

“(B) the reason the Attorney General awarded the duplicative grant.

“(d) COMPLIANCE WITH AUDITING STANDARDS.—The Administrator shall comply with the Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards, published by the General Accountability Office (commonly known as the ‘Yellow Book’), in the conduct of fiscal, compliance, and programmatic audits of States.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 is amended by striking section 407 (42 U.S.C. 5776a).

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the first day of the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—In the case of an entity that is barred from receiving grant funds under paragraph (2) or (7)(B)(ii) of section 407 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5776a), the amendment made by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not affect the applicability to the entity, or to the Attorney General with respect to the entity, of paragraph (2), (3), or (7) of such section 407, as in effect on the day before the effective date under paragraph (2) of this subsection.

TITLE V—JUVENILE ACCOUNTABILITY BLOCK GRANTS

SEC. 501. GRANT ELIGIBILITY.

Section 1802(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796ee-2(a)) is amended—

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

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) assurances that the State agrees to comply with the core requirements, as defined in section 103 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5603), applicable to the detention and confinement of juveniles.”.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his courtesy in allowing me to go next.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, this afternoon, Senator MURRAY, the Senator from Washington State who is the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and I, the chairman of the committee, made a joint bipartisan announcement that the Senate’s HELP Committee will hold hearings beginning the week of September 4 on the actions Congress should take to stabilize and strengthen the individual health insurance market so Americans will be able to buy insurance at affordable prices in the year 2018. We will hear from State insurance commissioners, from patients, from Governors,

from healthcare experts, and insurance companies. Committee staff will begin work this week, working with all committee members to prepare for these hearings and discussions. That was the announcement Senator MURRAY and I made today.

Now, in my own words, the reason for these hearings is that unless Congress acts by September 27, when insurance companies must sign contracts with the Federal Government to sell insurance on the Federal exchange next year, millions of Americans with government subsidies in up to half of our States may find themselves with zero options for buying health insurance on the exchanges next year, 2018. Many others without government subsidies will find themselves unable to afford health insurance because of rising premiums, copays, and deductibles.

There are a number of issues with the American healthcare system, but if your house is on fire, you want to put out the fire. The fire, in this case, is the individual health insurance market. Both Republicans and Democrats agree on this.

Our committee, the HELP Committee, had one hearing on the subject on February 1 and will work intensively between now and the end of September in order to finish our work in time to have an effect on health insurance policies next year, sold in 2018.

I am consulting with Senator MURRAY to try to make these hearings as bipartisan as possible and to involve as many committee members as possible. I will be consulting with Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN so the Finance Committee is aware of any matters we discuss that might be within its jurisdiction. A number of Senators, both Democratic and Republican, have approached Senator MURRAY and me and said they would like to be involved. We are going to find a way for them to be involved and update them on our progress.

In these discussions—the ones I am describing—we are dealing with a small segment of the total health insurance market. Only about 6 percent of insured Americans buy their insurance in the individual market. Only about 4 percent of insured Americans buy their insurance on the Affordable Care Act exchanges. While these percentages are small, they represent large numbers of Americans, including many of our most vulnerable Americans. We are talking about roughly 18 million Americans in the individual market. About 11 million of them buy their insurance on the Affordable Care Act exchanges. About 9 million of these 11 million have Affordable Care Act subsidies, and unless we act, many of them may not have policies available to buy in 2018 because insurance companies will pull out of the collapsing markets. It would be like having a bus ticket and no bus coming through town.

Just as important, unless we act, costs could rise, once again, even making healthcare unaffordable for the ad-

ditional 9 million Americans in the individual market who receive no government support to help buy insurance, roughly 2 million of them who buy their health insurance on the exchanges but who don’t qualify for a subsidy, and roughly 7 million who buy their insurance outside of the exchanges. This means they have no government help paying for their premiums, their copays, and their deductibles.

