

had 60 cosponsors, including 41 Democrats and 18 Republicans. But I have introduced this reauthorization with Senator HELLER from Nevada and Senator BLUMENTHAL from Connecticut. It is something we call the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program. It reauthorizes those.

I have had the sad experience of seeing how dangerous the internet can be for our vulnerable children. When I was attorney general of Texas, I launched something we quaintly called at the time the Texas Internet Bureau. That was a long time ago, about 2000. Today, they call it the cyber crime unit, and they do a lot of even more sophisticated things. But the idea back then and the idea still today is to fight internet crimes and to work with law enforcement agencies around the State, including a Dallas-based task force.

Now, 17 years later, these task forces are a national network of 61 coordinated units dedicated to protecting children from internet predators and investigating perpetrators who engage in these horrific crimes. These task forces are on the frontline every day, protecting our children online and rescuing victims of exploitation and abuse. They also work with local agencies to create victim support programs and encourage proactive community education; for example, educating parents and adults of the sorts of things their children might be exposed to online that they might not know about. So we need to educate families and children about the risks the internet can hold, together with the wonderful opportunities it also presents. This is really the dark underbelly of the internet.

It requires a depth of resources to fight child predators online. My experience as attorney general was that local law enforcement agencies didn't have the tax base. They didn't have the expertise. They didn't have the computers and the other sophistication they needed in order to combat this in their local communities.

Over the past few years we have been able to save many lives from crime online, and it would be a mistake now to change course. We cannot lose this critical tool.

Just for the information of colleagues, we put this on the hotline which, for those who don't work in the Senate, means we asked all Members of the Senate to comment on this and to let us know if they had any objection to its passage.

Hearing none, Mr. President, as in legislative session, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 122, S. 782.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 782) to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 782) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 782

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Providing Resources, Officers, and Technology To Eradicate Cyber Threats to Our Children Act of 2017" or the "PROTECT Our Children Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE NATIONAL INTERNET CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN TASK FORCE PROGRAM.

Title I of the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 17601 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 105(h) (42 U.S.C. 17615(h)), by striking "2016" and inserting "2022"; and

(2) in section 107(a)(10) (42 U.S.C. 17617(a)(10)), by striking "fiscal year 2018" and inserting "each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022".

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I came to the floor to talk about healthcare, but I wanted to be here on this occasion to join my distinguished colleague from Texas in supporting this measure because it is so vital to protecting children.

Like the distinguished Senator from Texas, I, too, was attorney general, and we in Connecticut have been at the forefront of fighting this internet and cyber threat to the welfare of our children.

So I want to express my thanks to him for working in a very bipartisan way. At a time when the public, many commentators, and media question whether we work together across the aisle, this bill is a very apt example of how we can and we must work together to protect our children, to advance our national interests, and to make sure that criminal justice is effectively enforced in this country.

I look forward to working with my colleague in making sure this measure becomes law.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, one of the things we are debating right now is, What is the future of the Affordable Care Act or, I should say, healthcare in the United States? One thing we can all agree to is that the individual market under the Affordable Care Act—or

ObamaCare, as it is commonly called—is not doing well.

I will put up this Facebook post from a constituent in Louisiana named Brian. He wrote in to say:

My family plan is \$1,700 a month. Me, my wife, and 2 children. The ACA has brought me to my knees.

He doesn't say this, but we know that, most likely, his family deductible is \$13,000.

I hope we can get something done. . . . The middle class is dwindling away. Can everyone just come together and figure this out?

So his family is putting out \$20,000 a year for insurance. They most likely have a \$13,000 family deductible. They have two children, a young family, \$33,000 of out-of-pocket expenses before they would see significant benefit from their policy. Clearly, we have a problem.

When he was campaigning, Candidate Trump recognized this, and he said over and over that his contract with the voters was to maintain coverage, lower premiums, address and care for those with preexisting conditions, and to eliminate the ObamaCare mandates. This, if you will, was his contract with the voters—a pretty good contract. I think it is something both parties can get behind.

Candidate Trump and then President-elect Trump doubled down on this just before taking the oath of office, saying: "People covered under the law"—meaning the law that he would support to replace the Affordable Care Act—"can expect to have great healthcare. It will be in a much simplified form. Much less expensive and much better."

Indeed, the President of the United States seemed, again, to renew this commitment this past week at a lunch with 15 Senators at the White House, once more saying how we have to have a law that lowers premiums and cares for those with preexisting conditions.

