

He couldn't have been more proud of his State, and they were always so proud of him.

At first glance, you might think we didn't have a lot in common. I am a northerner, and he was a southerner. We were from different political parties and different generations, but we both loved the blues and loved to play the piano. We were both passionate about agriculture and protecting the waters in our States, and we both deeply believed in bridging differences and working together to keep our country moving forward.

In his final speech on the Senate floor, Senator Cochran said this:

We have engaged in heated arguments. But even in full disagreement, I believe all our motivations begin at the same point: the sincere desire to serve our States and country.

Senator Cochran was always able to see the good in others, and I firmly believe that the Senate and our country would be a kinder, better place if more of us would follow his lead.

Senator Cochran was, above all, a statesman, and he was my friend. For that, I will always be grateful. I want to offer his family and friends and the entire State of Mississippi my deepest condolences.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 19TH AMENDMENT

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today as part of our national celebration of the 100th anniversary of U.S. women's suffrage.

Now, 100 years ago today, on June 4, 1919, Congress passed the 19th Amendment to the Constitution giving women the right to vote. This hard-fought legislative victory would ensure women's full participation in our democracy.

On August 18 of 1920, women's suffrage became U.S. law. Now, some of the people watching may not know that Wyoming was actually more than 50 years ahead of the Nation when it came to women voting. That is a fact.

This year, people back home in Wyoming are celebrating both the 100th anniversary of the U.S. women's right to vote and the 150th anniversary of Wyoming women's right to vote. Wyoming truly is the Nation's trailblazer when it comes to women's equality.

Many people think of Wyoming as the Cowboy State, and that name honors our State's great western heritage, but Wyoming is also known as the Equality State—the first State in the Nation to grant women the right to vote, long before statehood, actually, because, on December 10, 1869, the Wyom-

ing territory passed the first law in the United States granting women the right to vote and to hold public office. The law meant full civil and judicial equality with men.

The following year, on September 6, 1870, Louisa Ann Swain, of Laramie, WY, became the first woman in the United States—in the history of the entire country—to vote in a general election.

Twenty years later, Wyoming reaffirmed its commitment to women's rights as we sought statehood. Wyoming, categorically, refused to enter the Union without the right for women to vote. When standing on principle became a major sticking point, Wyoming stuck to its guns on women's equality.

In fact, retaining women's right to vote was so essential that Charles Burritt, of Johnson County, a delegate to the Wyoming Constitutional Convention, famously declared: "If we cannot come into the union of states with a platform of right, why then we will stay out and willingly remain in a territorial form of government until all of us have passed away to the grave." That is how important this issue was to the people of my home State of Wyoming.

In Congress, Joseph Carey was here as a Wyoming delegate to the U.S. House of Representatives. He presented the case for statehood in the House of Representatives. He emphasized the strong values of the people of Wyoming, values that included political parity between men and women. Members of Congress opposed to women's suffrage meanwhile argued strongly against Wyoming becoming a State. One Representative opposed to statehood even remarked—and I will quote him from the RECORD of the House of Representatives. He said: "Mr. Speaker, I do not hesitate to say that in my judgment the franchise has been too liberally extended." It is a Member of the House of Representatives arguing against allowing Wyoming to become a State.

Well, Wyoming, of course, won the debate narrowly. On March 26, 1890, the U.S. House of Representatives narrowly passed the Wyoming statehood bill by a vote of 139 to 127. The measure passed the Senate a few months later, and then on July 10, 1890—that is the day we became a State—President Benjamin Harrison signed Wyoming's statehood into law, naming the 44th State the "Equality State"—not the "Cowboy State," not a "Western State" but the "Equality State." Let me just say that my State may have been the 44th State to enter the Union, but Wyoming will always be the first when it comes to women's rights.

Wyoming has declared 2019 as "The Year of Wyoming Women," and on December 10 of this year, Wyoming will celebrate Wyoming's Women's Suffrage Day. It is a time to pay tribute to Wyoming's many women trailblazers, such as Nellie Tayloe Ross, who was Wyoming's 14th Governor and the first

elected woman Governor in the United States.

Governor Nellie Tayloe Ross completed the term of her late husband, Governor William Ross, who had died suddenly in office. She showed great courage and resolve by then running for election—and she did this against the advice of close family and friends—and she won. On January 5, 1925, Nellie Tayloe Ross became the first U.S. woman to be sworn in as Governor, serving with distinction until 1927. She didn't stop there. Nellie Ross went on to become the first female Director of the United States Mint, serving five terms here in Washington from 1933 to 1953. She died in 1977 at the age of 101.

