top 1 percent.

We have the absurd situation today where the top one-tenth of 1 percent owns almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent, and 52 percent of all new income is going to the top 1 per-

cent. The middle class is shrinking. There are 43 million Americans living in poverty, and the very wealthy are getting wealthier.

In the midst of all that, my Republican colleagues and President Trump are desperately trying to provide hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks for the top 1 percent and cut back on programs that working families desperately need, whether it is Pell grants to make it easier for kids to go to college, whether it is afterschool programs, whether it is the Meals on Wheels program, whether it is affordable housing, or whatnot—tax breaks for billionaires, cutbacks on programs that people desperately need.

The American people will not regain confidence in the U.S. Congress unless we keep promises that were made to them. Today I want to talk about promises that were made to coal miners. For decades, coal miners contributed to their pension funds with the promise that when they retired, they would receive a pension and retiree health benefits that would last for a lifetime. Those were the promises to the people who went underneath the ground, who worked incredibly difficult jobs, who died of black lung disease or a myriad of other diseases or injuries. Promises were made to those workers, and those promises were broken.

If Congress does not act by tomorrow, the retiree health benefits of more than 22,000 coal miners will be eliminated. We cannot allow that to happen. It is not only unfair to the retired coal miners and their families, it once again will tell the American people that they cannot trust their government. Promises were made, but they were not carried out.

My understanding is that an agreement to protect these retiree health benefits may be included in the continuing resolution to keep the government from shutting down. As I have walked the hallways here in the Senate, I have met with members, retirees of the United Mine Workers, who have been back here week after week after week, and I applaud them for their persistence.

Let us hope that, in fact, the continuing resolution does contain an agreement to protect those retiree health benefits. It is absolutely imperative that the agreement contain those benefits and that those promises be kept.

Even if we do put that provision in the CR, it still does not address another problem faced by retirees in the coal industry and retirees all over the country, and that is the fact that we are doing nothing to protect the pension benefits of coal miners and tens and thousands of other workers. This is an issue that is of major crisis proportions all across this country, and it is an issue that must be addressed. That is why I am a proud cosponsor of the Miners Protection Act. That is also why I will be introducing legislation on

May 9 to protect the pensions of not only 90,000 coal miners throughout this country, but the retirement benefits of 10 million workers in multiemployer pension plans—10 million workers.

Over 40 years ago, the Federal Government made a solemn commitment to the workers of this country. If a retiree is promised a certain pension benefit after a lifetime of hard work, a company could not renege on that promise. Making that commitment 40 years ago was exactly the right thing to do. When someone works for their entire life, when they give up pay raises, when they work overtime, when they work weekends in order to make sure that he or she has a secure retirement, it is absolutely unacceptable to pull the plug from that worker's benefit.

Guarantees were made, and those guarantees must be kept. This is not the negotiating of wage increases. This is not the negotiating of overtime. This is a promise made to workers and paid for by workers, which simply cannot be nullified if people are to have any faith in our political system.

But more than 2 years ago behind closed doors, a provision was slipped into a must-pass spending bill that now makes it legal to cut the pension benefits of about 10 million workers and retirees in multiemployer pension plans. As a result, retirees all over this country are waking up to the unacceptable reality that the promises made to them could be broken and that the pension benefits they are receiving today may soon be cut by 30, 40 or even 65 percent. What this means is that retirees who are currently receiving a pension benefit of \$18,000 a year are in danger of seeing their benefits cut by \$3,843, a 21-percent cut. Retirees who are currently receiving a pension benefit of \$36,000 a year could see their pension benefits cut by up to \$21,000, a 60-percent cut.

In other words, tens of thousands of retirees all over this country who today are in the middle class, who worked hard their entire lives, who gave up wage increases, who worked overtime in order to protect those pensions may be seeing significant reductions in what they anticipated. We are talking about retirees who will no longer be able to pay their mortgages. We are talking about retirees who will not be able to pay their utility bills. We are talking about families who may have to go on food stamps to feed their families after working their entire lives. That is unconscionable. We cannot allow that to happen.

In my view, we have to send a very loud and very clear message to the Republican leadership in Congress and to the President of the United States, and that is when a promise is made to the working people of this country with respect to their pensions and retiree health benefits, that promise must be kept.

Today, about 150 multiemployer pension plans are in trouble financially, but let's be clear. The retirees are not