That is the baseline. Some would argue, has President Trump committed himself to some right that previously did not exist that all Americans would have healthcare?

I am a physician, a doctor. I worked in a public hospital for the uninsured for so long. I can tell you, Congress created a right to healthcare when it passed the Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act. I think President Clinton was the one who signed it into law. This said that anyone—whether they were a U.S. citizen or not—could come to an emergency room and receive all the care they needed, and if they could not pay, they would still receive care.

Whenever somebody says "My gosh, folks don't have a right to healthcare," I note that when I was in the emergency room at 2 o'clock in the morning, as long as those emergency door rooms were open, there were people coming through. They would have congestive heart failure, COPD, diabetes out of control, gunshot wounds, or vomiting blood. They could be schizophrenic or a drug overdose. As long as

that patient or those patients came through the door, we treated them, and someone paid.

I would say that it is the fiscally conservative way that if Congress is going to say “My gosh, everybody has a right to healthcare,” then we should come up with a considered way to pay for it, as opposed to forcing the hospital to shift the cost of this care to other sources—principally, by the way, small businesses paying higher premiums for their employees, higher rates to pay for the uninsured. The fiscally conservative way is “Let’s address these needs.”

As a physician, I will also say that the best business practice ways to address somebody with chronic health conditions is to actually manage the disease. If you have a diabetic who doesn’t have insurance, she may come to the hospital once a month with diabetes out of control. You have to start an IV and put her in the hospital, perhaps overnight, sometimes in the hospital for longer. This can cost thousands of dollars. Contrast this with having that patient with a primary care physician so that you can manage her disease. Not only is her health better, but you spend a lot less money.

In fact, the wisest corporations in our country now consider the health of their employees as a cost center. What can we do to have the best outcomes at the lowest price? This is the most fiscally conservative way. I think that is the approach we should take as a country.

This brings us to the next point. How do we achieve that which President Trump suggested, which was that we would maintain coverage, lower premiums, care for those with preexisting conditions, and eliminate mandates in a way that we could achieve it? Some folks say that you cannot achieve this. I disagree with this.

The way to achieve it is to embrace each of President Trump’s goals. SUSAN COLLINS and four other Senators and I have put forward a bill called the Patient Freedom Act. In the Patient Freedom Act, the approach we take is to first maintain the coverage President Trump spoke of, but we do it by eliminating mandates. We give the States the options of doing something called automatic enrollment. It means it is easy to be enrolled.

On our income taxes, for example, Republicans have always said: We want to make it easy to pay your taxes—not 16 pages of forms that you have to fill out with a CPA and an attorney but, rather, something you can do on one page. We need to make enrollment in insurance easy.

The second thing—if you can expand the enrollment, we can take from what we know works, which is on Medicare. When someone turns 65, he or she is automatically on Medicare. They don’t have to fill out a bunch of forms online. Rather, they are just on Medicare. They get a card. Here is your Medicare card. You are in unless you don’t want to be.

If you don’t want to be, we make it easy to get out. You just call up and say: I don’t want to be on Medicare. And you are not. It turns out that 99 percent of Americans like this simple approach, and they stay on Medicare.

We could expand coverage and make it simple, still eliminating mandates by giving States the option to say to their residents, you are in unless you are out. We are going to make it simple.

If you are eligible for this credit, you would get the credit. And unless you call us up and say that you don’t want it, you would be enrolled in an insurance program.

In this way, we care for those with preexisting conditions. How is that the case? If you have a few sick people in the insurance pool, then the only people whom you can spread that risk among are the few and the sick in the pool. Every year they pay higher and higher premiums.

On the other hand, if you can expand the risk pool to include all the young “healthies”—the folks who think themselves immortal, who on an average year may only have \$500 or \$800 worth of healthcare expenses—if you can incorporate all of them in your risk pool, then the expense of the few and the sick is spread out over the many and the healthy. Instead of premiums rising because of one person’s illness, premiums hardly budge because the cost of that care is spread over so many.

We call it a risk pool for a reason. If you take a cup of water and you pour it in a large swimming pool, the level of that swimming pool does not change because that big pool absorbs the water. If you take a cup of water and you pour it in a smaller cup of water, it overflows.

We need to make it where it is the former situation—where we have a big risk pool with lots of young, healthy people with whom we can share that risk over the many and not the few. In this way, we can lower premiums.

It was modeled that if we did automatic enrollment in my State, still maintain the enrollment of the older and the sicker who are already in, we would lower premiums by 20 percent. That is the power of giving the States the option to make it simpler for people to be enrolled in their insurance.

