

adopt H. Con. Res. 24, calling for public release of the Mueller report. Now that President Trump supports public release of the report, there is no good reason for anyone to object to this request.

It is a simple request for transparency, nothing more, nothing less—not to make a decision as to what you believe, not to say what we ought to do about it, but just to make it public. Transparency is a great American virtue that we have tried to uphold through the centuries.

So I hope I will not hear a request from the other side to amend the resolution to call for a different special counsel investigation. If there is going to be an objection, the American people deserve to know why—why should this report not be made public—not why something else shouldn't be done, not some extraneous issue. Why shouldn't this report be made public?

I ask my friend, the leader—I see him rising, and I imagine he is going to object—to give a reason why this report should not be made public, not that something else should be done at the same time. This is serious stuff. If there is an objection raised, it will only serve to frustrate the compelling public interest that is made in the special counsel's report in making it public.

Therefore, I will now give the Senate another opportunity to join every one of their colleagues in calling for the public release of this important report.

Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 24, expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress, which is at the desk; further, that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). Is there objection?

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I said just a few moments ago, it is certainly good news for the country that the special counsel concluded that there is no evidence that the Trump campaign collaborated or conspired with the Russian Government to influence the last Presidential election. It is also good news for the country that due to the special counsel's work, we now have more insight into Russia's efforts to interfere with our democratic institution.

Now, I have consistently supported the proposition that the special counsel should be allowed to finish his work without interference. The work of the special counsel, however, is not yet complete. Neither is the work of the Department of Justice. The Attorney General told us yesterday that he is working with the special counsel to determine how much of the special coun-

sel's report can be produced without violating the law and without jeopardizing other ongoing matters, including other matters initiated by the special counsel. The special counsel and the Justice Department ought to be allowed to finish their work in a professional manner.

Now, my good friend, the Democratic leader, was all for allowing the special counsel to conduct his work without political interference when it might be politically advantageous to him, but, apparently, my friend from New York is not for allowing the special counsel to complete his work with the Justice Department, according to his best professional and legal judgment, when that might be inconvenient to my friend's own current political purposes.

To date, the Attorney General has followed through on his commitment to the Congress. One of those commitments is that he intends to release as much information as possible. I certainly welcome that commitment to transparency, as do others, but to the extent that the Attorney General, in consulting with the special counsel, believes it is important to protect sensitive sources and methods, protect material that could affect ongoing investigations and prosecutions, and is legally protected, then he deserves the time to work through these issues.

I am going to object in order to allow the special counsel and the Justice Department to finish their careful and professional review of a, no doubt, voluminous record—a record that likely contains sensitive, classified, and legally protected material.

For all of those reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I will be brief. The resolution does not say it has to be done immediately. The resolution certainly allows for the Attorney General to make sure that nothing is released that violates the law. All it says is that it ought to be released. It is hard to understand why the majority leader wouldn't be for that resolution.

None of his objections—none—are in the words of the report. In fact, the words of the report are very simple. It shows a sense of the Congress that it should be released—not when, not in violation of the law, not in a hurried matter, just to be released.

So I am sort of befuddled by at least the majority leader's reasoning in this regard because it is not in the words of this resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the country and the President had to wait 2 years. It has been going on for 2 years. This very expensive investigation took 2 years to be concluded. Look, it is not unreasonable to give the special counsel and the Justice Department just a little time to complete their review in a professional and responsible manner.

Remember, as I said earlier, we are likely dealing here with other potential prosecutions, classified information, and damaging people's reputations. There is no evidence that the Attorney General is not going to produce as much information as possible for all of us, and that is why I objected.

I think it is a reasonable thing to do. We have been waiting for a long time for this report to wrap up. It is largely good news, not just for the President but for the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, again, this language was good enough for every Republican in the Senate, as well as every Democrat. The President himself says it should be released. It is hard to understand why the majority leader should stand alone in objections no one else found to be reasonable or sustainable and oppose this resolution. The report should be made public, and the Senate should resolve that it should be.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, revolution is deeply embedded in the character of this Nation.

More than two centuries ago, delegates from across the American colonies gathered in Philadelphia to take what was audacious action. They risked everything, including their lives, by declaring independence from the greatest and strongest power in the world at that time, the British Empire.

I am proud to say that my forefather served in George Washington's army, and he was called to risk his life and serve in the Continental Army to fight for an idea—that freedom and liberty would reign in this country.

