

Studies. He testified to the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee that he was 99 percent certain that the year's record temperatures were not the result of natural variation. That was 30 years ago. It was the first time a lead scientist drew a connection between human activities, the growing concentration of atmosphere pollutants, and a warming climate.

This Senator was a young congressman at the time representing East Central Florida and Florida's Space Coast. Just 2 years prior, I had flown for 6 days on the 24th mission of the space shuttle. In this case, our orbiter was the Space Shuttle *Columbia*.

Growing up on the Indian River on Florida's Atlantic coast, it is easy to think that nature's bounty is endless, that the sand beaches, the crystal clear water, the blue sky, and the warm Sun will continue forever. It would be like Camelot. But peering out the window back at the planet from the window of a spacecraft, when I looked, all of the Earth suddenly took on a new meaning. I realized how thin the line was between our protected shared home—the planet—and uninhabitable space.

When Dr. Hansen testified about the greenhouse effect and how that thin layer of atmosphere was becoming polluted, it got my attention because I remembered looking at the rim of the Earth and seeing that thin film as we orbited the Earth every 90 minutes. Since his 1988 warning, the evidence has unfortunately confirmed Dr. Hansen's 1988 prediction.

Extreme events in 2017 and 2018 alone included back-to-back, record Atlantic and gulf hurricanes and unprecedented and devastating wildfires. Global temperatures are rising, and so are the seas. Why? The extra heat is absorbed by the oceans, which cover two-thirds of the Earth. That extra heat, when absorbed in water, causes water to expand. Also, 2016 and 2017 had two of the highest global temperatures ever recorded since we began measuring in 1880, and 2018 is on track to be the fourth hottest year on record.

Warmer air and water make the environment more hospitable to toxic algae blooms, mosquitos that carry deadly diseases, and things like poison ivy. These are three things that I think we can all agree that we need less of, not more.

The oceans are warming, and they are fueling the intensification of hurricanes—as we saw recently with Irma and Michael—and that warming water is creating the conditions that bleach coral reefs and feed toxic algae blooms.

My beautiful home State of Florida, which I have had the great privilege of serving, is ground zero for these impacts. According to the fourth National Climate Assessment report released by the administration just last week—the day after Thanksgiving—climate change is expected to make South Florida more vulnerable to diseases like the Zika virus. Florida could see more than \$346 billion in lost property

value over the course of this century. But this stretches beyond property values. A Florida Department of Health assessment determined that almost 600,000 people in South Florida are going to face extreme or high risk from sea level rise. Warming water, nutrient enrichment, overfishing, and coastal development are all contributing to the dire situation of one of our Nation's crown jewels—the coral reefs of the Florida Keys.

The real question is, What are we going to do about it? I think there are three things we ought to consider.

First, we truly cannot afford to politicize the air we breathe. The science is not up for debate. The greenhouse gas emissions are heating the atmosphere, which in turn heat our oceans, supercharging the hurricanes, leaving us vulnerable to drought and threatening the water we drink and the food we eat. Reports of political censorship or political interference with science—that is unacceptable and foolish. If we ignore the science, we do so at our peril.

Second, I think we are going to have to stop putting so many greenhouse gases into the atmosphere so fast. This is called climate mitigation. It means that we must invest in new technology, in the economy of the future, things like wind and solar, electric vehicles, and more efficient buildings. Each one of them would have a huge impact in lessening the amount of derivatives of carbon that we put into the atmosphere.

Third, I think we should consider that we are going to have to make our communities more resilient to the impacts of climate change—climate change that is already upon us and climate change that, in the future, we are not going to be able to avoid. You can't just cut off the greenhouse gases going into the atmosphere and the warming that results therefrom that is already in the system.

You talk to the scientists. There is something just beyond about 4 degrees Fahrenheit more than the average annual global temperature—that if it rises beyond that, there is no return.

We have a chance, but time is of the essence. We ought to consider climate change adaptation. You don't have to agree with climate science to know that it makes sense to do that.

I want to urge our colleagues on both sides of this aisle that separates Republicans from Democrats. You need to take this seriously. For the sake of your States and mine, for the good of our planet, for the good of our children, for the good of future generations, take climate change seriously. Listen to the experts, and come together to work on solutions. Instead of saying "I am not a scientist," listen to the scientists. Don't try to censor their warnings or hide from the truth. Instead of saying that making changes could cost money, think about the cost to our economy and our society if we don't act.

