

into account future emissions from other sectors including shipping, aviation and heavy industry that will be hard to wean off of fossil fuels. Nor does it account for emissions related to fossil fuels extraction and pipelines or non-energy emissions such as from agriculture.

Emissions from yet-to-be-built ships, planes, factories and other fossil fuel-powered infrastructure will likely outweigh emissions saved from the early retirement of existing fossil fuel power plants, said Gunnar Luderer, head of the Energy Systems Group at the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research in Germany, who reviewed the study.

For the new study, the researchers used detailed datasets of fossil fuel-burning energy infrastructure operating in 2018 or planned. They found some progress, including “substantial” cancellations of proposed fossil fuel power plants in the past two years, which cut the expected emissions from future power plants by as much as half from studies conducted just a few years earlier.

In the U.S., utilities have been announcing plans to shut down coal-fired power plants and add more renewable energy as the costs of solar and wind power generation fall, but other types of fossil fuel infrastructure have been expanding—particularly natural gas drilling and pipelines to carry oil and gas, both for domestic use and for export to other countries. On June 20, for example, Energy Transfer LP announced it planned nearly double the capacity the Dakota Access oil pipeline, a project that was highly contested over both climate and environmental concerns when it was approved in 2017.

NO TIME FOR DEBATE OR DELAY

Other studies have used different methods to estimate emissions growth.

One study, published in *Nature Communications* in January, determined there was a 64 percent chance that existing energy infrastructure wouldn’t commit the planet to passing 1.5 °C warming, provided construction of additional fossil fuel energy infrastructure stopped immediately and other measures were taken to dramatically reduce emissions from all other sectors of the economy.

Such measures would have to happen in the immediate future, said Joeri Rogelj, a lecturer at the Grantham Institute at Imperial College London and a co-author of the January study.

“Both studies are really clear,” Rogelj said. “If we wait another 5 to 10 years with being serious about emissions reductions and addressing climate change then indeed we will have no discussion anymore whether we can still make it to 1.5. It will be very clear and obvious that we will run past it.”

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

STOP CRUELTY TO MIGRANT CHILDREN ACT

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, tonight I am rising to talk about legislation that I have introduced that now has 40 Senators sponsoring it. It is called the Stop Cruelty to Migrant Children Act.

I think all of us in America have seen so many stories of refugee children being treated in a horrific manner at the border or beyond the border in a system of child migrant prisons.

Just recently, we have had the story about 3-year old Sofia and her parents—Tania and Joseph—proceeded to experience horrific circumstances in which a gang killed Tania’s mother and her sister-in-law. A note was posted on the door that they would be killed, that they had 45 minutes to leave. I imagine all of us would flee with our children under those circumstances.

They made it to the border of the United States. They did get through an initial hearing which is designed to determine if there is credible fear of return, and that sets the stage then for an asylum hearing.

But we are shipping folks back into Mexico to await that asylum hearing. In this case, the little girl in the family—she has a heart problem, and she had suffered a heart attack—a 3-year old girl—yet we sent that family back into Mexico without friends, without family, without funds.

It is only because a Member of Congress heard about it—a Member in the House, Congresswoman ESCOBAR—and intervened, that the little girl was allowed to remain in the United States. Even then, the administration said you—the little girl, the 3-year old—you have to choose between which parent will be in the U.S. and which one will be sent back without funds, family, and friends into Mexico with the rest of the children.

It is a horrific situation to split the family in this process, horrific to ask a little girl to have to decide who would be in the safety of the U.S. and which parent would be sent back into very dangerous territory across the border. This is just one example out of thousands.

President John F. Kennedy said: “This country has always served as a lantern in the dark for those who love freedom but are persecuted, in misery, or in need.”

If President Kennedy were speaking today, he couldn’t say those words because today our country, under the current leadership, is not conducting itself in a manner that serves as a “lantern in the dark for those who love freedom but are persecuted, in misery, or in need.”

Instead, we have a new policy. It is a policy that was articulated by John Kelly just weeks after the administration took office. The policy was that if we inflict pain and suffering on refugees, it will deter immigration. The strategy of deliberately inflicting pain on refugees is not supportable under any moral code, under any religious tradition, or under any system of ethics.

Shortly after John Kelly, who was then head of Homeland Security, expressed this, there was a reaction. This was in the early months of 2017. As a result, they took the program under-

ground for a little more than a year, until June of 2018, when then-Attorney General Jeff Sessions gave a speech called “Zero Tolerance.” Six months out from an election, it is not unusual to have an Attorney General give a speech in which getting tough on crime is emphasized. But as you read the details of that speech, you realize this wasn’t about getting tough on crime. This was about returning explicitly to the vision that John Kelly had laid out originally of tormenting refugees in order to discourage immigration. That is a whole different thing. It is not zero tolerance; it is zero humanity.

