

Passage of the Sawtooth National Recreation Area and Jerry Peak Wilderness Additions Act, also called the SNRA+ Act, is the result of tremendous efforts by Representative SIMPSON and Senator RISCH. He deserves tremendous credit as well. I do want to say that I honor Representative SIMPSON's dogged determination and his persistence to fight through many obstacles associated with this treasured region of our State for a very long period of time.

Representative SIMPSON's efforts have given Idaho a homegrown solution to what was rapidly becoming a national problem. As I said, similarly, my colleague Senator RISCH has fought through many challenges in his pursuit of developing a consensus on this issue that has been hard to achieve. Both of my colleagues, in their respective ways, have expressed again the power of collaboration in the attempt to find consensus to deliver local solutions to longstanding public land management challenges in Idaho.

Local governments and local stakeholders must be empowered to shape and manage decisions relating to our public lands. In the process, such efforts must respect private property rights and the owners of private property as well as other impacted stakeholders. Such initiatives are never easy to achieve, and consensus takes dedication, patience, and persistence. For too long, westerners have been saddled with top-down land management decisions that are both harmful to the landscape and the people living in and subsisting off of our natural treasures. The SNRA+ is a win for Idaho and an example of how local governments and interests can achieve solutions to some of the most persistent public land management issues we face.

I have to conclude by saying that while we have succeeded today in passing a milestone in Congress, the focus must now shift to the hard work of successful implementation that will require commitment from the various Federal agencies and all of the affected interests.

Again, I commend Senator RISCH and Representative SIMPSON for their incredibly important work that has been accomplished today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I congratulate my colleagues from Idaho on this particular piece of legislation, proving it can be done right. It was just a few weeks ago that the President unilaterally declared a monument in the State of Nevada the size of Rhode Island, with two counties that had no input in the process. Our delegation had no input. The collaborative effort that we saw from Idaho and how it works and how the system should work needs to be recognized. What happened in Nevada, I feel, was a disgrace.

It is a shame we are standing here today with a monument in the State of

Nevada the size of Rhode Island with no input from Nevada's delegation or counties, just a single action made by one person.

CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION
SHARING ACT OF 2015—MOTION
TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I would like to talk about personal privacy rights for American citizens. It was just 2 months ago that the Senate took action to restore privacy rights of American citizens through the USA FREEDOM Act—part of action that was taken, as I mentioned, just 2 months ago. Both Chambers of Congress and the President agreed it was time to end the bulk collection of American's call records pouring into the Federal Government.

I was a proud supporter of the USA FREEDOM Act and believed it was the right thing to do on behalf of U.S. citizens. My constituents all across Nevada—from Elko, to Reno, Ely, and Las Vegas—all understand how important these rights are and will not accept any attempts to diminish them. Today, I am here to continue protecting these privacy rights and uphold our civil liberties.

Protecting privacy will always be important to Nevadans. It is nonnegotiable to me, very important. Similar to many of my colleagues in the Senate, I believe addressing cyber security is also important.

When I was ranking member of the commerce committee's consumer protection subcommittee, I worked on these issues in detail. I understand very well the impact of data breaches, cyber threats. In fact, back in my State of Nevada, one of the top concerns is identity theft. Not only can these identity thieves wreak financial havoc on a consumer's life, but these threats also pose a serious national security concern.

We saw with OPM's breach that personal information for 21.5 million Federal employees, even those who received security clearances, was compromised. In my office, in fact, a member of my staff was breached three times in just the last 4 years. These thieves cross international borders. They break and enter into private homes. They hack their way to intrusion with a keyboard and a simple click of the mouse.

So I share the desire to find a path forward on information sharing between the Federal Government and the private sector as another tool in the cyber security toolbox, but I have always stood firm with these types of efforts that they must also maintain American's privacy rights.

The bill I see today, including the substitute amendment, does not do enough to ensure personally identifiable information is stripped out before sharing. That is why I filed a fix. Let's strengthen the standard for stripping out this information. Right now, this

bill says the private sector and the Federal Government only have to strip out personal information if they know—if they know—it is not directly related to a cyber threat.

I would like to offer some context to that. Let's say you are pulled over for speeding, not knowing the speed limit does not absolve you of guilt. If your company fails to follow a Federal law or regulation, not knowing about the law does not exempt you from the consequences of violating it. Ignorance is no excuse under the law, so why should this particular piece of legislation be any different?

My amendments ensure that when personal information is being stripped out, it is because the entity reasonably believes—not knows but reasonably believes—it is not related to a cyber threat. One of my amendments addresses the Federal Government's responsibility to do this, and the other addresses the private sector's responsibility to do this.

