

Student athletes may also combine other sources of financial aid, including Federal or State need-based aid, to help pay for the full cost of attendance. These include Pell grants, for example, which could be \$6,300 a year, supplemental education community grants, work-study, State grants based on need using Federal calculations, such as the Tennessee HOPE Scholarship or the GI bill. About 92,000—or 20 percent—of the student athletes receive Pell grants also.

According to the College Board, the value of a 4-year undergraduate degree is \$1 million over a lifetime, and according to the NCAA, 88 percent of Division I student athletes will earn a 4-year degree.

So the question at hand is, Should Congress act, or should varying State laws govern payments for name, image, and likeness to student athletes? Is a patchwork set of regulations worth the confusion it will cause with unrestrained boosters, creative agents, the impact on title IX on men's and women's programs, on a coach's effort, and most of all on the tradition of the student athlete? That is the Commerce Committee's job. We heard some interesting testimony this morning.

Based on my experience as a student athlete, as a member of the Knight Commission, and as a university president, I offered these suggestions:

The Knight Commission is correct to say that student athletes shouldn't be on the payroll. They shouldn't be treated as hired hands.

Two, Congress should act but in a limited way—as limited as possible—to authorize an independent entity, safe from litigation, to write rules governing payments for the use of name, image, and likeness. Congress should provide aggressive oversight of that entity rather than try to write the rules ourselves.

Three, that governing entity ought to be the NCAA. I know, I know—the NCAA is controversial, but if it is not doing its job, the presidents who are supposed to be in charge of it should reform it. Giving the job to a new entity would take forever. Giving it to an existing entity like the Federal Trade Commission, without expertise and without any responsibility for higher education, would make no sense.

Now, as to the rules that I would hope the NCAA would write, here is what I believe should be the overriding principle: Money paid to student athletes for their name, image, and likeness should benefit all student athletes in that institution. Following this principle would allow the earnings to be used for additional academic support, further study or degrees, more insurance options, and more support for injured players and other needs. It would avoid the awkwardness of a center who earns nothing snapping the ball to a quarterback who earns \$500,000 from the local auto dealer. It avoids the inevitable abuses that would occur with agents and boosters becom-

ing involved with outstanding high school athletes. It would avoid the unexpected consequences to other teams in an institution because of the impact on title IX or the impact on existing student aid available to athletes.

Such a principle would preserve the right of any athlete to earn money for the use of his or her image, name, or likeness. It simply says: If you elect to be a student athlete, your earnings should benefit all student athletes at your institution. If you want to keep the money and be someone's employee, go become a professional.

This system would create the same kinds of choices that today's NCAA rules for college baseball require. A high school student must stay 3 years if he chooses to participate in a college baseball program. Take Vanderbilt's baseball program. David Price, Sonny Gray, and Dansby Swanson—Major League fans know they are all very successful professional athletes—all were drafted by Major League baseball teams while they were in high school. They could have earned a lot of money going directly into professional baseball. Instead, they chose a Vanderbilt education, 3 years of college experience, and the opportunity to be taught by Coach Tim Corbin, a great teacher. If Price, Gray, and Swanson had been permitted to sell their name, image, and likeness while at Vanderbilt, under the principle I am suggesting, their earnings would have been used for the benefit of all of Vanderbilt's sports teams, men and women.

Applying such a principle to all intercollegiate athletics might cause a few talented athletes to join professional leagues immediately after high school. That is their right. But if that young athlete prefers the college experience, the expert coaching and teaching, the free education, the other academic support, and the undergraduate degree that can earn \$1 million over a lifetime, then their earnings ought to benefit all the student athletes at the institution.

While the NCAA is making new rules, I suggest it ought to assign most of the new television revenue that comes to institutions—let it go to institutions and be used for academic support for student athletes rather than continue to encourage inordinately high salaries for some coaches.