As Americans, throughout history, we have been called to service. Sometimes we are called to service by clear and present danger, such as the bombing at Pearl Harbor. Sometimes we are called to greatness by stretching our imagination like, when we went to the Moon, and sometimes we are called to unity by necessity because the stakes of inaction are simply too high.

Today the United States faces such a challenge, and I believe we can once again prove our greatness. It is an undeniable fact that climate change, caused in large part by humans, is a threat to Michigan, our Great Lakes, our country, and our planet. Climate change poses a threat not only to the lands and waters that we all depend on but also to our health, our economy, and even our national security.

It is also undeniable that the United States, unified in purpose, can meet the challenges and defeat the threats caused by climate change, but we need to take action now. Time is simply not on our side.

Without question, taking action involves political risk, but doing nothing is simply not an option. The longer we

wait, the risks to our planet only grow more challenging and difficult to solve.

Our planet is showing clear, unequivocal evidence of climate change, according to an overwhelming scientific consensus. Our ice caps are melting. Our oceans are warming. Severe weather is becoming the new normal. Land temperatures are rising.

Just last week, an alarming new report found that the Great Lakes are warming more quickly than other parts of the country. This change will negatively impact fish species, lead to more algal blooms, cause flood damage to communities, homes, and businesses, and irreversibly alter a sensitive ecosystem that provides drinking water for 40 million Americans. I represent the Great Lakes State, and climate change threatens our economy and our way of life.

I am disappointed that instead of working together on commonsense efforts and treating climate change with the seriousness that it deserves, the Republican Senate majority leader has chosen to waste limited floor time on a political stunt.

What we should be doing is having a thoughtful debate on the need to address a significant threat to our country. Rather than playing partisan games, it is time to find unity and take bold action.

The Senate must come together to pass real, concrete policies that will help to mitigate climate change and to wean us from our dependence on fossil fuels. I know it is possible because I have worked on bipartisan efforts with my colleagues to advance clean energy and lower greenhouse gas emissions.

Together, we have advanced technology innovation, fueled our Nation's transportation with cleaner energy, bolstered our Nation's infrastructure to be more resilient to climate impacts, offered incentives for carbon capture sequestration, and boosted energy efficiency. These are all accomplishments that we have done together, but more needs to be done.

This Congress, as we consider a surface transportation reauthorization package, as well as a new Water Resources Development Act, would be foolish to ignore climate impacts as we spend taxpayer dollars for infrastructure. We must seize the opportunity presented by a clean energy economy to continue driving American innovation while creating sustainable good-paying jobs.

Today our auto industry in Michigan is rapidly working to advance electrification. Just last week, General Motors announced plans to add 400 jobs and invest \$300 million to build a new electric car at their Orion plant. But despite these efforts, our State and our country have been hurt by the lack of a coherent, cohesive, and forward-looking policy that grows our economy while protecting our environment.

We need a policy that ensures that renewable energy is produced here in America and done in a way that cre-

ates jobs and strengthens our national security. I know that we can do it if only we can find the political will.

Together, we can effectively confront climate change in a way that benefits Michigan workers and families, our Great Lakes, and the entire country.

The science is clear, but time is not on our side. We must take action now to confront climate change before it is too late. I urge my colleagues to stop playing political games. Let's roll up our sleeves and get to work on solving the climate change crisis together.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

DISASTER RELIEF

MR. ISAKSON. Thank you, Mr. President. I rise for a moment to talk about a vote we will have tomorrow in this Chamber on a motion to adopt an amendment to the supplemental appropriations passed by the House, and it is a disaster amendment dealing with the States that have been afflicted by disasters over the last 2 years—most of them southern States, but not all. Some include the Territory of Puerto Rico.

I am going to go over the details in a second, but first of all, some of you may see floating around this memorandum from the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the House and the vice chairman in the Senate. It talks about an agreement that was on the disaster money and refers to Puerto Rico being shortchanged and the fact that we need to make sure that that doesn't happen. I want to give you the facts.

Georgia, which I represent, is one of a number of States that includes Alabama, North Carolina, South Carolina, Alaska, California, and Hawaii, which have experienced significant disasters in the past 2 years. We saw the fires in California on our TVs. We saw the volcanoes in Hawaii. We saw the blueberries in Georgia fall off the vines and be destroyed. We saw what happened to these crops and Alaska's earthquake. All of these States have received nothing yet.

Puerto Rico has received \$40 billion—\$40 billion for what happened in Maria, and \$21 billion has not been spent. They have gotten a lot of money, \$40 billion, and the amendment I want to talk about in a second gives them \$600 million more.