Coastal communities inundated with catastrophic flooding, midwestern droughts that raise food prices, and soaring health costs—these are some of the costs that are coming to our country—indeed, to our society—indeed, to the civilization of planet Earth. We must act, and we must do it now.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, first, I am going to commend the senior Senator from Florida for what he said. Throughout my career, I have been so impressed and so grateful for his strong voice on the environment. He is the only Member of this body who has seen Earth from space.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Mr. President, I thank my dear friend, the senior Senator from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, who is going to speak but said I could go ahead, and I will. I will be brief.

In the 44 years I have served in the Senate, I have never been so concerned about the state of press freedom around the world, including, I deeply regret to say, in our own country.

I was brought up in a family that owned a weekly newspaper and owned a printing business. The First Amendment was the most important part of our Constitution because it promised the freedom of speech and it promised the diversity of religion, and that Amendment was the foundation of our democracy.

Yet the premeditated murder and dismemberment of Jamal Khashoggi by Saudi authorities and then their ridiculous, transparent attempt to cover it up have shocked the consciences of people everywhere. Yesterday, by voting to discharge S.J. Res. 54, the Senate demonstrated that the Saudi royal family needs to hold accountable all those who are responsible for that horrific crime if it wants to salvage relations with the United States.

Look at what happens if we don't speak out in defense of a free press. Just a few days after Mr. Khashoggi's murder, the body of Bulgarian journalist Viktoria Marinova was discovered. The investigation suggests that she was raped, beaten, and strangled. I think the motive is undeniable. She had spent the previous year reporting on corruption.

According to the Committee to Protect Journalists, so far, in 2018, at least 43 journalists have been killed for their work while 15 other journalists have also been killed, although their deaths have not yet, at least, been officially linked to their work. According to data compiled by Freedom House, the muzzling of journalists and independent news media is at its worst point in over a decade. Similarly, according to the Committee to Protect Journalists, the number of reporters who have been jailed for their work—who have been jailed for being reporters doing their

job—is at a level that has not been seen since the 1990s. Strongmen around the world are cracking down with impunity. Frankly, this son of a printer, this son of a newspaper owner, is not surprised.

At home, President Trump regularly demonizes the news media. He calls the news media the enemy of the people and hopes that his acidic outbursts and threats will dissuade journalists from accurately reporting on his administration. With the eyes of the world upon him, he makes a mockery of the entire notion of an independent press. It is something that has been guaranteed in our Constitution since the beginning of our country, yet the President makes a mockery of it.

He brands anybody who challenges him as either a liar or worse, while he holds hands with those who are willing to sing his praises. He even went so far as to rescind the credentials of one reporter who persisted in asking questions the President didn't like. I have been here with eight different Presidents, and I have never seen that done before, not even with Watergate.

A few days ago, he publicly denigrated the decorated, retired U.S. admiral who led the raid that killed Osama bin Laden and who had dared to criticize the President's attacks against the press as being a grave threat to our democracy, which it is. So this President who avoided the draft five times demeans the Admiral who was in charge of the raid that killed Osama bin Laden.

As Americans who cherish the First Amendment and who rely on a free press for sustaining our democratic form of government, we should be appalled. The words of a President matter. They always have. Yet this President's rhetoric gives comfort to autocrats the world over who are emboldened to clamp down on dissent, as they are confident they have a powerful defender in the United States as they censor and jail journalists.

We have seen despots quote our President. Can you imagine? We Americans see autocrats in other countries quote our President about this. We see them pass laws outlawing so-called fake news, which their leaders use to justify dismissing and castigating reporting with whom they disagree in order to persecute their political opponents.

We should fear the day when a free press is seen as unimportant or as a luxury—as something no longer synonymous with our country and its values. We must always recommit ourselves to defending press freedom and to elevating and celebrating a free press as one of the cornerstones of our democracy.

Americans should not be silenced just because our President, for the first time in history, demeans and tries to intimidate the press. We must stand up, as the Founders of this country and as every leader in this country up to now has done, and defend a free press.