As I said at the beginning, I don't see a good ending to allowing a few student athletes to be paid by commercial interests while most of their teammates are not. If they want to be part of the team, enjoy the undergraduate experience, learn from coaches who are great teachers, and be paid a full scholarship that could help them earn \$1 million during their lifetimes, their earnings should benefit all the student athletes. If they prefer to keep the money for themselves, let them become professionals.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I begin by asking that the RECORD reflect how much I am going to miss the Senator from Tennessee when he is gone at the end of this year. It is nice to be on the floor with him.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Madam President, I am here for the 271st time to call this Chamber's attention to climate change and to two of the reports on this defining issue of our generation.

As I speak, wildfires are devouring the American West and consuming American lives: east of Salem, OR, two people dead in a scorched vehicle; in Butte County, CA, three dead, overrun by a fast-moving fire; in Ashland, a 1-year-old boy; in Malden, WA, almost the entire town burned down; half a million Oregonians evacuated due to fire. That is 1 out of 10 people in the entire State.

Over the weekend, Oregon's emergency management director said they are preparing for a "mass fatality event."

Paradise, CA, suffered apocalyptic destruction in the 2018 Camp Fire. It is, once again, under fire warnings, this time the North Complex fire, which has stunned firefighters with its rapid growth and ferocity.

We cannot avoid it. Climate change is here. Plenty of factors contribute to individual wildfires, but climate change is now always among them.

Last fall, I went out to the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Colorado and met leading wildfire researcher Daniel Swain. As Dr. Swain puts it:

Climate change has not just made the extreme heat waves that coincide with fires worse. The bigger effect is the more subtle, long-term warming. That couple of degrees of (average) warming over decades . . . it's lurking in the background, sucking extra moisture out of the vegetation and the soil.

The new normal is smoke, ash, orange skies, and constant nerve-fraying vigilance.

Climate change's impacts through the West land crushing economic blows. The 2018 Camp Fire that burned Paradise cost \$16.7 billion. NOAA says natural disasters—mostly hurricanes and wildfires, both highly climate-related—inflicted \$91 billion worth of damage that year, 2018; and over the past 40 years, 241 climate- and weather-related disasters have cost Americans \$1.6 trillion.

The first report I want to talk about warns that it is not just what is lost in floods and flames. As climate risk worsens, the harder it is for communities to rebuild, for bankers to write mortgages, for owners to find insurers willing to continue to write policies and pay out claims. That risk spreads beyond burned or flooded land and runs through the rest of the economy.

Climate risk becomes what economists call systemic risk. So one of our leading regulatory agencies, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, has done a report on risk.

Think of the 2008 financial crisis. That home mortgage problem spread far beyond mortgage lenders into a brutal global recession. Millions of people who had no connection to a bad mortgage lost their jobs, lost their homes, or lost their retirement savings. Many are still recovering from that collapse.

Now think even worse. The Stanford Business School's Corporations and Society Initiative believes "the financial risks from climate change are systemic"—there is that economic word again—that these risks are "singular in nature"; and that "[g]lobal economic losses from climate change could reach \$23 trillion—three or four times the scale of the 2008 Financial Crisis."

Those of us who were here for the 2008 financial crisis don't want to see that happen again, and we certainly don't want to see it happen at a three- or four-times scale.

Senator SCHATZ and I have been calling for financial regulators to do a better job accounting for these risks. In May, we wrote to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission Subcommittee on Climate-Related Market Risk. We had two simple requests: One, recommend a carbon price, and, two, urge our financial regulators to include climate risks in their core market risk assessments and supervisory practices.

The CFTC Subcommittee report is out, and I am happy to report that they did both. They write: "Financial markets will only be able to channel resources efficiently to activities that reduce greenhouse gas emissions if an economy-wide price on carbon is in place at a level that reflects the true social cost of those emissions." That is actually kind of economics 101, but it is good to hear them say it.