There are a lot of places in this country that are States that we represent that have gotten nothing and have had big disasters in the last 2 years. These disasters are hurting our economy, our people, and our States.

So I want to—any of you to see this email or this flyer tomorrow or hear the debate tomorrow. What it says, the flyer says that the vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator LEAHY, is going to object to the substitute that will be offered by Senator PERDUE and myself tomorrow to the bill that will be debated unless Puerto Rico gets a better shake. The

point, Puerto Rico has gotten 40, only spent 19, they have got \$21 billion left to spend. We have \$600 million to see to it that they don't run out of SNAP money at the end of this month, which they will with everything that stands currently. Puerto Rico is being treated great. Is there CDBG money they want? No, it is not in there.

“Fair” is an interesting word. Fair is when you and I are treated fairly. We both get equal proportions, for money and things of that nature. Unfair is when somebody weights the formula—or someone takes undue advantage of a special situation.

Well, this is a special situation. A lot of people are going to go without help by the end of next month. Farm bills are going to come due, and banks are going to foreclose on them. A lot of people in agriculture will be hurt badly. People who have been hurt by the fires in California will not be helped. Those who expressed help for earthquake damage in Alaska will not be helped. A lot of people will not be helped.

We need to put off this guise of fairness and be really fair. Let's see that we put in the \$600 million, which the amendment does and see to it that people on SNAP in Puerto Rico get their money. Let's see to it that those people in Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina and other States damaged by floods, hurricanes, or fires get their money.

There will be more emergencies, and we all know that. We all hate emergencies for a lot of reasons—appropriators, especially. Nobody wants to have to do that, but when our State, your State or mine, is injured dramatically in a disastrous hurricane or tornado or whatever, we as a country have always passionately dealt with the results of those storms, the losses those States have felt, and helped those States get back on their feet and those people be served.

We are not asking for a handout; we are asking for a hand up in each of those States, and they have been waiting for a long time. Those who know what I am talking about, who is from Georgia, we have farmers who have gone through a cycle and their farm financing was done through banks that, at the end of this month, will have to act on those loans and call them for payment or have a refinance schedule knowing that they got some money coming down the line. If this passes and is agreed to by the House and the banks get the message that we are trying to help them like we have always had in the past, they will have a chance to make the negotiations, pay the money back that they borrowed, and do it over time and give people jobs in the field rather than go back and tell them we can't give them money and help them and lose the farm and business and us lose a lot of jobs.

It is just not right, and it is not fair. I used the word “fair” just then because I think fair is the definition of

seeing to it that Puerto Rico, Georgia, and South Carolina get help.

If you get this argument, read it. It sounds like we agreed to something 3 weeks ago, and now, all of a sudden, we are not agreeing to the same thing. That is not true. We agreed last week when we left what this vote would be tomorrow, what the supplemental will look like, what would be included in it, and as I understood it and my sense of understanding, we agreed to all the things. Was there enough money for Puerto Rico for what they wanted? No, they wanted more. Would Florida like more? Would Georgia like more? North Carolina like more? Yes. But in fairness of equity, it is fair and equitable to those people.

I would urge you to listen to the debate and what everybody tells you what happened before you make a decision and everyone gets hurt. Instead what you are going to do, if you fall for this scenario, you are going to really hurt some people who will otherwise be helped through deliberations that have taken over the part of the last 2 or 3 months.

Mr. President, I appreciate the time and the time to come here. I wish I could talk about something other than disasters, but I can't. A lot of people lost their lives and farms and their future. I want to see that we help in an equitable fashion in those States and those Territories that we do so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise to speak this afternoon on the upcoming vote on the majority leader's Green New Deal resolution, a resolution that, ironically, he apparently does not support.

First I want to say this about the Green New Deal: Even our Republican friends cannot deny that this resolution has sparked a national conversation and generated a great deal of enthusiasm among the American people, especially among younger Americans.

It reminds me of the time when I was a young naval flight officer stationed at Moffett Field Naval Air Station just south of San Francisco, waiting to be deployed to Southeast Asia during the Vietnam war. I joined millions of Americans across our country that year and celebrated our Nation's very first Earth Day.

As I listen to the rising chorus of voices calling for climate action today, I hear the sounds of that day in Golden Gate Park. I remember the urgency we felt then to address the environmental challenges facing our Nation and our world, and I feel an even greater sense of urgency today. That is why it is so disappointing to me that our Republican colleagues—not all of them but a number of them—are trying to make a mockery of the very real concerns and the passionate calls for action we are hearing from people all across this country and, indeed, all around the world.

