

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,

Los Angeles, Houston and New Orleans, among many others. These entities account for a sizable chunk of both U.S. gross domestic product and carbon emissions. They may not be able to get the United States all the way to our 2025 Paris emissions target, but they have the potential to go far.

Private companies, too, have been instrumental in driving the clean-energy revolution, pursuing the massive economic opportunities presented by the need to decarbonize our energy system. And consumers are increasingly demanding that companies not only provide desirable products or services, but also stand as good corporate citizens.

Finally, for citizens, it is time to hold our leaders accountable at all levels of government. Protecting our nation, our children and our American heritage should not be optional for an elected leader. Nor should preserving America's singular standing in the world.

Thursday was not a good day for climate change, and it was not a good day for the United States. Nothing we say now can change that. But it is a day that needs to be remembered as the visible moment the rear-guard opposition went too far. It is a day to spark action and resolve. It is a day that needs to count.

RUSSIA SANCTIONS LEGISLATION

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, the United States must send an unequivocal message to Vladimir Putin: we will not tolerate attacks on democracy in the United States or in Europe. That is why I have long pressed for harsher sanctions on Russia, including with Secretary of State Tillerson in his June 13 appearance before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations. I am a strong supporter of amendment No. 232 to S. 722 on Russia sanctions. While I missed the vote on June 14 due to an unanticipated illness, I would have voted yes had I been present. I voted yes on the passage of S. 722 today.

The Kremlin's ambitions are clear. It interferes in elections in the United States and Europe, in an attempt to undermine public faith in the democratic process. It wants to erode the cohesion and strength of our NATO alliance. It bolsters the hand of brutal dictators like Bashar al-Assad. It wages wars in Ukraine and Georgia, supporting insurrections against the government. It seeks to reestablish a leading role on the world's stage through an unraveling of the international order.

Russia's use of subversion, disinformation, and irregular warfare are nothing new. However, in this last U.S. presidential cycle, Russia launched an unprecedented and multifaceted campaign to undermine our elections—a view corroborated by our entire intelligence community. Russia paid more than 1,000 people—human trolls—to work out of a facility in St. Petersburg. These trolls spent their waking hours creating anti-Clinton fake news reports and disseminating these stories in key States and districts. Russia also used thousands of botnets to echo and amplify these fake news stories. Russia also targeted the

election boards of 39 States in our country, successfully infiltrating at least four voter registration databases and gaining access to hundreds of thousands of voter records. They even attempted to infiltrate the Maryland State Elections Board, but were not successful.

In response to these attacks, I filed an amendment to S. 722 that would ensure the United States develops a strategic, long-term approach to combat Russia's cyber warfare. My amendment requires a unified strategy developed with our NATO allies and European partners to counter Russia's cyber attacks, including Russia's efforts to undermine our democratic elections. It would also require the FBI to establish a high-level cybersecurity liaison for Presidential campaigns and major national campaign committees, so that the United States is prepared for Russia's next attempt to interfere with our elections. The liaison would share cyber threats as they arise and cyber security protocols with these organizations to stave off cyber attacks. Given the critical importance of shoring up our own cyber defenses, I plan to introduce this amendment as standalone legislation at a later point.

I also filed a second amendment to S. 722 that prohibits the President from returning diplomatic compounds in Maryland and New York that the United States seized last December, in response to Russian interference in our elections. It is outrageous that President Trump is considering allowing the Russians access to these facilities, which they used to spy on the United States. I am proud to have worked with Senator CARDIN to incorporate this provision into the larger Russia sanctions bill. Senator CARDIN and I will keep working to hold Russia and the Trump administration accountable.

This legislation demonstrates to our allies and partners around the world that the United States will not stand idly when our democracy is under attack. I commend my colleagues for working across the aisle to impose tougher sanctions on Russia. Today the Senate put patriotism over partisanship.

PRIDE ACT

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the Police Reporting of Information Data and Evidence Act, or PRIDE Act—legislation I introduced on Thursday, May 25, 2017. This bill would increase accountability and transparency for law enforcement by requiring States to report to the Department of Justice use of force incidents that occur between police officers and civilians. I am proud to have introduced this important bill and I want to thank Senator CHRIS VAN HOLLEN for joining the legislation as an original cosponsor. I also want to thank Representative JOAQUIN CASTRO for introducing a House companion of the PRIDE Act.

Across our Nation, law enforcement officers put their lives on the line each day to protect our communities. These individuals have answered the call to serve, and we owe these brave men and women our deepest respect and gratitude. As mayor of Newark, NJ, I saw firsthand the dangers police officers face each and every day. They must make tough, split-second decisions that have life and death consequences. They truly have one of the toughest jobs in America.

We must provide law enforcement with the tools and resources they need to do their jobs safely and effectively. That is why I have been a strong advocate for robust funding for the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant program, Bulletproof Vest Partnership program, and the Community Oriented Policing Services Hiring program. These programs support law enforcement in their mission and help make our communities safe.

While the vast majority of police officers serve with integrity and perform their duties without incident, we know that there are instances when officers engage in inappropriate uses of force. These cases are not emblematic of law enforcement as the whole; however, these incidents have eroded trust between law enforcement and the communities they are sworn to protect. This is especially the case today due to the number of incidents that are caught on video and shared on the internet. This phenomena only exacerbates the difficult job police officers have and fails to lend clarity to the actual number of cases of excessive use of force that occur nationwide.

We must work to shore up that trust deficit and ensure that those who break the law and use excessive force are held accountable and those who rightfully uphold the law are viewed in the correct light. We must collect more data on use of force incidents between law enforcement and civilians. As former Federal Bureau of Investigations Director James Comey said in an address to Georgetown University, "Without complete and accurate data, we are left with 'ideological thunderbolts.' And that helps spark unrest and distrust and does not help us get better."

For those reasons, I introduced the PRIDE Act. This legislation would require States to report to the Justice Department any incident where use of force is used against a civilian or against a law enforcement officer. It would mandate the collection of certain information such as national origin, sex, race, ethnicity, age, physical disability, mental disability, English language proficiency, housing status, and school status of each civilian against whom law enforcement used force. It would require officers to record the date, time, and location of the incident and whether the jurisdiction allows for the open-carry or concealed-carry of a firearm. It would require the officer to detail whether the