They went on to say:

Climate change poses a major risk to the stability of the U.S. financial system and to its ability to sustain the American economy. . . . U.S. financial regulators must recognize that climate change poses serious emerging risks to the U.S. financial system, and they should move urgently and decisively to measure, understand, and address these risks.

And what if we don't? Well, the CFTC report goes on: Failing to act would lead to what they called "disorderly repricing of assets"—that is commonly known as a crash—"with cascading effects" through the economy. Put simply, do nothing and trigger financial chaos far and wide, just like 2008, except probably worse.

The CFTC report calls for corporate America to tell the truth about climate-related risks to their business models. Investors need to know the truth for the free market to operate. The subcommittee writes that we must require "disclosure by corporations of information on material, climate-related financial risks . . . to ensure that climate risks are measured and managed effectively."

That is a key point. We have seen Exxon, for instance, downplay climate

risks to investors, shareholders, and the general public. That mischief will stop if financial regulators require an honest accounting of climate-related risks.

The CFTC report is a big deal, but it requires Congress to act. America is among the few industrialized nations worst prepared for wide-ranging reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Regulators will not be enough; Congress must act.

That is where another report comes in, the Senate Democrats' Special Report on the Climate Crisis. Under Chairman SCHATZ's leadership, we recently released a roadmap for fixing that problem. We propose a plan to cut emissions across our economy, to get on course to limit warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius, to create a host of well-paying jobs in clean energy and other emerging technologies, and to remedy the burdens of pollution across all sectors of the economy, including those usually overlooked.

We know we have a battle ahead. The fossil fuel industry runs a covert operation that has blocked progress in Congress. This covert op is extremely well funded and has reached its roots deeply into our politics. We need to tear up those roots. This is how.

First, our report tells the dark story of that covert op: the story of the fossil fuel industry apparatus built to obscure the industry's hands behind phony front groups, the story of capture and control of corporate trade associations, the story of lives marketed by flashy PR firms, and the story of brute-force political spending and threats to blockade climate progress.

Those tactics were a test run for the fossil fuel industry by Big Tobacco: Manufacture false doubt in science and flex your political muscle against anyone who dares to challenge you. That bullying worked pretty well, and then when the Supreme Court handed down *Citizens United*, the fossil fuel industry supercharged its covert campaign with dark money, almost immediately turning the ability to spend unlimited money in politics into spending unlimited dark money in politics. Then the bullying worked really well.

Citizens United was a climate watershed. After that decision unleashed its fearful weaponry, not one Republican in this body joined any comprehensive bill to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. The Senate heartbeat of bipartisan climate activity before *Citizens United*, which I remember and experienced in 2007, 2008, and 2009, all flat-lined under the supercharged political pressure unleashed by fossil fuel interests with *Citizens United* behind them.

Our Senate report tells the full rotten story because that is step 1 in fighting covert influence. Follow the money. Show the American people how corporate interests pay to block progress on climate. Show the co-opted trade associations and the phony front groups. Let the American people see the scheme, and they are less likely to fall for it.

Second is cleaning it up. Fully exposing and ending *Citizens United* dark money and the fossil fuel scheme will take reform. Bold transparency measures like the DISCLOSE Act are needed, and our report calls for that.

Then, we need to wake up the so-called good guys in corporate America. They need to see the mischief a few bad actors have perpetrated right under their noses. They need to see how the fossil fuel industry commandeered their corporate trade associations, like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which is one of the two most obstructive organizations against climate action. Why would the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, with its wide corporate membership, be one of the two most obstructive organizations against climate action unless the fossil fuel industry had co-opted it right under their noses?

The so-called good guys need to examine how their own lobbyists and their own trade associations and their own political operatives are doing on climate because with very few and very rare exceptions, the answer is that they are doing nothing on climate, not lifting a finger in Congress.

Just last week, the giant tech companies came in through their trade group TechNet, with a 13-page list of all of their lobbying priorities—13 pages and not a mention of climate. Google, Apple, Microsoft, Facebook—the Big Tech barons—a lot of big talk, and they never even mentioned climate in their shopping list for Congress.