This is not a time for derision. This is not a time for division. On an issue as serious as this one, we ought to be serious about addressing it. However, it has become clear that some—not all but some—of our Republican friends would rather have some fun and talk, maybe, about hamburgers and cheeseburgers and that kind of thing. Worse, some have conflated meaningful action on climate change with socialism.

With the death of our late colleague John McCain, I am the last Vietnam veteran serving in the U.S. Senate. I served 5 years in a hot war in Southeast Asia to oppose the expansion of communism. Shortly after we celebrated that first-ever Earth Day in 1970, I was sent on the first of three deployments in Southeast Asia before eventually serving another 18 years until the end of the Cold War as a Navy P-3 aircraft mission commander in the Naval Reserve and retiring as a Navy captain after chasing Soviet submarines in all of the oceans of the world.

I am not a socialist. Like most of our colleagues here, I am an American patriot and proud to be one. I care deeply about this planet, and I know we can have cleaner air and water while creating jobs. Those two things are not mutually exclusive. Our Republican colleagues know better than that, and they owe our country better than that.

In recent weeks, our Republican colleagues have thrown around a \$93 trillion number. That wildly overestimated number primarily refers to provisions in the Green New Deal that are not directly related to climate change.

At a time when our country is looking to Congress for leadership on climate action, hiding behind political games, deception, and scare tactics is irresponsible. It is cowardly when we ought to be brave.

Right now a clear majority of Americans want us, in Congress, to address the growing climate crisis that is facing our country and our planet. We should be having a fact-based, policy-driven conversation about tackling this crisis, and we should be talking about the real costs that confront us, including the cost of inaction.

I live in Delaware, the lowest lying State in our country. Our State is sinking. The oceans around us are rising. According to our Nation's leading scientists, climate change unchecked means more sea level rise, costing coastal communities up and down the east coast—like my State—trillions of dollars in economic damages over the next 80 years.

In the Northeast we are experiencing rain events in which we are measuring rain by the foot, not the inch. Not too far from where we stand today, Ellicott City, MD, has experienced not one but two 1,000-year floods. They have withstood not one but two 1,000-year floods in less than 2 years.

Today, our hearts go out to our neighbors along the Missouri River Basin as they are suffering through

catastrophic flooding. As of Friday, the cost of damage to Nebraska alone had already surpassed \$1.3 billion, and the damage to Iowa alone was estimated at \$1.6 billion. Some cities are currently without fresh water. In Missouri, entire communities have been evacuated. In Northwestern Missouri, roughly 40,000 acres of farmland was still underwater this past Friday.

Our Nation's scientists tell us that climate change unchecked means more frequent and more intense storms, meaning bomb cyclones. I didn't even know there was such a thing as bomb cyclones, but there are. Intense rainfalls and category 5 hurricanes are becoming the new normal.

Last year, we witnessed the tragic devastation caused by wildfires fueled by drought and heat, like the California wildfires. Imagine what we could face in 2050 when, according to our Nation's scientists, wildfire seasons burn up to six times more forest area each year.

The extreme weather events we see are already taking a toll on American lives, on American livelihoods, and our Nation's budget. According to NOAA, in 2017 alone, extreme weather cost Americans \$300 billion in economic damages—a new record. That same year, the Federal Government spent \$120 billion in Federal disaster spending for just four extreme weather events—just four.

Earlier this month, the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office released its biennial high-risk list and once again identified climate change as a significant fiscal risk to the Federal Government and, I might add, to taxpayers.

According to GAO, since 2005, Federal funding for disaster assistance has reached \$430 billion—nearly one-half trillion dollars—and those costs will continue to rise. GAO says: "Disaster costs are projected to increase as extreme weather events become more frequent and intense due to climate change."

NOAA and NASA tell us these numbers will be a drop in the bucket compared to our new climate future if we do not act on climate change. If we do not change course, just about every major economic sector in the United States will be negatively affected by climate change by the turn of this century. Some sectors could see hundreds of billions of dollars of losses every year.

Add it all up, and climate change could slash up to 10 percent of our gross domestic product, GDP, by 2100. I like to say, compared to what? Well, for context, that would be more than double the losses incurred during the great recession of the last decade. However, all of these costs are woefully underestimated. How can we put a pricetag on the toll of this destruction? What is the cost of our fourth-generation farm family who loses their land and their livestock? What is the cost of a bridge inundated by water, separating a community from a hospital or