I want to recognize another Wyoming trailblazer today—educator Estelle Reel. Estelle Reel was the first woman elected to Wyoming's statewide office as the superintendent of public instruction. Only 1 year later, in 1895, she became the first woman confirmed by the U.S. Senate to a Federal position, the Superintendent of Indian Schools.

There are a few more Wyoming women firsts whom I would like to mention.

On March 7, 1870, Esther Hobart Morris was the first woman to serve on a jury. That jury was in Laramie, WY. She was also the first female justice of the peace, appointed on February 17, 1870.

In 1870, Wyoming's Mary Atkinson became our country's first female court bailiff.

Wyoming was also home to the first all-woman city government, elected in 1920 in Jackson, WY, and they are shown here in this photograph as Wyoming's trailblazing women. The Jackson Press dubbed them "the petticoat government."

Clearly, the people of Wyoming and all Americans owe an incredible debt of gratitude to the Nation's extraordinary women leaders, past and present, so this year, we celebrate those first laws that gave women the right to vote and ensured their full participation in our democracy.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. JONES. Madam President, before I get into my initial remarks, let me commend my colleague, the Senator from Wyoming. I didn't know about all of the Wyoming women having been first in women's issues. I congratulate that State, and I hope that, given the record number of women we have in this body and in the Congress of the United States, we will continue that march toward progress that Wyoming started over 150 years ago.

H.R. 2157

Madam President, today I rise to speak about a disaster so many of our American citizens have experienced over the last few months. I am not talking about the historic flooding that has taken place in the Midwest. I am not talking about the devastating

tornadoes that have touched down all over the country, including most recently in my home State of Alabama. I am not even talking about Hurricane Michael, which hit Alabama's Wiregrass and wiped out entire fields of crops. We all agree those have been tragic and deadly natural disasters, but the disaster I want to talk about for a few moments today is the self-imposed disaster that was created by this U.S. Government that has taken place in the wake of these storms and natural disasters.

President Trump and certain Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle have managed to take what has traditionally been a bipartisan process and turn it into a political mess. It began last December when the President decided to insist on funding for some type of wall along our southern border. That demand resulted in the longest government shutdown in our Nation's history. It also set off a series of delays for badly needed disaster relief. Only after the President dropped his demand for wall funding could the government once again open and resume full operations.

After the government reopened and disaster relief was proposed in this new Congress, the President was locked into a political dispute with leaders in Puerto Rico and refused to provide the necessary aid to those American citizens—American citizens—and yet another stalemate thus began. As that stalemate dragged on, the President once again injected the issue of border security and immigration into the unrelated discussions regarding disaster relief. Finally, after a delay of several months that saw the occurrence of additional weather-related disasters, the President, just as he had done with the most recent government shutdown in January, resumed his political demands and signaled he would sign a clean bill that included only disaster relief.

That bill passed the Senate a couple of weeks ago by unanimous consent. Unfortunately, it did not pass the House last week because of three individuals who refused to let it pass the House also with unanimous agreement. It was only after the President withdrew his demands that the bill got to the Senate floor with enough support to garner the necessary votes to pass.

What was interesting about the bill that passed by unanimous consent in the Senate a couple of weeks ago and passed the House of Representatives just last night was the "lo and behold" moment as Republicans voted for the bill last night. A month ago, they had voted against an almost identical bill in order to please the President. They obediently switched their votes to aye when the President signaled his support.

Folks, I think it is somewhat shameful to play politics with people's lives the way we have done in this Congress over the last few months—to play politics with people's lives and their liveli-

hoods, especially when the political issues that were holding things up had really nothing to do with the important issues at hand.

You can see it here. This photograph shows what happened in the Wiregrass area of Alabama just last fall as a result of Hurricane Michael. On the left side of this graphic is the "before" picture. We had a record cotton crop that was ready to be harvested, and everyone was excited about the bumper crop we had. Hurricane Michael came through, and, with no pun intended, it was just gone with the wind—literally wiped out. That was last fall.

Then it was in March that the tornado season once again hit Alabama. This is one photograph, but I can show you many of the devastating effects of the tornado that touched down in Lee County in March, killing 23 people. I myself visited there with the first responders to comfort those who had lost loved ones and had lost everything.

What you cannot see in this picture is the littered countryside of Lee County, littered with not only the splintered trees but with people's lives—their homes, their belongings, their mobile homes that were scattered throughout the entire area. All was lost in that area and in Beauregard and in Smith Station. Yet these folks couldn't get the disaster relief they needed in a timely manner because it was being held up by the President and Congress. These folks had been through so much already, and the fact that we put them through so many months of uncertainty while they were waiting for help from their elected representatives is really unconscionable.