This term "reasonably believes"—let me repeat that—"reasonably believes" is an important distinction that this bill needs. It creates a wider protection for personal information by ensuring these entities are making an effort to take out personal information that is not necessary for cyber security. Our friends over in the House of Representatives already agree the private sector should be held to this standard, which is why they included this language in the cyber security bill which they passed. I hope to see this important protection retained in any conference agreement should this bill move forward.

Furthermore, in a letter to a Senator last week, DHS directly acknowledged the importance of removing personally identifiable information and even went so far as to say this removal will allow the information-sharing regime to function much better. Even DHS agrees that with this amendment it would function much better. So what it comes down to is our Nation's commitment to balancing the needs for sharing cyber security information with the need to protect America's personal information.

I believe my amendment, No. 2548, to hold the Federal Government accountable strikes that balance, and I will continue strongly pushing forward to get this vote. I encourage my colleagues to support this commonsense effort to strengthen this bill and keep our commitment to upholding the rights of all U.S. citizens.

As we discuss this issue, I hope we will continue having the opportunity to truly debate and make improvements to this bill. I believe that if given the opportunity, we can strengthen this legislation even more to protect against cyber security threats while also protecting American citizens' private information.

No bill is perfect, as the Presiding Officer knows, but that is why we are here and that is why there is an amendment process. That is why I wish to see

the Senate openly debate and amend this bill, including my amendment. The privacy rights of Americans are too important an issue and a very important issue to all of us.

I acknowledge that some of my colleagues want the opportunity to debate issues related to the bill and those issues that are unrelated to the bill. I recognize there are many important issues Members would like to see addressed before August—or at least the August recess—such as my friend from Kentucky, who filed an amendment regarding firearms on bases. Like my colleague, I recognize the importance of this issue, which is why I introduced this legislation days ago. My legislation would simply require the Secretary of Defense to establish a process for base commanders in the United States to authorize a servicemember to carry a concealed personal firearm while on base. Men and women who serve our country deserve to feel safe and should be able to defend themselves while stationed in the United States. That is why I feel strongly that Congress should give our Nation's base commanders the authority they need to create a safer environment for our heroes serving across America.

At this time I recognize it is unclear if there will be an opportunity to debate this issue on this particular piece of legislation, but it is an important issue. Once again, I hope that as we continue to debate this bill that we will find a path forward on all amendments.

I appreciate the willingness of both Senator BURR and Senator FEINSTEIN to work with me on my amendments, and I look forward to continuing this debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next 30 minutes be equally divided between Senators SCHUMER, BOXER, WHITEHOUSE, MARKEY, and SCHATZ.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, may I ask for a modification that I be able to speak for 1 minute on the cyber issue before we go into that 30 minutes?

With that modification, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Thank you.

Mr. President, in my 1 minute, I just wish to respond to what my friend, the Senator from Arizona, said. We are very keen to get a good, strong cyber security bill passed.

My concern about the amendment process is that amendments that will strengthen the bill and make it a better cyber bill ought to have a chance to get a vote. I have one that I worked out with Senator GRAHAM, who I think has good national security credentials

and whom Senator MCCAIN respects, and another one with Senator BLUNT, who also has good national security credentials and whom I think Senator MCCAIN also respects. I believe both of the bills have now been cleared by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, so they don't have a business community objection. But I also fear that if we followed the majority leader's proposal, he would file cloture and they wouldn't survive a germaneness test.

So I think our leader's offer, basically, of a specific list of amendments—none of which are “gotcha” amendments, all of which relate to this bill—would be a very good way to proceed, get on the bill, and get something passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. First, I thank my friend from Rhode Island. I think there is a broad agreement—I certainly do—that we want to move to this bill and, if given an agreement on a limited number of amendments, all relevant to cyber security, with no intention to be dilatory, and with time limits, we can get this done. But it is only fair on a major bill to offer some amendments and not just to fill the tree and have no amendments at all.

CLIMATE CHANGE

On the issue at hand, I thank Senators WHITEHOUSE, MARKEY, SCHATZ, and BOXER for speaking today and participating in this colloquy. I join my colleagues in appealing for meaningful action on climate change in this body, which thus far has been stymied by my friends on the other side of the aisle on behalf of special interests, and that is an absolute shame.

Climate change is one of the defining challenges of our time. Left unchecked, the changing climate and rising seas will threaten our shoreline cities and communities, as I personally witnessed after Superstorm Sandy buffeted New York. Left unchecked, a changing climate will have dramatic consequences for our children and grandchildren. Pope Francis's papal encyclical represents as much. He said climate change “represents one of the principal challenges facing humanity in our day.”