Every one of us can picture relatives coming to this country and to this border and would want them to be treated with respect and decency as they pursue asylum.

Most people do not win their asylum hearings. The rate of success is different in different districts. In some, it is 15 percent. In some, it is 20 percent. In some, it is 30 percent. But the burden of proof is on the refugee. The burden of proof is difficult to establish, so most people do not succeed if they do not have extensive evidence to make their case on the fear of return.

The initial hearing is easy in the sense that you simply have to assert that you have a credible fear based on your story, but in the asylum hearing, you have to prove it. You carry the burden of proof. Is it too much for us to continue the vision of treating those fleeing war and those fleeing famine, those fleeing conflict and violence—is it too much for this America that we love to treat them with decency and respect as they go through the adjudication process for asylum? It is not. In fact, that has been the vision of America; that has been the process in America to say that if you are truly fleeing these horrific circumstances, then we light a torch to shine your way forward.

I cannot understand how it is possible that the administration persists in this strategy of traumatizing children. It starts at the border, where Customs and Border Protection has been instructed to set up a blockade and block children who arrive right at the line on the middle of the pedestrian bridge or the pathway and then block them from entering while they call up Mexican officials to come and drag them away.

I saw this down in McAllen a year ago June. Three CBP officers were stretching across the bridge. Anyone who did not have a passport or a visa was sent back into Mexico in violation of international law and our domestic law. I asked why we would do this to refugees fleeing persecution. Basically, the answer was this: We are too busy. We are too crowded.

The only thing was, there was no crowding, not at that time. There was no crowding at all. The interview rooms were empty. The processing center at McAllen was empty. It was simply a strategy of slamming the door shut.

For these families sent back across the border without friends and family and extension funds to support them, it is very dangerous across the border. This is happening with children at Tijuana. I was told of numerous circumstances where unaccompanied children would come to the border, and they would be blocked at the entry, and then the CBP would say: Well, we can't let you step across that line until we consult with the manager. Then the U.S. side would call up the Mexican side to come drag these kids away.

I got a phone call. I was in my office here, working late at night. I think it was about 11 p.m. at night. I got a phone call from a group that has helped escort children. They said: We have three French-speaking children on the border in Tijuana. They are at the line with the U.S. gate, and the U.S. Customs and Border Protection officer is blocking them from stepping across that line, and they are very worried because if the Mexican officials come and apprehend them, they could be sent back to the horrific circumstances—the life-and-death challenges that they were fleeing from.

I had spoken previously to the head of that sector. I had a phone conversation, and he said: No, our policy is to facilitate the movement. Our instructions to our officers are to facilitate the children in crossing that line as if they were our own children.

I said: Well, do you have training for this, because I keep hearing reports of the blockade at the border.

He said: Yes, we have musters.

I said: Well, do you have training documents that say that it is your policy to treat these kids as if they were your own and facilitate bringing them across?

He said: Yes, absolutely.

The Legislative Affairs Director cut in on the phone call to say: I will have that for you tomorrow. I will have those for you tomorrow.

We are still waiting for those documents. I don't know that they exist. I don't know that the training exists. What I do know is that after I had that conversation, I got a call from the border with this volunteer group, and they had these three French children who were being denied entry. I asked the volunteer who was with the children—I said: Hand your phone to the American officer. I will explain the conversation I had with the head of the sector and the policies that he says are in place and the training that is supposed to be in place that says you are supposed to treat these children as if they were your own and facilitate their passage across the border.

The CBP officer said: No, I am not talking to a U.S. Senator. I will talk only to the President of the United States.

I said: Turn on the loud speaker on the phone. Hold your phone up so that they can hear what I am saying.

I told them the same thing—that I had met with their supervisors for the

sector, and their bosses had said: These are the guidelines. Your guidance is to treat these children who are in front of you as if they were your own and to facilitate their passage across that line to safety and not leave them stranded in Tijuana.

Realize that being stranded in Tijuana for any child is horrific. Imagine it is your child. Whether your child is 17 or whether your child is 5, Tijuana is an incredibly dangerous place. There are all kinds of sex industry operators there who thrive on pulling little kids and teenagers into that sex industry. Do you want your child there with no friends and family or funds on the street in that setting? There are gangs who prey on the children who are on the street. Do you want your children in that setting? No, of course you would never want them left in that situation.

This border blockade is the first piece of traumatizing children to discourage immigration. It is morally wrong, and it needs to end.

Then there is the metering program. Basically, metering says that if you come to the border, we will not let you cross. But if you come the following day to a square near the border, there will be a book, and you can put your name in the book and get on a wait list. That is called metering.

