Ms. Mary Kay Lanthier to the U.S. District Court for the District of Vermont.

Born in Orwell, VT, Ms. Lanthier earned her B.A. at Amherst College in 1993 and her J.D. from Northeastern University School of Law in 1996. After graduating from law school, she served as a law clerk in the court administrator's office for the Chittenden County District Court and Addison County Courts.

Ms. Lanthier then worked on family law, workers' compensation, and criminal defense cases as an associate at Keiner & Dumont, P.C. between 1998 and 2000. After that, from 2000 to 2003, she served as a staff attorney at the Addison County Public Defender's Office. Ms. Lanthier later worked as an associate from 2003 to 2004 and partner from 2005 to 2007 at Marsh & Wagner, P.C. There, her practice centered on family law, real estate law, and criminal defense.

Since 2007, Ms. Lanthier has served as a staff attorney and supervising attorney in the Rutland County Public Defender's Office. Over the course of her career, she has tried approximately 50 criminal cases to a jury verdict.

The American Bar Association unanimously rated Ms. Lanthier as "well qualified," and her nomination is strongly supported by her home State Senators, Mr. SANDERS and Mr. WELCH.

With 20 years of experience as a public defender, Ms. Lanthier's litigation background and deep commitment to equal justice has prepared her to serve with distinction on the Federal bench in Vermont. Her nomination has received support from a range of individuals and organizations, including law enforcement, prosecutors, and the Vermont Bar Association.

I am proud to join them in supporting her nomination and urge my colleagues to do the same.

#### VOTE ON LANTHIER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Lanthier nomination?

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Kennedy), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Rounds), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Vance).

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 42, as follows:

#### [Rollcall Vote No. 236 Ex.]

#### YEAS-55

Baldwin	Carper	Gillibrand
Bennet	Casey	Graham
Blumenthal	Collins	Hassan
Booker	Coons	Heinrich
Brown	Cortez Masto	Helmy
Butler	Duckworth	Hickenloope
Cantwell	Durbin	Hirono
Cardin	Fetterman	Kaine

Kelly	Padilla	Tester
King	Peters	Tillis
Klobuchar	Reed	Van Hollen
Luján	Rosen	Warner
Manchin	Sanders	Warnock Warren Welch Whitehouse Wyden
Markey	Schatz	
Merkley	Schumer	
Murkowski	Shaheen	
Murphy	Sinema	
Murray	Smith	
Ossoff	Stabenow	

#### NAYS-42

## NOT VOTING—3

nedy Rounds Vance

The nomination was confirmed.
(Ms. CORTEZ MASTO assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 781, Laura Margarete Provinzino, of Minnesota, to be United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Laphonza R. Butler, Benjamin L. Cardin, Mazie K. Hirono, Chris Van Hollen, Ben Ray Luján, Brian Schatz, Thomas R. Carper, Margaret Wood Hassan, Christopher Murphy, Tammy Duckworth, Tina Smith, Jack Reed, Patty Murray, Amy Klobuchar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Laura Margarete Provinzino, of Minnesota, to be United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Sentator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MAR-

SHALL), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. Tuberville), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) would have voted "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 39, as follows:

### [Rollcall Vote No. 237 Ex.]

#### $YEAS\!\!-\!\!55$

Baldwin	Hassan	Reed
Bennet	Heinrich	Rosen
Blumenthal	Helmy	Sanders
Booker	Hickenlooper	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Schumer
Butler	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kelly	Sinema
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Luján	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Van Hollen
Coons	Markey	
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Cramer	Murkowski	Warnock
Duckworth	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Welch
Fetterman	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Graham	Peters	

#### NAYS-39

Barrasso	Ernst	Paul
Blackburn	Fischer	Ricketts
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Braun	Hawley	Romney
Britt	Hoeven	Rubio
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	Moran	Wicker
Daines	Mullin	Young
	NOT VOTING	<del></del> 6

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 39.

Tuberville

Marshall

The motion is agreed to.

Hagerty

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Laura Margarete Provinzino, of Minnesota, to be United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

## CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, 6 years ago, I sent all of my colleagues in the Senate this binder of economic warnings about climate change. Here it is. The warning signs were flashing, so I shared all of those different reports. When I assumed the role of Senate Budget Committee chair, I provided an updated version of that binder to my committee members. As you can see, it had gotten a lot thicker. The warning signs had kept piling up, imploring us to act now before it is too late. And what is happening now? The events warned of are coming to pass.

