

By intentionally withholding medically accurate information from students at a moment when access is already under attack, this bill will only further undermine access to reproductive care.

This bill does nothing to protect the rights of students. It treats students as though they are political pawns, endangering their health and well-being to advance Republicans' extremist anti-abortion agenda. For those reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mrs. MOODY. Mr. President, I am disappointed to hear from my colleague—the Democrat that claims the party is the party of women—that we are not going to ask that universities educate women in college who become pregnant as to their rights and to modify class schedules or excused absences, which would allow them to continue their education and continue their pregnancy to term.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, if Republicans truly want to help students make informed decisions and prevent unintended pregnancies, they would support evidence-based—not ideologically based but evidence-based policies that expand access to medically accurate information, policies like the Real Education and Access for Healthy Youth Act, legislation that I introduced with Senator BOOKER that would expand comprehensive medically accurate sex education and ensure young people at colleges and universities have the information they need to navigate their futures. That is what real support looks like.

By equipping students with factual information, our bill will help empower our young people to make informed decisions about their bodies and their lives.

Mr. President, that is why I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1910; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be consider made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Florida.

Mrs. MOODY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I just want to make sure that I am clear. The Democratic Party who, again, repeatedly asserts that they are the party of women, does not want to educate pregnant women on how to continue their education while they are pregnant. They don't want to do that.

But we are now being asked, unanimously, to fund at the tune of half a billion dollars to teach kids as young as elementary school students about sex, gender identity.

And I want to repeat the words: They did not want to agree to my bill because they didn't want it to be ideologically based, but yet they say that spending half a billion dollars to teach elementary school kids, educating young women on sex, gender identity—that that is not ideologically based?

So I just want to make sure that I am clear. I come down here to seek passage of a bill focused on educating young women, allowing them to feel empowered to continue that education. And after blocking that simple idea, I am now being asked to agree to the education of elementary school students on topics such as sexual orientation and sex.

That is the Democrat Party. This is the Republican Party. I just want to make sure America is clear. That is the difference, and I cannot believe that is what we are being asked to adopt by unanimous consent.

So for that reason, I will object, and I will lament that we find ourselves in a place where we cannot promote the education of a pregnant mother, but we are being asked to spread sex and gender ideology to our children in elementary school.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. RES. 555

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, climate change is real. Earlier this year, I came to the floor and asked my colleagues if they could all agree to that simple scientific fact. Unsurprisingly, given the clout of fossil fuel in this arena, they could not.

So I return to the floor in hopes that my Republican colleagues could at least agree to some of the simple truths that make up the bigger picture of climate change.

I asked if we could agree that sea levels are rising due to fossil fuel emissions. Republicans objected.

I asked that we could agree that oceans are warming due to fossil fuel emissions. Republicans objected. They are actually warming by the zettajoule, if you want to look up a really big number.

So I changed tactics. I wanted to see if my Republican colleagues could at least acknowledge some of the realities. I asked if we could agree that climate change is driving up the cost of homeowners insurance, which is something that even homeowners insurers will tell you. But, again, Republicans objected.

Well, I am not giving up. Here is today's simple truth: Climate change poses a threat to home values and the mortgage market. Can we all agree on that?

Let me break this down. Republicans may object, but facts remain. And the fact is that sea levels are rising.

Sea level rise and the flooding that comes along with it causes cata-

strophic damage to coastal infrastructure, businesses, and homes. This drives enormous financial loss.

Between 2005 and 2017, Florida, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, and Georgia together lost \$7.4 billion in home value due to sea level rise-related flooding. Absent climate action, flooding like this will get worse in the years to come.

Researchers find that 300,000 U.S. homes and commercial properties collectively valued at \$136 billion, in today's dollars, are at risk of chronic disruptive flooding in the next 30 years, the duration of a mortgage; and by the end of the 21st century, nearly 2.5 million U.S. homes and commercial properties, collectively valued at over \$1 trillion, will be at risk of chronic flooding. Indeed, the chief economist of Freddie Mac has predicted what he called a "coastal property values crash."

Sea level rise is not the only climate impact threatening homes across the country. We see it in all kinds of natural calamities. I have shown this chart on the floor before. It tracks billion-dollar climate disasters in the United States between 1980 and now. These include floods, wildfires, cyclones, and drought. As you can see, the events and the costs are increasing.

And it is not just homes directly impacted by climate disaster that face declines in property values. Following a weather disaster, housing values decline substantially across entire impacted ZIP Codes, in part because of the market's expectation of future disasters in that area.

Last week, I explained that the same forces driving home insurance costs up are driving down home values. That is because climate losses hit insurers first, and insurers then raise their costs; and those costs ultimately affect the home's value.

This chart shows that insurance costs are increasing the most in areas facing the highest climate risk, which is only logical.