So I went to the square in Tijuana where this is done to watch the metering process. People arrive with the book, and they place it on a little table under a little canopy. They start calling out names. That day, the United States was taking about 30 people, and when all of the spaces were full, that was it.

Then everyone else on the wait list is waiting. If I recall right, the wait had been about 6 or 7 weeks for people to be able to get just a credible fear interview, which is the very first step. Realize that a credible fear interview is not complicated. It can be done expeditiously. It means 6 to 7 weeks with no money on the streets of some hostile city across the border.

I want to show you a picture that perhaps you have seen. It is a picture that deeply, profoundly disturbs me. This is a father and little girl swimming the Rio Grande. They didn't just try to swim the Rio Grande. They came to a port of entry of the United States of America. They did what the President of the United States, President Trump, said to do. They came to the port of entry, and they asked for asylum. They were metered and sent back to Mexico to fend for themselves for who knows how long—as long as the wait list ends.

It is dangerous to have a mother, a little girl, or a father on the streets of a hostile city. If you wouldn't send your child into that, if you wouldn't send your sister and your sister's child into it, then we shouldn't be sending others into this perilous circumstance. It is so perilous there, and you have no way to even buy food. You certainly

don't have money for a hotel. You have been stripped of your funds during your journey. You fled suddenly to begin with and probably didn't have resources on the front end of the journey. So what do you do? You say: Well, I can starve and be beaten up—or who knows what horrific treatment here—or I can go and cross between the ports of entry and ask for asylum.

That is what they did. It was because they were rejected at the port of entry—the very place President Trump said to come—that they lie dead on the banks of the Rio Grande, trying to get out of the incredibly hostile situation across the border. This is the deliberate infliction of trauma, and for every situation like this, there are life-and-death decisions.

This is not the end of it.

Let's say they had made it across the border and had been taken into a processing center. What would happen in those processing centers? Well, in the first one I went to in McAllen, there wasn't room to sit down. There certainly wasn't room to lie down. You had little kids in there who were crying and mothers who were crying, and the fathers were in cells that were across the aisle on the other side. They were holding these Mylar blankets. There were no cushions on the ground, and there were lights left on all night long.

We have heard the reports of all of the various things we have done to children in these processing centers—of our not providing diapers, showers, soap; of our making it difficult for them to go to the bathroom; of our making it difficult for them to get water; of our not providing three meals a day; and of our not providing medical aid.

What kind of country treats children in this manner? Who does this with our tax money, on our land, and by our government? This is more than wrong. This is cruel. This is evil. This is the depth of darkness to treat children in this fashion. That is why 40 of us have introduced this Stop Cruelty to Migrant Children Act. The processing center isn't the end of it.

Then we have a for-profit prison in Homestead that is paid \$750 a day on a no-compete contract. Who is on the board of that? He is the same John Kelly who started the child separation strategy in March of 2017 and who then served as the President's Chief of Staff. He is paid to be on the board of a for-profit. He is paid to lock up children. It is the largest child prison in American history.

Now, if some other country had wanted to throw children back across the border into hostile circumstances, if some other country had set up a metering program that had left children vulnerable for weeks before their initial credible hearings, if some other country had proceeded to put children into holding cells and kept the lights on all night and had given them no mattresses to lie on and had not supplied

diapers, hygenics, food and water, or medical treatment as appropriate, and if some other country had locked up children in a child prison that had been built to a capacity of 3,200 children at a for-profit and had had no incentive to pass the children on to State-licensed care facilities or to sponsors with homes, we would have 100 Senators down here on this floor, saying we have to stop this because we stand up for children in the United States of America.

So what I want to know is: How come there aren't 100 Senators down here today, standing up against this type of treatment? I invite all 100 of my colleagues to join this bill to stop cruelty to migrant children.

I was struck by some of the comments by the kids who were being held down in Clint.

A 12-year-old boy said:

I'm hungry here at Clint all the time. I'm so hungry that I awaken in the middle of the night with hunger. Sometimes I wake up from hunger at 4 a.m. and sometimes at other hours.

A mother recounted that when she asked for medicine for her son's fever, an agent retorted: "Who told you to come to America with your baby anyway?" How about, instead, we get help for the child who has a fever.

There are children being held in cages, children being marched in single lines between Army-style huts, children who have been inflicted with trauma through child separation, children who have been locked up in a for-profit prison that has no incentive to move children to State-licensed facilities. In fact, it is the opposite. It is by a company that got a no-compete contract. Who is on the board? He is the former Chief of Staff to President Trump.

So what does this bill do?