The conservative way to approach our healthcare reform is to recognize that President Trump’s contract with the voter on the campaign trail is the pathway to achieving his goals. As we do that in a fiscally conservative way, we recognize that we should not move this cost of care off to small businesses. We should go ahead and pay for it. It is fiscally conservative to manage these patients’ illnesses, as opposed to have them going to an emergency room every so often for emergency room care.

Lastly, we have to say that if we embrace Republican ideas of making it simpler to be in a plan, as opposed to

more complicated, we are more likely to have that risk pool that is inclusive of many who are healthy, not just a few who are sick.

I look forward to replacing the Affordable Care Act—the un-Affordable Care Act as it has become—with something that embraces conservative principles and fulfills President Trump’s campaign pledges.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, it is nice to see the Presiding Officer again today—again and again. I don’t know if I will be your last speaker, but I will try not to keep you here too long just in case.

I know the Presiding Officer has been through Delaware a time or two and the Senator from Louisiana has been through my State. I have been through theirs.

I am going to talk about a 14-year-old young man who lives in Delaware. I used to say to my friend from Louisiana: Thanks for working, trying to get us to pull together and do something across the aisle on healthcare. We will see how it turns out.

If you come up I-95 on your way to Philadelphia, PA, Trenton, NJ, New York City, Boston, or Maine, you pass through Delaware. As you cross from Maryland into Delaware heading north, you cross into Delaware and go through the toll plaza, and then almost immediately you are at the intersection of a road called State Route 896, a north-south highway.

If you happen to go north on 896, you go into Newark, DE, and you go right by the University of Delaware, which is there in Newark, DE. We don’t pronounce it Newark. We pronounce it New-ark, as if it were two words—New-ark. Even though it is one word, we pronounce it as if it were two words, New-ark.

If you go north, you go on 896, you go right into the University of Delaware. I took that road over 40 years ago while I was still in the Navy and on leave with the Navy, trying to figure out where to go to graduate school. I went north on 896 and ended up falling in love with the University of Delaware and applied to graduate school there, and I made my life in Delaware.

If you go south on 896—when you intersect 896 and I-95, you don’t go to the University of Delaware. You don’t go to Newark. You go south to a town called Middletown. It is one word. There are some extraordinary athletes, high school athletes in Middletown.

For many years, their principal high school was Middletown High School. They have a couple of other schools there now, but one is Appoquinimink High School. In Middletown, they are the Cavaliers. The other is the Jaguars. The Jaguars have a new school; Appoquinimink is a newer school. Middletown has been around forever. They have a history of great athletes.

Year after year, they have won championships, including football—State

football championships—and men's sports and women's sports. The key to their successes is that these kids grew up together, and they played sports when they were Peewees. They played sports when they were in middle school. By the time they got to high school, they had worked together, trained together, and knew each other, and they did well as a team.

I met another athlete from Middletown a couple of weeks ago. He came by my office with, I believe, his mom. I think it was his mom. We have a photograph of him right here. He is an unlikely athlete. He is 14 years old. He is from Middletown, DE. His mom's name is Jennifer.

They told me what it was like for Michael—Michael Davis—to grow up in and live with a disease called cystic fibrosis. Before we talked much about cystic fibrosis and his preexisting condition, we talked about something we have a passion about, and that is running.

I am all of 70 years old. I still work out every day. I have been doing this since I was a brandnew ensign in the Navy and on my way to Pensacola, FL, to become a naval flight officer and serve our country around the world.

I like to run every day. This guy does, too—almost every day. There is a difference. The difference is that he has cystic fibrosis. I will talk about what that means in a minute, but despite the lung condition he has, he has defied the odds to be alive today—and not just to be alive today, but to become quite an athlete.

I don't know how many people in the Chamber—I look at our new pages who are here, their first week on the job, and I don't know how many of them have run half marathons. I run have run quite a few in Delaware over the years, but I don't have cystic fibrosis. This guy can run a half marathon and beat me into the floor and beat me into the road, at least. I need to yield to him when he goes by.

We have been joined on the floor today by the majority leader. When he shows up, along with a guy who is a fast runner, I yield to them. I will yield to the leader so he can take care of business, and then I will pick up when he finishes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Delaware.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. 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.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, one thing we learn at a young age is the very basic principle that, when you give your word, you keep it. On June 1, on the international stage, President Trump signaled to the rest of the world that America cannot be relied upon to meet this very basic tenet. On one warm afternoon in Washington, President Trump withdrew the United States from one of the most sweeping global environmental accords in generations. Abandoning our obligations to the Paris climate accords doesn't make America great. It doesn't reflect America's traditional role as innovator, leader, and standard bearer in our shared commitment to protecting the environment.