Unfortunately, for the parts of the country most exposed to climate change, insurance premiums are going to continue to climb. This chart shows the county-level forecast for homeowners insurance premiums over the next 30 years. As you can see, all along the gulf coast, through Florida and out through the Intermountain West, where fires are such an issue, premiums are expected to double or triple or even quadruple. The darkest areas here are the highest increase, but everywhere is heading up.

And it gets worse. Rising premiums depress home values, as the carrying cost of owning that home increases. If you have to pay, as in Florida, on average, \$14,000 every year for home insurance and that doubles or triples, and now you have a \$30,000 or \$40,000 annual burden—a check you have to pay to keep that home—that is going to drive down the cost of the home because the next buyer is going to be looking at that cost burden.

So rising premiums are one key risk to home property values, but insurance unavailability is just as big. More and more often, in the areas of highest climate risk, insurance companies are refusing to insure homes at all.

This chart tracks home insurance nonrenewal rates. That is when your insurance company—that you have been a good customer of for years and years and years—suddenly sends a notice into your mail slot saying: Sorry, you are all done. Your property is too dangerous. We are not going to insure it any longer. You will have to look elsewhere.

This was based on work we did last Congress in the Budget Committee, and the nonrenewal rates are the highest in areas with high climate risk. Again, it seems obvious, but the data tracks that the greater the climate risk, the more the insurance industry is backing away from uninsurable risks. Obviously, coastal Florida and wildfire-prone western areas are in greatest danger.

This problem is a disaster for homeowners because lenders won't approve a mortgage unless the borrower also purchases insurance. An uninsurable home is an unmortgageable home, and an unmortgageable home is, in most places, an unsellable home. At the individual level, homeowner by homeowner, this can wipe out a family's primary source of wealth. One day your home had one value. The notice of nonrenewal comes, you can't get insurance, and your own home's value drops precipitously, wiping out your primary source of wealth, endangering retirements, endangering your children's future.

And as climate disasters keep getting worse, so will this. Researchers predict that U.S. residential property will lose nearly \$1.5 trillion in value over the next 30 years due to increasingly expensive and unavailable insurance. Just recently, Moody's Analytics came to a similar conclusion. And, sure enough, the places that will see the biggest declines in value are the places most exposed to climate risk: the Southeast and gulf coast, and the West and Plains, which are exposed to wildfire and hail risks.

Indeed, in Florida, property values have already started to decline. It has been reported that Florida is the No. 1 State in the country for lost property value, which is the natural endpoint of the cascade from climate risk to insurance collapse, to mortgage market collapse, to property values collapse. And there in Florida, you see it beginning to happen.

Here is the bad news. At the end of the day, the pressure from the insurance market on home values—this is the place where home values are likely to decline because of climate change.

There has always been a basic truth in America that, with time, over the course of the mortgage, your property is going to go up in value. But in a world burdened by this level of climate

risk, that is no longer the case. Now, we are looking at areas where it is predicted that home values may decline. In some cases, the decline is targeted at 100 percent.

What is 100 percent decline in home value? That means it ain't worth nothing anymore; you have lost all the value in your home. And, obviously, it is concentrated in the highest risk areas, but the risk is continuing to grow.

We know what happened the last time, when there was a widespread decline in property values: The economy spiraled into the great recession. It cost millions of people in the United States their jobs, their homes, their savings. It would be folly to repeat 2008 all over again. The warnings are many, and they are real, and they come from leading voices in the financial sector—not environmentalists—people who track financial markets.

So let's agree on the simple truth that climate change portends significant declines in American home values in climate-exposed regions of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 555; further, that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wyoming.

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I object. And excuse me. Let me start with this: I reserve the right to object.

I have respect for the Senator's tenacity in making these arguments, but we are being asked, through this resolution, to accept the most dire narrative that is built on projections and models rather than proven causation. The data cited here conflates correlation with causation.

The U.S. Senate should legislate based on evidence, not based on unrealized projections and fear. The resolution cites a \$7.4 billion real estate loss in five southeastern States, between 2005 and 2017, and attributes it to sea level rise.

But we shouldn't forget what also happened during those years. We lived through the 2008 financial crisis and the housing collapse, the worst real estate market in generations. Property values fell across the entire Nation, but they were particularly bad in Florida.

So future projections and predictions are a troubling thing upon which to base legislation. Models are tools, not crystal balls. Models predict outcomes based on assumptions fed to them, and those assumptions can be wrong.

There were many projections that cattle cause climate to be worse. At Oxford, in England, and in Italy, studies were done that changed the projec-

tions, and the new projections determined that cattle are good for the environment. They not only are not making things worse, but they are making things better.