It ensures that children are not thrown back across the border when they come up to the border of the United States. It ensures that children receive prompt medical assistance. Many children have died from fever. By just using a simple device to check the fever, it would enable you to know if this child needs additional help. It would ensure that basic hygiene and three meals a day are provided. It would allow for more caseworkers to be hired to help children to be moved quickly to State-licensed facilities or to homes, and homes are really where they should be while they await asylum. Children belong in schools and homes and on playgrounds, not behind barbed wire in a for-profit prison that is designed to hold 3,200 people down in Homestead, FL. This bill would prohibit that devilish, misdirected strategy of paying for and incentivizing the imprisonment of children.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said: "Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter."

I hear a lot of silence in this Chamber on the horrific treatment of children. Let's have a little less silence and a little more advocacy. Let's have 100

Senators sign up for the Stop Cruelty to Migrant Children Act. America is better than the way we have been treating these children. I give thanks to all 40 Senators who have signed on to this legislation.

In our hearts, I think it is fundamentally understood that deliberately traumatizing children in order to discourage immigration is wrong. We have a responsibility to end it.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

TRIBUTE TO AVES THOMPSON

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, it is that time of week again. It is the time when I get to recognize a special person from a special place—the great State of Alaska—in what we call our "Alaskan of the Week." It is one of the best times of the week for me because I get to talk about Alaska's community and its individuals. I think we have new pages here, but I think the pages unanimously agree every year that this is the most exciting speech of the week. I will not disappoint because you get to learn about Alaska, and whether it is summer—right now—or winter, you get to learn about what people are doing in Alaska.

I recognize Mr. Aves Thompson today. He is one of the many people in my State who has worked diligently to ensure that Alaska runs well and that goods get properly transported from one place in Alaska to another place. We are a big State. He ensures that when delivering things, the systems that make a functional State and a functional society are in working order in Alaska. Now, I will get to what Aves has done in a minute here and will talk about him. What I always like to do is talk a little bit about what is going on in Alaska right now.

The weather is gorgeous, and the fishing is great. A couple of weeks ago, I was up on the mighty Yukon River, which is way up north. I was with my wife and three daughters and a bunch of family members. We were fishing for one of the most iconic fish on the planet—the Yukon River king. It is a time of festivals and parades all across the State.

Last week, I was at Eagle River, which is about 15 minutes north of Anchorage, for the Bear Paw Festival. Among other things, many Alaskans—myself included—partook in the Slippery Salmon Olympics. I am not going to describe exactly what happened, but as you can imagine, it involved running and obstacles with salmon. It was a lot of fun. So it is a great time to be in Alaska, and I encourage everybody who is watching on TV to come on up. You will love it. I guarantee it will be the trip of a lifetime.

As you know, events like these reflect something larger about a place. They reflect ties and commitment and, importantly, people and community. They reflect people who help each

other and spend their lives working to make things better. So let me introduce you to Aves Thompson, our Alaskan of the Week. He is someone who has definitely spent his life making Alaska better and, more fundamentally, making Alaska work well and efficiently.

I will admit it. Alaska is not the easiest place in which to live. For one, it is really far away from the rest of the lower 48. I am going to get on a plane. I try to get home every weekend, so I will go home tomorrow afternoon. It will be about 11½ hours door-to-door, one way, to get to my home in Anchorage. That is pretty far. The winter weather, of course, can be brutal. Our mountains and our tundra are beautiful, but it can be challenging, to say the least, to build on that terrain.

Getting goods in and out of Alaska is particularly vexing in a State the size of Alaska. Now, my colleagues from Texas don't always like to hear about it, but I like to say, if you were to split Alaska in half, then Texas would be the third largest State in the country because we are 2½ times the size of the State of Texas. More than that, we are a continental-wide, expansive State. When you look at communities like Ketchikan, which is down in the southeast, at communities like Barrow, which is in the north, and all the way out west to the end of the Aleutian Islands chain, you will literally cover Florida, North Dakota, and San Francisco. That is the size of Alaska. So it is a challenge to move things.

Aves Thompson is currently the head of the Alaska Trucking Association. He has spent his entire career working to make sure Alaskans get the goods they need not only to survive but to thrive. He has also worked to ensure that the goods are measured properly and that people aren't overpaying for them. This is very important.

Aves and Phyllis, his wife, came to Alaska in 1970. First, it was to visit friends, then to build a life. They love the State. They love the weather. They love the people. They love the community. Phyllis taught elementary school, and eventually Aves worked for a small trucking company. Then he worked for the State as, first, the division director of the Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Program and then as the director and the chief of the Alaska State Division of Measurement Standards. Now, that is a mouthful, but it is a really important job.

What does it mean?

It means that he was in charge of all of the scales in Alaska—everything from the scales to weigh your fruit at the grocery store and your gas at the pump to the scales that weigh huge shipments of goods that come into our State.

When she was a little girl, Kristin, who is Aves' daughter, remembers how her father used to always check the scales at the grocery store. So she told her friends that her father weighed cheese for a living. That is a family