Now that this bill has passed—and I am assuming that as soon as the President comes back, he will sign it, as he signaled he would—I want to thank my senior colleague from Alabama, Senator SHELBY, and Senator LEAHY for their leadership in getting this bill across the finish line. I want to also say a special word of thanks to my neighbors from Georgia, Senator ISAKSON and Senator PERDUE, who worked tirelessly—so hard—to make this bipartisan deal such that the President would sign it.

Although it took far too long, I am certainly grateful that farmers and Americans across the country who have suffered from these disasters, experienced them firsthand, can finally breathe a sigh of relief today because of the disaster relief bill that has finally been passed.

(The remarks of Mr. JONES pertaining to the introduction of S. 1708 and S. 1709 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. JONES. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, 75 years ago tomorrow, June 5, 1944, General Dwight D. Eisenhower gave a speech to U.S. soldiers the day before the invasion of Normandy.

In that speech, he said this:

Soldiers, Sailors and Airmen of the Allied Expeditionary Force!

You are about to embark upon the Great Crusade, toward which we have striven these many months. The eyes of the world are upon you. The hopes and prayers of liberty-loving people everywhere march with you. In company with our brave Allies and brothers-in-arms on other Fronts, you will bring about the destruction of the German war machine, the elimination of Nazi tyranny over the oppressed peoples of Europe, and security for ourselves in a free world.

He ended his comments by saying:

I have full confidence in your courage, devotion to duty and skill in battle. We will accept nothing less than full Victory!

Good luck! And let us all beseech the blessing of Almighty God upon this great and noble undertaking.

It was an undertaking not just remarkable for its logistical effort and massive supply planning but for what it meant to humanity: a mobilization in the name of freedom to stand against evil and a massive undertaking uncertain of outcome to fight oppression for a free world.

I hope every American will take some time this week to reflect on that massive undertaking 75 years ago that ultimately led to the liberation of Europe, the destruction of Adolf Hitler, and the end of World War II and to reflect on the sacrifice and courage, the selfless acts of bravery, and the stories of families who never saw a loved one return.

The decision to move forward with the invasion was reached in late 1943. By May of 1944, nearly 3 million Allied troops were amassed in southern England. Gathered along with the millions of soldiers was the largest armada in world history, with over 4,000 ships from Canada, the United States, and Great Britain. There were 11,000 airplanes that participated in the invasion, pounding the shores and Nazi positions, and delivering supplies and thousands of troops up and down the coast of France.

The assault began shortly after midnight on June 6, 1944, with Allied bombers attacking targets along the coast and inland. More than 24,000 American, British, and Canadian airborne assault troops and 1,200 aircraft followed the air bombardment. At 1:30 a.m., the 101st Airborne Division began landing behind Utah Beach, and the 82nd Airborne Division began landing at 2:30 a.m. The second phase on the coast began at 5:30 a.m. when six Allied divisions and numerous small units began landing on five beaches. In total, the Allies landed more than 160,000 troops at Normandy—73,000 American, along with 83,115 British and Canadian forces—on Gold, Juno, and Sword Beaches.

By the end of the first day, Allied casualties were estimated at 10,000 killed, wounded, and missing in action: 6,603 Americans, 2,700 British, and 946 Canadians. From D-Day through August 21, the Allies landed more than 2 million men in northern France and

suffered more than 226,000 casualties, with nearly 73,000 killed or missing. They paid the ultimate price to save the world from tyranny, and their average age was 26 years old.

Etched in the pavement of the U.S. Armed Forces Memorial Garden in Normandy, France, are the words: "From the heart of our land flows the blood of our youth, given to you in the name of freedom." Let us never forget the sacrifice of the greatest treasure this Nation has and what these men and women did for a free world and free people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, one of the things I have noticed over the years that I have given these climate speeches is that corporate engagement on climate change has been one-sided, let's just say. It is clear who my adversaries have been—Big Oil, the coal lobby, the Koch brothers, and some very powerful corporate trade associations—the American Petroleum Institute, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the most powerful of all, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, so-called. In my view, it is more properly called the U.S. Chamber of Carbon. These adversaries have managed a big-money campaign, first, to sow doubt about or outright deny climate change and, second, to block action in Congress and Federal agencies to limit carbon pollution.

The International Monetary Fund just estimated fossil fuel subsidies in the United States at \$650 billion for 2015. Yes, that is "billion" with a "b." When you are defending that kind of subsidy, you spare no expense, which explains the millions of dollars spent by the fossil fuel industry and its trade group cronies in opposing climate bills, in supporting phony climate denial front groups, and in funding election attacks against candidates who might try to limit carbon pollution.

While the fossil fuel industry has been running roughshod around Washington, the rest of corporate America has sat on its hands. Even companies with gauzy website offerings on climate and strong sustainability policies within the company have done virtually nothing to support climate action in Congress. I could name names, but that would make it a very long speech because, basically, everybody in corporate America has been absent here.