The chief U.S. negotiator of those accords, Todd Stern, is a former member of my staff. No one among the ranks of our government was closer to these negotiations, which led to a deal that was a win for American workers and businesses and a first step toward ensuring the survival of our planet. His words, published by the Washington Post on June 1, should be required reading for every American, including the President.

By reneging on our pledge to honor these accords, which were forged through U.S. leadership, President Trump is ceding American leadership in emerging clean energy technologies and worsening one of the genuine existential threats to the world. The President's decision was a serious setback in our fight to save our planet. But as Mr. Stern writes, "This is not the end of the line. This is a call to arms."

Governors and mayors and State and local officials are heeding this call, rejecting the President's decision, and pledging to move forward with aggressive efforts to curb climate change. President Trump may think this is the end of America's involvement in the Paris climate accord. But, like Todd Stern, I believe a majority of Americans will reject this move. I, too, hope they will double down on our shared commitment to protecting our environment and our world for generations to come.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stern's column, "Trump just betrayed the world. Now the world will fight back," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, June 1, 2017]

TRUMP JUST BETRAYED THE WORLD. NOW THE WORLD WILL FIGHT BACK.

(By Todd Stern)

President Trump has made a colossal mistake in deciding to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement. There is simply no case for withdrawal, other than a desire to double down on an ill-informed campaign promise, while the case for staying in is overwhelming. But damaging as it is, this decision is not the beginning of the end for efforts to contain climate change. The world decided in Paris to confront the climate threat, and it is not turning back.

Around the world, climate change is a metastasizing danger, for some countries even an existential threat. It was understood in the years leading up to the Paris negotiation that the climate challenge could be met only with a new kind of agreement premised on concerted effort by all. That agreement—ambitious, universal, transparent, balanced—was reached in Paris, with the help of U.S. leadership every step of the way.

Trump's suggestion Thursday that he is willing to renegotiate the deal to make it fairer to the United States doesn't pass the straight-face test. The Paris agreement—for anyone who actually understands it—is entirely fair to the United States. The idea that 194 other countries will listen to Trump's insulting Rose Garden blather and say, "Sure, let's sit down and negotiate a new deal" is ridiculous.

Instead, Trump's decision will be seen as an ugly betrayal—self-centered, callous, hollow, cruel. The ravages of climate change have been on display in recent years in the superstorms, floods, rising sea levels, droughts, fires and deadly heat waves that will only get worse as the carbon index mounts. Vulnerable countries will look at the United States, the richest power on Earth, the largest historic emitter of greenhouse gases, and think—even if they do not say—how dare you?

President Barack Obama once said to business leaders, in a Roosevelt Room meeting I attended, that climate change was the one threat, other than nuclear weapons, with the potential to alter the course of human progress. A near-consensus of major U.S. companies urged the Trump administration to stay in the agreement because they know climate change is real, that the Paris agreement is a good and balanced deal, that their own concerns on matters such as intellectual property and trade will be defended only if U.S. negotiators are at the table and that turning the United States into a climate-change pariah will be bad for business, for access to markets and for investment. But our chief-executive president decided to leave U.S. business in the lurch.

All this is more than disappointing. And watching the so-called internal battle on this issue play out between determined antagonists on the one side and diffident, sotto voce defenders on the other was downright depressing.

But let's be clear: This is not the end of the line. This is a call to arms.

Countries won't follow Trump out of the Paris climate agreement and over a cliff. They won't give Trump the satisfaction of "canceling" the agreement, as he promised during his campaign. They will want to show that they can carry on without the United States. And they know too well that climate change is real and that if the Paris regime fell apart, they'd just have to build it again. They will hold on to the hope that the current administration will be a one-term wonder. It is true that, in the longer run, it would be difficult for the Paris regime to produce accelerated action at the level that is needed without the United States. But other countries will probably bet that the United States will come back.

Progressive U.S. states and cities also have a crucial role to play, not only in extending the good work they are already doing on climate change, but also by sending a clear and resounding message to the global community: that while Trump's Washington may have gone dark on climate change, inspired centers of innovation and commitment are lighting the way forward all over the country. In states such as California and New York, Washington, Oregon, Minnesota, Illinois and North Carolina, and in New England; in cities such as New York, Chicago,