Over 19 Budget Committee hearings, we heard from serious experts about the looming economic, financial, and fiscal risks of climate change. We had economists, actuaries, industry analysts, scientists, healthcare providers,

farmers, academics, national security leaders; even some conservative political leaders shared the warnings. The witnesses and the topics differed, but the message was the same: Look out. Climate change presents an economic threat, and ignoring it poses severe, even systemic economic risks. We ignore it at our economic and fiscal peril.

Ignoring it is, unfortunately, the path my Republican colleagues have chosen to follow, but ignoring climate change does not stop climate change from hitting our economies even in red and purple States. The changes are happening in every corner of the country; and day after day, news reports only confirm the warnings.

We held hearings on communities facing coastal flooding risk and wildfire risk and how those risks affect insurance and mortgage markets and, ultimately, property values. A mortgage issuer looks forward 30 years—the term of the mortgage—and climate-driven sea level rise, extreme precipitation, hurricane damage, and river flooding will add big risks to residential properties over the next 30 years. I am a Rhode Islander, so the flood risk is close to home, but more than half of all U.S. properties face a wildfire risk, and that is also getting worse with climate change.

Insurers are taking notice. When climate-driven losses increase, premiums increase; and when climate-driven losses become too hard to predict, insurers pull out. Insurance becomes not only not affordable but not even available. Since our hearings, insurance and housing markets in Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and California—States highly exposed to climate-driven hurricane, flooding, and wildfire risks—are in full crises.

In May of last year, State Farm announced it was no longer offering new policies in California. Then in June, Allstate followed suit. That July, Farmers announced it was pulling out of the Florida market entirely. Just last week, Progressive Insurance announced that the company was "temporarily restricting" new homeowners business in Texas.

After Texas got a double whammy—historic wildfires through February and March and then the Hurricane Beryl flooding in July, knocking out power to nearly 3 million Texans and leading to "the most tornado warnings issued in the U.S. in a single July day since records began"—people sat in flooded homes, without air conditioning, in 90-plus-degree heat, with mold growing, and Texas politicians still denied climate change.

Well, homeowner's insurance companies don't deny climate change. Nationally, average homeowner's insurance premiums increased 33 percent between 2020 and 2023. In Florida, already high premiums more than doubled. Average insurance premiums in Florida are now more than \$10,000 per year—average. Over in New Orleans, average premiums are closing on \$10,000 per

year. In Miami, they average almost \$17,000 per year. This is fossil fuel-driven climateflation, and it presents an affordability crunch for American families.

Don't just take it from me; take it from Federal Reserve Chairman Powell, who testified that rising insurance premiums have been a significant driver of inflation. He warned that "in the longer term, companies are withdrawing from writing insurance in some coastal areas. It's a significant issue."

It even came into the Presidential debate last night, when Vice President Harris said what we know about climate change is that it is very real. You ask anyone who lives in a State who has experienced these extreme weather occurrences who now is either being denied home insurance or is being jacked up on insurance rates.

There is a cascade effect here: The crisis in coastal homeowner's insurance bleeds over into mortgage markets. And when mortgage markets suffer, that affects property values—a cascade that poses what economists call a "systemic" threat to our economy.

If your property can't get insurance, good luck getting a mortgage. Without mortgages, your only buyers are those able to pay cash, and that drives down your property values.

The chief economist of Freddie Mac actually warned of a coastal property values crash that would damage the entire economy, "systemic" damage, just like we saw in the 2008 financial crisis and great recession. Florida and parts of Texas are already in that spiral, as unsold condominiums pile up in those markets and values fall.

We face a national affordable housing challenge, so it is an added piece of bad news from housing nonprofits that the insurance rates squeeze "could threaten to end affordable housing development as we know it."

Back to wildfires. New York City saw this orange skyline, a phenomenon San Franciscans got to know too well in 2020's wildfire season. That is because extreme wildfires have more than doubled over the past two decades, with the six worst wildfire seasons occurring in the last 7 years. That makes wildfire risk the evil twin of flood risk for insurance, mortgages, and property values.