Everyone needs to understand the two faces of corporate America and to imagine how quickly Congress would act if powerful trade associations like the chamber became actual advocates for serious climate policies or if the big interests in Congress, like Big Ag, or Big Tech, or Wall Street, or the insurance industry actually took an interest in something more than their own special interest programs and tax benefits.

What if climate had been on Big Tech's list of priorities, perhaps even on page 1 of 13? That would change the game.

A 16th century alchemist by the name of Paracelsus is credited with the phrase "*sola dosis facit venenum*," Latin for "the dose makes the poison." The dose makes the poison. The idea is that everything from a nerve agent to the water we need to drink to survive can be lethal if delivered in sufficient dosage.

Right now, in the American West, toxins in the climate wildfire smoke waft in such high concentrations that our typical measurement systems fail. The dosage is literally off the charts. In our Earth's atmosphere, the dosage of carbon dioxide is way outside the range of human experience, putting all of mankind into uncharted territory, to face unprecedented dangers.

Citizens United unleashed toxic doses of money, unprecedented doses of virulent dark money, into our American

political atmosphere. So our democracy is poisoned, stunned by secret fossil fuel money and threats, and, consequently, failing to listen to plain warnings like those of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

We had better act before the poison has overpowered us, and we had better get the dosages back to safe and normal levels. One good start would be to wake up to the reality of climate change.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL SCOTT GRANT

Mr. JONES. Madam President, one of the great privileges that I have enjoyed as a U.S. Senator and a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee has been the opportunity to get to know and support our men and women in uniform. I have been proud to represent the people of the great State of Alabama, a State where patriotism runs deep and for whom service is a way of life.

Col. Scott Grant, U.S. Air Force, is a perfect example. Colonel Grant retired this summer, and since I was not able to attend his retirement ceremony this past Saturday, I decided I would say here what I wanted to say there, in the hangar in Birmingham, AL, where he had spent the last few years of his career.

Colonel Grant retired as the commander of the 117th Air Refueling Wing, Alabama Air National Guard, Sumpter Smith Joint National Guard Base in Birmingham, AL.

The 117th was the first military installation that I visited after my election in 2017 and swearing-in, in January of 2018. I can tell you, at that first visit, Colonel Grant set a pretty high bar for the future visits I would have to the many other military installations in Alabama, and we have quite a few. He set a high bar for those I would meet later because of his dedication to his unit, to his mission, and to the men and women he commanded.

It was immediately apparent—his dedication and professionalism—and it has guided his every decision in all our interactions over the next 2½ years. Scott's unwavering commitment to excellence earned him the respect of all those who served with him, but his genuine love for the men and women who served under his command earned him their affection. In other words, Col. Scott Grant had and has his priorities in order, and everyone who knew him and met him could see that immediately.

In 2019, the 117th won STRATCOM's Omaha Trophy. The Omaha Trophy is one of the most prestigious awards in the military. It was the first time that an Air National Guard unit had received this prestigious award. Then STRATCOM Commander Gen. John Hyten said: "The Omaha Trophy represents the best of the best in units executing strategic deterrence."

The 117th won in the area of strategic aircraft for their many missions

around the world protecting America. It was an award that the unit and Colonel Grant richly deserved. I was really honored to be present at that awards ceremony, and I can remember, as Brigadier General Stevenson said: "To put it simply, the 117th Air Refueling Wing was the most outstanding in their Nuclear Operational Readiness Inspection and their dedication to the mission itself. As a traditional guard unit, but with a total force, they have accomplished unique tasks and in an innovative way that we absolutely need to meet future challenges that STRATCOM faces." True to form, in his acceptance speech, Scott gave the credit to the men and women in his command.