We know we have to act. We know the American people want us to act. According to a New York Times-Stanford University poll, 74 percent of Americans said the Federal Government should be doing a substantial amount to combat climate change. That is 74 percent.

Democrats agree the Federal Government must do something. We tried to pass several bills through Congress, but my friends on the other side of the aisle blocked action time and time again on behalf of the special interests in the fossil fuel industry.

Now the President has a bold plan to reduce carbon emissions, which he announced yesterday and today, but already the groups on the other side are marshaling their forces. The New York

Times reported today that fossil fuel lobbyists and corporate lawyers have been working since 2014, over 1½ years ago, to bring down these new rules.

Some of these Republicans admit that climate change is real and a threat. Yet they still block and block and block. My friend, the distinguished majority leader, has urged governors across the country to simply ignore the new climate rules while they cook up lawsuits to delay and frustrate their implementation.

OK. So you don't like the actions we propose or what the President proposes. Fine. What do you propose? I say to those on the other side of the aisle: What is your plan to meet this existential challenge? I have heard none. That is why this chart says:

—WANTED—

A GOP plan to combat climate change and reduce dangerous air pollution

#WhatstheGOPClimatePlan

There is none. We all know it is happening. Just look at the news, read the weather reports, and ask what scientists who are totally impartial and nonpolitical say. Unfortunately, I have a funny feeling that our colleagues on the other side are using the same playbook they are using on health care, immigration, and a host of other issues. Block, repeal, oppose, but propose nothing.

So I conclude my brief remarks by repeating the question. What is the Republican plan to act on climate change? Let me ask again in case they didn't hear me. What is the Republican plan to act on climate change?

Let me suggest that my friends on the other side join us in seeking solutions on climate change rather than obstructing our efforts and the wishes of the American people on behalf of special interests. Again, I thank my friends for organizing this colloquy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, what is the order in terms of time allocated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty minutes have been allocated. Each Senator has about 6 minutes to speak.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Chair remind me when I have spoken for 5 minutes so I can wrap up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be so notified.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

In 2007, in its landmark decision called *Massachusetts v. EPA*, the U.S. Supreme Court found very clearly that carbon pollution is covered under the Clean Air Act. I think it is important to note that the Bush administration took the position that carbon pollution could not be covered under the Clean Air Act. They wasted about 8 long years litigating the matter, and we lost a lot of time. But when the Supreme Court finally spoke out, this is what they said, and I quote from the decision:

Because greenhouse gases fit within the Clean Air Act's capacious definition of "air pollutant," we hold that EPA has the statutory authority to regulate the emission of such gases. . . .

Following the Supreme Court decision, the Obama administration issued an endangerment finding which showed that current and future concentrations of carbon pollution are harmful to our health. This finding built on the work of the Bush administration, and we found some of the raw data from the Bush administration, and we went public with it. This is what the endangerment finding said, among other things:

No. 1, severe heat waves are expected to intensify, which can increase heat-related death and sickness.

No. 2, climate change is expected to worsen regional smog pollution, which can cause decreased lung function, aggravated asthma, increased emergency-room visits, and premature deaths.

So once that endangerment finding was made, the Clean Air Act clearly requires the Environmental Protection Agency to act to control greenhouse gas pollution because it is determined that that pollution causes harm.

I wish to say, when I still had the gavel of the Environment and Public Works Committee, we called four former EPA administrators who served under Republican Presidents from Richard Nixon to George W. Bush. Every single one of those Republicans called on us to act now to reduce carbon pollution.

In that hearing, former EPA administrator Christine Todd Whitman, who served under George W. Bush, summed it up best—and I know my friends remember this. She said:

I have to begin by expressing my frustration with the discussion about whether or not the Environmental Protection Agency has the legal authority to regulate carbon emissions that is still taking place in some quarters. The issue has been settled.

This is a former Republican EPA administrator under George W. Bush. Continuing:

EPA does have the authority. The law says so, the Supreme Court has said so twice. That matter, I believe, should now be put to rest. Given that fact, the agency has decided, properly in my view, that it should act now to reduce carbon emissions to improve the quality of our air, to protect the health of our people and, as part of an international effort, to address global climate change.

Now, I was so proud in that particular hearing because I haven't found a Republican on the Environment and Public Works Committee who really even believes that climate change is real, to be honest. So to have a Republican—the former head of the EPA under George W. Bush—tell us it is time to move was very heartening to me because I believe action can't come too soon. The impacts that scientists predicted years ago are all around us and they are happening now.

I wish to share a couple of charts. The prediction quite a while ago was that we were going to see extreme heat

more frequently all around the world. Well, 2014 was the hottest year on record, according to NASA and NOAA, and 2015, the first half of this year, is the hottest on record, according to NOAA.