In this challenging time for press freedom around the world, the Committee to Protect Journalists honored four exceptional journalists at the 2018 International Press Freedom Awards in New York City.

One is Amal Khalifa, who is the co-founder of the Sudanese Journalists Network, which has covered protests of official wrongdoing in Sudan, whose leader, President al-Bashir, has been indicted by the International Criminal Court. Because of her reporting, she has been harassed, detained, and physically abused by Sudanese authorities, but she still does her job at great personal peril.

Anastasiya Stanko is an independent broadcast journalist who was taken hostage by an armed group while she reported on the conflict in eastern Ukraine. Since her release, she has continued to risk her safety and her life by reporting on the war and on other human rights violations in conflict-torn areas by Ukraine's Security Service.

Luz Mely Reyes is an investigative reporter who founded an independent news website to bring attention to the political situation in her country of Venezuela. In 2017, while she covered protests against Venezuela's President Nicolas Maduro, members of her team were attacked and threatened, but she courageously continued her work. She has since emerged as one of Venezuela's most recognized champions of independent journalism.

Lastly, Nguyen Ngoc Nhu Quynh, one of Vietnam's most prominent independent bloggers, has devoted her life to calling attention to human rights violations in Vietnam. In October 2016, she was sentenced to 10 years in prison on charges of propagandizing against the state. After her health began to deteriorate she was released from prison, but only on the condition of exile.

We often speak about the abuses of repressive governments around the world. We must also speak out against the increasing attempts to demean and intimidate the press here at home. The President may continue to do that as the leaders of some other countries do, but we should not stand for it.

Our democracy depends on a free press. The lives of these four brave individuals remind us of what is at stake. We must stand up for what is right even when our President does not.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, next Friday, appropriations expire for 7 of the 12 appropriations bills for fiscal year 2019, and we are in good faith negotiations with our Republican counterparts here in the Congress to get them enacted. The good news is that because of the bipartisan work in the Senate, approximately 75 percent of the Federal Government is funded for 2019. The bad news is that the 7 bipartisan appropriations bills are hanging

in the balance for one reason and one reason only—President Trump.

President Trump has said that he wants to shut down the government unless he gets \$5 billion from the American taxpayers for an unnecessary border wall. The President hasn't even tried to get Mexico to pay for it, as he promised in his campaign over and over and over. He hasn't outlined a plan to deal with eminent domain concerns or even a plan as to how it would be built. He hasn't even spent the \$1.3 billion Congress allocated last year in the fiscal year 2018 budget for border security—fences, drones, technology—which actually makes sense. Now he is asking, having not spent that money, for more. So this isn't actually about border security. This is the President's way of trying to manufacture a shutdown to fire up his base.

Make no mistake. The President is the only person who holds the ultimate responsibility for a government shutdown. He can decide if we are going to have one or not have one. He, certainly, has the power to shut down the government, but he has two very reasonable ways to avoid one.

First, he could agree to sign the bipartisan DHS appropriations bill that the Senate Democrats and Republicans have already agreed to, which includes \$1.6 billion for border security on top of the \$1.3 billion that President Trump still hasn't spent from last year. It is just what we have done in previous years—funding for fencing on the border where the experts say it makes the most sense. It would protect our border far more effectively and far more quickly than any wall.

Leader MCCONNELL voted for that bill. Chairman SHELBY voted for it, as did Senator RUBIO. Even Senator GRAHAM, the President's strongest supporter and closest ally in the Senate, voted for that bill. Now, all of a sudden, it seems that the Republicans, afraid to buck the President even when they know he is wrong, want to renege on that agreement to go along with the President's shutdown plan. But it doesn't have to be that way. This bipartisan negotiated deal remains on the table and would, certainly, receive more than 60 votes in the Senate.

Second, if the President doesn't want to agree to that bipartisan bill, we could avoid a shutdown by passing a continuing resolution for the Department of Homeland Security. We think it should be for a whole year. It would keep the government open and still provide another \$1.3 billion for border security on top of the \$1.3 billion the President has not yet spent. Again, this option would, certainly, receive more than 60 votes in the Senate.

So President Trump has a simple choice of two good bipartisan options. If he decides to support either the bipartisan DHS bill or a continuing resolution, I am confident that both would pass by comfortable margins. The only position that cannot garner 60 votes is the President's position. He is adamant