As we prepare for these discussions, I have urged again that President Trump temporarily continue the cost-reduction payments through September so Congress can work on a short-term solution for stabilizing the individual markets in 2018. These cost-sharing reduction subsidies reduce copays, reduce deductibles, and reduce other out-of-pocket costs to help low-income Americans buy their health insurance on the exchanges. We are talking about those who make under 250 percent of the poverty level or roughly \$30,000 for an individual or \$60,000 for a family of four. Without payment of these cost-sharing reductions, Americans will be hurt. Up to half the States will likely have bare counties, with zero insurance providers offering insurance on the exchanges, and insurance premiums will increase by roughly 20 percent, according to the American Health Insurance Plans.

In my opinion, any solution that Congress passes for a 2018 stabilization package would need to be small, bipartisan, and balanced. It should include funding for the cost-sharing reductions, but it also should include greater flexibility for States in approving health insurance policies which should reduce costs.

Now, it is reasonable to expect that if the President were to approve continuation of cost-sharing subsidies for August and September and if Congress, in September, should pass a bipartisan stabilization bill that includes cost-sharing for 1 year—that is 2018—it is reasonable to expect that the insurance companies in 2018 would lower their rates. They have told us—in fact, Oliver Wyman, an independent observer of healthcare, has told us that lack of funding for cost-sharing reductions would add 11 to 20 percent to premiums in 2018.

So if the President, over the next 2 months, and the Congress, over the next year, take steps to provide certainty that there will be cost-sharing subsidies, that should allow insurance companies to lower the premiums they have projected they will charge in 2018. In fact, many insurance companies have priced their rates for 2018 at two different levels—one with cost-sharing and one without cost-sharing. So it is important not only that the President improve temporary cost-sharing for August and September but that we, the Congress, in a bipartisan way, find a way to approve it for at least 1 year so we can keep the premiums down.

Now, this is only one step in what we want to do about health insurance and about the larger question of healthcare

costs so we will proceed step by step. A subsequent step will be to try to find a way to create a long-term, more robust individual insurance market, but for the short-term, our proposal is that by mid-September, we will see if we can agree on a way to stabilize the individual insurance market to keep premiums down and make affordable insurance available to all Americans.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here to speak about something else, but let me take just a moment and thank my chairman for what he has done. I had the experience of serving on the HELP Committee with Chairman ALEXANDER and Ranking Member MURRAY when we did the Education bill last year.

Education is nearly as fraught a topic politically around here as healthcare is, and what we saw in a thoughtful, regular-order process that was developed under Chairman ALEXANDER's leadership was a very considerable piece of work with real effect.

Sometimes we agree on something on both sides of the aisle in this body because there is nothing to it. It is "National Peaches Week" or something, and everyone votes for that. But when it is something big and something consequential, that is where difficulties begin to emerge, and what the chairman was able to work in the committee was something big and something consequential on healthcare. To the end of my days in the Senate, I am going to remember that closing vote, when the clerk of the committee called the roll, and every single member of the HELP Committee voted in favor of the measure. It came out of the committee unanimously, and with that burst of energy, it came through the floor fine, and it passed the House without too many changes. It was just a remarkable piece of work. So I have seen what the HELP Committee can do under Chairman ALEXANDER and Ranking Member MURRAY, and I am filled with confidence that the process can be terrific there, and I am filled with goodwill toward a successful outcome.

I just think what the chairman has said is terrific, and I wanted to say a few words of appreciation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 17 minutes in morning business.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, what I would like to speak about is a new form of fossil fuel-funded climate denial spin that has just entered the climate debate. They are always up to something, and here is their latest. The Trump administration's two great scientists, Scott Pruitt and Rick Perry, the Frick and Frack of climate denial,

have called for a science showdown, where climate denial and climate science can have it out for once and for all—red team versus blue team. "Fossil fuel man" Pruitt has even called for the showdown to be peer reviewed. Well, what is comical about that is that climate science has been peer reviewed all along. That is how it gets to be science—by going through and surviving the process of peer review by other scientists.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to Administrator Pruitt from a wide range of scientific organizations pointing out to him this very fact, that climate science is called climate science because it has been through scientific peer review.

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

JULY 31, 2017.