There are, at long last, signs that corporate America is waking up to the climate fight it has been losing in Washington. When and if corporate America finally engages in the serious support of climate action, Congress will, once again, spring to life. After a 10-year drought, we could again see bipartisan legislation to reduce carbon pollution.

Why this new spurt of corporate engagement on climate change?

Look at the avalanche of warnings about the financial risks climate change poses to the global economy. In just the last few months, here are some of the warnings: 34 central banks, including Canada's, France's, and England's; a group of major reinsurers; the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco; the investment giant BlackRock; EPA economists and scientists; the Urban Land Institute; the investment advisory firm Mercer; the European Central Bank; and the investment advisory firm Sarasin & Partners. All have separately warned about climate change's tanking the economy.

There are agricultural as well as financial warnings. In April, the big food companies—Danone, Mars, Nestle, and Unilever—announced that they would begin advocating for Federal action on climate change. They see the risk climate change poses to the world's agricultural and water supplies.

Their preferred solution? A price on carbon:

Establish an ambitious carbon pricing system that sends a clear signal to the marketplace to reduce economy-wide greenhouse gas emissions aligned with the Paris Agreement goal to keep global temperature increase well below 2-degrees centigrade. An appropriate carbon pricing structure should be transparent in how prices are set, equitable in how revenue is appropriated to mitigate costs on the most vulnerable communities, and built to ensure our global competitiveness.

I fully agree.

Following on those food companies' heels, Microsoft announced that it, too, would begin advocating in Congress for Federal climate action. It joined the Climate Leadership Council—a group of economists, policymakers, businesses, and environmental groups—formed in 2017, to advance a price on carbon. Like the food companies, Microsoft sees a Federal price on carbon as the best policy to tackle climate change.

Then, in May, 13 more companies announced the CEO Climate Dialogue to advocate for climate action. Once again, these companies declared that they supported a price on carbon:

An economy-wide price on carbon is the best way to use the power of the market to achieve carbon reduction goals, in a simple, coherent and efficient manner. We desire to do this at the least cost to the economy and households. Markets will also spur innovation, and create and preserve quality jobs in a growing low-carbon economy.

Note that last sentence: "Markets will also spur innovation, and create and preserve quality jobs in a growing low-carbon economy."

One of the weird things about all of the remorseless opposition to climate action out of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers is that there is a heck of a lot of commerce and a heck of a lot of manufacturing in climate change solutions. So why are they so against them? It is an anomaly but not the only anomaly in climate denial.

Republican colleagues who wax poetic about the free market seem not to

notice this massive \$650 billion subsidy for carbon pollution. That is a big thing not to notice if you are serious about the free market. The last gasp of climate obstruction here in Congress is to talk about innovation as the magic climate solution. Here is the rub: Without a clear market signal in the form of a price on carbon, there will be little incentive to innovate. How do you innovate away a \$650 billion annual subsidy? How does the market work to reduce carbon pollution when carbon pollution is free? Innovations like carbon capture and storage aren't cheap. There is not much of a business case for these innovations—it is hard to see the revenue proposition—unless we put a price on carbon. Then innovation happens.

Am I wrong about market theory?

Let's go to Milton Friedman, the Nobel Prize-winning patron saint of market theory. He was unambiguous about pricing pollution.

He was asked: Was there a case for the government to do something about pollution?

He responded:

Yes, there's a case for the government to do something. There's always a case for the government to do something about it . . . when what two people do affects a third party [. . .] But the question is, What's the best way to do it? And the best way to do it is not to have bureaucrats in Washington write rules and regulations. . . . The way to do it is to impose a tax on the cost of the pollutants . . . and make an incentive for . . . manufacturers and for consumers to keep down the amount of pollution.

So, yes, putting a price on pollution to give an incentive to innovation is core free market principle.

I happen to share that faith in the power of the market to drive innovation when the market is working. But it is not going to happen when the market is distorted by a \$650 billion subsidy.

That is why I filed a carbon pricing bill to help correct that fossil fuel subsidy and balance the market, so those principles can go to work.

At the end of May, 75 companies came to Capitol Hill to advocate for carbon pricing. Together, those companies operate in all 50 States, have annual revenues over \$2.5 trillion, and have a market value of nearly \$2.5 trillion.

These companies met with dozens of lawmakers, both Democrats and Republicans, to make the case for a price on carbon—that it is the commonsense policy to dramatically reduce carbon pollution, drive the transition to a low carbon economy, and grow jobs and the economy. There is enormous economic and scientific support for that argument. There is little opposition to that argument or at least little opposition that can't be traced back to the mischief of the fossil fuel industry and its front groups. I hope my colleagues listened.

I also hope that other companies join in and help the American business community make climate action a