So if you change the assumptions and the projections, models can produce a different result. So we should not assume that every model has been fed the right information. We cannot make policy based on worst case scenarios from computer models.

Mr. Chairman, I actually do believe that climate is changing. But even during the Obama administration, when I was on the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, we had some witnesses come to the committee from National Labs and testify. And one of them was asked what percentage of climate change is caused by mankind, the activities of mankind. And the response was it is a single-digit number. And that scientist, from a U.S. National Lab, was never allowed to testify in front of our committee again because he gave an answer that didn't comport with the narrative that the administration was trying to sell.

Climate change is happening, and I wish the Senator were making his remarks in China, rather than the United States, where the air is so bad that—I was in South Korea, in Seoul, and one day the weather was beautiful, the climate was beautiful, the air was fabulous. And the next day, you couldn't see two blocks because there was so much pollution.

And I said: What happened here?

They said: We know what our air quality will be in Seoul, South Korea, when we look at what the air quality was in China 48 hours ago.

So it is coming from a very polluted environment.

The United States has been exemplary, since the passage of the Clean Air Act, in cleaning up its air. We have extremely clean air, and especially so since we are an industrialized nation. I am proud of what the United States has done to address the Senator's concerns, but climate cannot be used to address the issue of concern to the Senator. Therefore, I object.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, may I just say that some of the projections that my colleague objects to go back to the Chafee hearings of 40 years ago. These are predictions that are the product of NASA scientists.

NASA is pretty good at stuff. We have vehicles rolling around on Mars thanks to NASA science. Their predictions are pretty good about where things are going to go.

When the 2008 mortgage meltdown happened, there were two guys—one named Burry and one named Burt—who predicted. They got it right. Had we listened to those predictions, we could have saved ourselves a lot of pain.

By the way, both of them are predicting a climate-related insurance collapse affecting property values, as we

have said. And, indeed, if you look at some of the companies most responsible for this mess, their own scientists predicted exactly what we have seen.

We can test those predictions from 30, 40 years ago by measuring what has happened since, and what happened since confirms the predictions that Exxon scientists knew about, American Petroleum Institute scientists knew about, Chevron scientists knew about.

Their problem was that when they told their senior management, the senior management said: No. No. No. Let's not talk about that. Let's cover that up, and let's start actually misleading the public about it.

The folks who came into the Budget Committee to testify about this are people like the former risk management chief for Goldman Sachs, the chief economist—former chief economist for Freddie Mac, the mortgage giant.

We had reports from the international Financial Stability Board about the danger to global banking markets. The Mortgage Bankers Association expressed their concern about this problem. An Allianz board member has written a very compelling article about what the collapse of the insurance market looks like as it continues. The American president of Aon, a huge insurance giant testified about this risk. Mark Carney, who was the president of the Bank of England and the Bank of Canada before that and is now Prime Minister of Canada, testified about this.

So some predictions are worth paying attention to, either because they have a track record over decades of proving themselves out or because the people really seem to know what they are talking about. And I would urge that we pay more attention to these predictions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 4876

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4876) to improve handling of vacancies of the Director of National Intelligence, and for other purposes.

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

GLIOBLASTOMA AWARENESS DAY

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed

to the consideration of S. Res. 786, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 786) designating July 15, 2026, as "Glioblastoma Awareness Day."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. LUMMIS. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 786) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MORNING BUSINESS

TRIBUTE TO ERIK GUNDERSON

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Erik Gunderson, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Erik is a graduate of Bishop Ireton High School in Alexandria, VA. Currently, he is attending the University of Notre Dame in Notre Dame, IN, where he is pursuing degrees in global affairs and political science. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Erik for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO NATALIE KELLEY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Natalie Kelley, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Natalie is a graduate of Berkeley Preparatory School in Tampa, FL. Currently, she is attending New York University in New York, NY, where she is pursuing a degree in psychology. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Natalie for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO BENJAMIN LUST

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Benjamin Lust, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my

staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Benjamin is a graduate of Stevens High School in Rapid City, SD. Currently, he is attending Vanderbilt University in Nashville, TN, where he is pursuing degrees in political science and human and organizational development. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Benjamin for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO NICHOLAS MAAS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Nicholas Maas, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Nicholas is a graduate of Roosevelt High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, he is attending the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis, MN, where he is pursuing degrees in criminal justice and political science. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Nicholas for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO LAVIN MADDOX

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Lavin Maddox, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Lavin is a graduate of Sioux Falls Christian High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, she is attending Vanderbilt University in Nashville, TN, where she is pursuing a degree in human and organizational development. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Lavin for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO ELENA ROSSI

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Elena Rossi, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Elena is a graduate of Georgetown Visitation Preparatory School in Washington, DC. Currently, she is attending Boston College in Chestnut Hill, MA, where she is pursuing a degree in economics. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.