To quote our witness, Benjamin Keys, a professor of finance at Wharton:

This should be ringing alarm bells for housing markets all over the country.

April's Economist magazine—I have got a bigger version for folks watching us on C-SPAN. April's Economist magazine—not exactly a green publication—went Dr. Keys one better, warning that the whole world should be concerned about climate change, putting \$25 trillion of global real estate at risk, threatening a global financial meltdown—cover article. Read it yourself.

Insurance, of course, isn't the only cost being driven higher by

climateflation. Just go to the grocery store. At one hearing last year, we actually had bipartisan agreement that climate change is damaging crop yields and driving up prices. And those trends continue this year.

Just look at breakfast. The price of orange juice is at an alltime high, driven by the lowest harvest in Florida in 90 years and a 24-percent decline in yield in Brazil, which supplies about 70 percent of the world's orange juice—climateflation.

Brazil and Vietnam supply more than half of the world's coffee beans. In both countries, drought drove coffee prices up. Vietnam just reported that its July coffee exports declined nearly 30 percent year over year, and worse was June, which declined 50 percent year over year—more climateflation.

India and Thailand are the two largest exporters of sugar behind Brazil. Severe droughts in both of these countries have pushed the global cost of sugar to its highest level since 2011.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. consumers saw the price of sugar and sweets rise by 8.9 percent in 2023. USDA expects prices to increase another 5.6 percent this year. And cocoa production is also hit, with April prices up 235 percent in less than 6 months.

Olive oil, a kitchen staple, saw prices jump over 130 percent due to last year's Mediterranean drought. The International Olive Council expects even less production this year as droughts persists. In Spain, bottles of olive oil are now one of the most shoplifted items.

Climate change bodes ill for wine, too. A recent reveal of more than 200 studies predict that "70% of current wine-producing regions face a substantial risk of losing their suitability for wine-growing if global temperatures increase more than 2 degrees Celsius." That is a danger threshold we are coming closer and closer to, giving new meaning to "in vino veritas."

When we wonder why grocery prices remain high, look at climate-driven disruptions, climateflation, not just to agriculture, as I have been describing, but also to the supply chains that move those products around.

Last October, a witness of ours warned the committee that "the direct impact to extreme weather events can cascade through supply chains, affecting the flow of commodities and goods to regions and sectors leading to increased costs to business and to the broader economy"—more

climateflation.

And while we were listening to that testimony, a historic drought had reduced Panama Canal vessel traffic to 24 crossings per day. So vessels resorted to the Suez Canal or went around South Africa to avoid the delays of canal travel. And those longer routes came at a higher shipping cost, ultimately passed on to consumers in higher prices—more climateflation.

Climate change is even beating up the infrastructure that underpins our supply chains. As a witness told us last year, "Physical impacts have been widely observed for everything from extreme heat waves to flood events compromising roads, tarmacs, pipelines, and rail lines, with direct repair and delay costs being felt throughout the economy. Annual direct damage costs for road and rail impacts alone are estimated to be just under \$20 billion a year by 2050."

This past July, New York had to close the Third Avenue Bridge from the Bronx to Manhattan because 95-degree heat caused the steel to expand.

Severe flooding struck Iowa, South Dakota, and Minnesota in June and led to the collapse of a railroad bridge, the near failure of a dam, and the destruction of hundreds of homes.

A bridge in Lewiston, ME, recently closed because its pavement started to buckle in high temperatures. One expert told the New York Times that extreme heat and flooding are accelerating the deterioration of bridges, causing them to "fall apart like tinkertoys." And this will get worse: Extreme temperatures could cause one in four steel bridges to collapse by 2050.

Americans aren't just paying the cost of fossil fuel emissions through climateflation; they are paying it through direct Big Oil price-gouging. The oil and gas market, so-called, is actually controlled by an international cartel. And when OPEC jacks those prices, Big Oil in the United States happily rides along, loading up the biggest corporate profits in history. That, too, drives inflation.

One last thing. Last year, I came to the Senate floor and talked about what was then the hottest June on record, followed by the hottest July on record, followed by the hottest August on record, and then the hottest September on record. Well, this July, the world experienced the hottest day in at least 100,000 years.

We have talked a lot about costs and costs matter. The point of this speech is the economic harms of climate change, but that heat kills.