Hon. SCOTT PRUITT,
Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

DEAR ADMINISTRATOR PRUITT: As leaders of professional scientific societies with our collective membership of hundreds of thousands of scientists, we are writing in response to reports that you are working to develop a "red team/blue team" process that challenges climate science.

We write to remind you of the ongoing research, testing, evaluations, and debates that happen on a regular basis in every scientific discipline. The peer review process itself is a constant means of scientists putting forth research results, getting challenged, and revising them based on evidence. Indeed, science is a multi-dimensional, competitive "red team/blue team" process whereby scientists and scientific teams are constantly challenging one another's findings for robustness. The current scientific understanding of climate change is based on decades of such work, along with overarching, carefully evaluated assessments within the United States and internationally.

As a reflection of that work, 31 scientific societies last year released a letter, updated from 2009, to reflect the current scientific consensus on climate change. We urge you to give its text consideration, along with America's Climate Choices, the work of our premier United States scientific body, the National Academy of Sciences.

Of course, climate science, like all sciences, is an ever-changing discipline: our knowledge is always advancing. Robust discussion about data interpretation, methodology, and findings are part of daily scientific discourse. That is how science progresses. However, the integrity of the scientific process cannot thrive when policymakers—regardless of party affiliation—use policy disagreements as a pretext to challenge scientific conclusions.

Given your interest in the state of climate science, we would welcome the opportunity to meet with you to better understand your perspective and rationale for the proposed activity; and to discuss climate science, including which areas are at the frontiers of scientific knowledge and which are well-established because of thousands of studies from multiple lines of evidence.

We look forward to hearing from you, and your office may contact Lexi Shultz, Kasey White, or Joanne Carney to coordinate a meeting.

Sincerely,

Rush D. Holt, Ph.D., Chief Executive Officer, American Association for the Ad-

vancement of Sciences; Robert Gropp, Ph.D., Co-Executive Director, American Institute of Biological Sciences; Chris McEntee, Executive Director and CEO, American Geophysical Union; Ellen Bergfeld, Ph.D., Chief Executive Officer, American Society of Agronomy, Crop Science Society of America, Soil Science Society of America; Brian Crother, Ph.D., President Elect, American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists; Crispin B. Taylor, Ph.D., Chief Executive Officer, American Society of Plant Biologists; Barry D. Nussbaum, Ph.D., President, American Statistical Association; Olin E. Rhodes, Jr., Ph.D., President, Association of Ecosystem Research Centers.

Linda Duguay, Ph.D., President, Association for the Sciences of Limnology and Oceanography; Robin L. Chazdon, Ph.D., Executive Director, Association for Tropical Biology and Conservation; Katherine S. McCarter, Executive Director, Ecological Society of America; David Gammie, Executive Director, Entomological Society of America; Vicki McConnell, Ph.D., Executive Director, Geological Society of America; Paul Foster, Ph.D., President, Organization of Biological Field Stations; Raymond Mejia, Society for Mathematical Biology; Luke Harmon, Ph.D., President, Society of Systematic Biologists.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Climate denial, on the other hand, avoids peer review as if it were Kryptonite, so this call for peer review of the contest between climate science and climate denial is almost comical, except for the evil intent behind it and, of course, the stakes. How very risky and dangerous continuing to get this climate issue wrong is for our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an op-ed written by John Holdren, until recently the President's climate adviser, called "The perversity of 'red-teaming' climate science."

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

[From *bostonglobe.com*, July 25, 2017]

THE PERVERSITY OF 'RED-TEAMING' CLIMATE SCIENCE

(By John P. Holdren)

EPA administrator Scott Pruitt is reportedly giving serious consideration to investing the taxpayers' money in a "red team/blue team" effort to determine whether current scientific understandings about climate change are actually right. The idea is that a "red team" made up of officials from government agencies with responsibilities related to climate would try to poke holes in mainstream climate science, while a similarly constituted "blue team" would have the task of defending the mainstream consensus against this critique. Supposedly, this process would shed new light on what is known and what is not about human influence on the global climate. But the argument that such a process would be helpful is some combination of naive and disingenuous.

All of science works through the continuous application of the skeptical scrutiny of key findings by essentially everybody working in a given field. This happens in part