With 7,000 military flight hours, Scott's deployments have spanned the globe, and his awards and decorations are almost too numerous to list. Here are just a few: the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal with two oakleaf clusters, Air Medal with seven oakleaf clusters, Aerial Achievement Medal with two oakleaf clusters, Air Force Outstanding Unit Award with Valor and two oakleaf clusters, Combat Readiness Medal with 10 oakleaf clusters, National Defense Service Medal with one Bronze Star, the Southwest Asia Service Medal with three Bronze Stars, the Kosovo Campaign Medal with one Bronze Star, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal with one Bronze Star, the Iraq Campaign Medal with one Bronze Star, the Humanitarian Service Medal, the Alabama National Emergency Service Medal and Service Medal with one device, the Alabama Special Service Medal—and the list just goes on and on.

We could be here all night, but I will stop there and just say that, rated as a command pilot and an instructor, Colonel Grant has been described as a pilot's pilot, one from whom you learn something every time you fly with him.

So it is good news for the Air Force. The good-news-bad-news story: The bad news is the retirement from the 117th, but the good news is, in his retirement, Colonel Grant is going to continue training airmen on the KC-135 simulators in Oklahoma.

Scott, you have served your country with honor and distinction, and you are a credit to the State of Alabama and the United States of America. It is my great honor to call you a friend. Thank you.

Congratulations on an outstanding career. Best wishes for clear skies in retirement, and although I did not serve in the military, I salute you, sir.

REMEMBERING ROBERT EDINGTON

Madam President, just a few weeks ago Alabama lost one of its most distinguished and dedicated citizens, and I lost a great friend. Robert Edington, of Mobile, AL, died peacefully on July 26 with his beloved wife of 58 years, Patricia, at his side. I rise today to honor the life and legacy of this patriot; this

public servant; this devoted husband, father, grandfather, and friend.

Robert was born in Mobile on November 18, 1929, and Mobile remained in his blood until the day he died. The son of a local judge, Robert earned his undergraduate degree at Rhodes College but came back home for his law degree at the University of Alabama.

He served our Nation in the military while on Active Duty with the U.S. Navy from 1951 to 1955. During his active military career as a Navy operations officer, Robert was awarded the Korean Service Medal with two battle stars, the China Service Medal, the United Nations Service Medal, and the Korean Presidential Unit Citation.

Robert truly loved his service to this country and the U.S. Navy, prompting him to remain with the Navy Active Reserve until 1980, when he retired as commander.

Robert Edington was one of Mobile's most prominent lawyers and community leaders for over 60 years. He served three terms in the Alabama Legislature, first as a State representative from 1962 to 1970 and then in the State senate from 1970 to 1974.

As a member of the Alabama Legislature, he played a pivotal role in establishing the University of South Alabama and the university's college of medicine. He actively furthered the development of Bishop State Community College, one of Alabama's great historically Black colleges and universities, of which I am so proud.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation in Washington, DC, presented him with their national award for his role in establishing the Alabama Historical Commission.

But his love for the Navy continued on prominent display even as a legislator, authoring the legislation that created the USS Alabama Battleship Commission, bringing the USS *Alabama* home to Mobile following her retirement from Active Duty. He served on that commission from 1963 to 1972 and served as its chairman, but his passion for the battleship and all it stands for never wavered, and he was once again appointed to the battleship commission in the year 2000.

In addition, Robert served as the Alabama President and National Director of the Navy League of the United States, where he supported port visits of Navy vessels for important occasions that included some just fun occasions like the Mardi Gras in Mobile.

Back in his hometown of Mobile, Robert was an active member of the Mobile Bar Association, where at one time he served as the director of the bar's Volunteer Lawyers Program. He was a member of the Mobile Kiwanis Club and the Mobile American Legion.

As Mobile's Consul to Guatemala for 20 years, Robert organized Mobile's first trade mission to Central America, earning him the U.S. Department of Commerce's Achievement Award.

In 2007, Robert's dedication to the community and the city of Mobile was