Our hearing on public health warned how climate change acts as a "threat multiplier with health impacts happening through a variety of mechanisms, including worsening temperature extremes."

Shortly after that hearing, Phoenix, AZ, experienced 31 straight days of 110-plus-degree temperatures, shattering the previous record. This year, the Phoenix hot streak continued, with temperatures breaking 100 degrees from late May for more than 100 straight days.

In Maricopa County, where Phoenix is located, at least 150 people have died from heat, and hundreds more deaths are still under investigation.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that over 1,200 people are killed by extreme heat in the United States every year. Heat deaths in 2023 were the highest in 45 years.

In just 1 month—just 1 month, July 2023—the death count was near the annual average. One month nearly matched the annual average. An estimated 1,130 U.S. residents died of heat. And as work from Brown University and others have shown, that is likely an undercount.

In spite of all of this danger and its severe fiscal implications, some of my Republican colleagues complain that the Budget Committee is giving climate change too much attention. To them, it is not enough of a risk to our Federal budget, never mind that at least \$10 trillion of our national debt stems from economic shocks—"exogenous" they would call it in economics—economic shocks; specifically, the 2008 financial crisis and the COVID pandemic.

Well, climate change portends the biggest systemic shock of all. That is the lesson of all of these economic reports and studies, the lesson of the cover article from The Economist, and the lesson of our testimony in the Budget Committee hearings.

For homeowners in Florida, those dangers are already on their doorstep. They are suffering through sea level rise, extreme precipitation that floods homes and cars, intense hurricanes that batter families and communities, and the soaring insurance premiums that result, leading into the cascade from the insurance market to the mortgage market, to the property values market that Freddie Mac's chief economist warned about.

To all of this, what is Florida Republicans' answer? To try to silence conversation about the climate crisis, to forbid State employees from discussing climate change, even when it is an affordability crisis for their own constituents.

There is really no doubt the dangers are growing worse and more widespread. The economic shadow of those dangers is looming. Folks with fiduciary responsibilities told us in the Budget Committee: We have to address the dangers. Folks with business responsibilities told us in the Budget Committee how they have to adjust to these new dangers. And I have been telling you for a while now, and I hate to say "I told you so," but it is here now, and dammit, I told you so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). The Senator from Rhode Island.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I was necessarily absent, but had I been present, I would have voted yea on roll-call vote No. 208, the nomination of Charles J. Willoughby, Jr., to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

I was necessarily absent but, had I been present, I would have voted yea on rollcall vote No. 209, the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Anne Marie Wagner to be a Member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority.

I was necessarily absent but, had I been present, I would have voted yea on rollcall vote No. 210, on the nomination of Anne Marie Wagner to be a Member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority.

I was necessarily absent but, had I been present, I would have voted yea on rollcall vote No. 211, the motion to invoke cloture on the Motion to Proceed to S. 4554.

I was necessarily absent but, had I been present, I would have voted yea on rollcall vote No. 212, On the Point of Order Is the Point of Order Well Taken Re: To the Privilege Status of S.J. Res. 89.

I was necessarily absent but, had I been present, I would have voted yea on rollcall vote No. 213, on the nomination of Robin Michelle Meriweather, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims.

# 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF CARY MEDICAL CENTER

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, on September 5, 1924, a new hospital opened its doors in my hometown of Caribou, ME, and admitted its very first patient. Today, I join people throughout the region in celebrating a century of expert, compassionate care at Cary Medical Center.

It is fitting that this 100th anniversary coincides with Cary being named as one of the Nation's Top 100 Great Community Hospitals by Becker's Hospital Review. This latest addition to the long and impressive list of national awards and recognitions underscores what CEO Kris Doody said when that announcement was made this summer: "Working at Cary Medical Center is not just a job. It's a calling."

From the start, Cary has been a community hospital with the emphasis on "community." It was built on the foundation laid by Dr. Jefferson Cary, a physician as devoted to the people of northern Maine as he was to the practice of medicine. He came to Caribou in 1877, a time when house calls, even in the frigid winter, were made by horse and buggy, medical supplies were scarce, and payment for services was often made with farm products and firewood rather than cash. His skill as a physician was matched, as a friend put it, by his "untiring devotion to the cause of humanity.'

When Dr. Cary died in 1912, he left the bulk of his estate to Caribou. His