Then, heat waves are more frequent. In Australia, in 2014, towns 320 miles northwest of Sydney hit 118 degrees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 5 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair.

Areas affected by drought will increase. Look at what is happening in my great State, the worst drought, according to scientists, in 1,200 years. Fires are increasing—same thing—and I am just so disheartened by the fact that we lost a firefighter, a visiting firefighter. Firefighters are fighting those fires right now and putting their lives on the line every single day. Tropical storms, hurricanes—this is all happening—heavy precipitation, flooding events. Houston got 11 inches of rain in 24 hours in 2015. And there is decreasing polar ice, and, in addition, rising sea levels.

So I will close with this. The evidence of climate change is here. To say you are not a scientist is no answer. We know you are not a scientist. Politicians as a group are not. But we should listen to the 98, 99 percent of scientists who are telling us our planet is in trouble. Our people are going to be in trouble.

As long as I can stand up on my feet in this body, I am going to stand shoulder to shoulder—well, not quite; in my high heels shoulder to shoulder—with my friends because this is a moment in our Nation's history when our kids and grandkids will look back and ask: Why didn't they protect us? Why didn't they save us? As far as I am concerned, it is our duty and our moral responsibility.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I want to start my remarks with this photograph I have in the Chamber, which is a photograph of—I guess the miniplanet is what they call it now—Pluto. Why do I start remarks on climate change and carbon pollution with a picture of Pluto? I do so because of the amazing achievement it was for our NASA scientists to fly a craft close enough to Pluto to take that picture. That is a heck of an accomplishment by our American NASA scientists.

But that is not their only one. While this craft was shooting by Pluto taking these pictures, they had a rover rolling around on the surface of Mars. They sent a vehicle the size of an SUV to the surface of Mars and are driving it around. Do you think these scientists know what they are talking about when they say something as simple as climate change is real? Of course, they do.

But our Republican friends can't acknowledge that. They have even said these NASA scientists are in on a hoax.

Can you imagine anything more demeaning to the people who put a rover on Mars and shot this picture of Pluto than to say: Oh, they do not know what they are talking about. They are in on a hoax. Forget about it. That is just not true.

The real issue is this. Here is Kentucky's electric generation fuel mix. That is its fuel mix. Guess what the gray is? Coal. That is basically all they have. There is a tiny little strip of blue at the bottom for the hydro. There is a little tiny strip here of red for oil. And there is a tiny little bit of natural gas here at the top, for which you need a magnifying glass. You can look and, with a magnifying glass, you can see this tiny little green line at the top that is their entire renewables portfolio. Really?

The last I heard the sun shines bright on my old Kentucky home. Right? So why no solar? None. How about wind? Do you think the wind blows through the Kentucky hills? None. You have to use a magnifying glass to see it. They are not even trying. They are not even trying. The coal industry has that State so locked down they are doing nothing.

Go to Iowa. There are two Republican Senators from Iowa—hardly some liberal bastion—and they get about 30 percent of their electricity from wind. It is not a Communist plot. It is not a Socialist fabrication. It is Iowa, and the farmers love it.

But no, we have to protect coal at all costs. So this is the GOP signal for what they are doing on climate change. I think it would probably be wise to take out the smile and actually put a little band of tape over the mouth so that it is clear that nobody is allowed to say a word.

This is really astonishing. Here we are, in which every State—just ask your home State university if climate change is real. You don't have to go far. Ask the University of Kentucky, ask the University of Louisville, ask your home State university. They know. Everybody knows. The problem is the coal industry and the Koch brothers have this place locked down, and it is ridiculous.

The Koch brothers have pledged to spend \$889 million in this election through this group called Americans for Prosperity. And they have also said that "anybody who crosses us on climate change will be at a severe disadvantage." When you are swinging a \$900 million club and you are telling folks, disagree with us and you will be at a severe disadvantage, this is what you get—no plan on climate change.

You are going to hear endless complaining from our friends on the other side about the President's plan. What are you not going to hear? What their plan is. What is the alternative? What have they got? If you have nothing, if you have nada, zip, you really have to get into this conversation because even your own Republican young voters are demanding it. Republican voters under

the age of 35 think climate denial is ignorant, out of touch or crazy—their words in the poll, not mine.

So it is time we broke through. It is time the majority leader got away from this 100-percent coal situation that he is defending, allowed the future to take place, and allowed a conversation to take place here in the Senate. We are ready for it. We are ready for it.

I yield the floor to my wonderful colleague, Senator MARKEY, who has been working on this a good deal longer than I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Rhode Island, my friend from California, Senator BOXER, Senator SCHATZ from Hawaii, and all the Members who work on these issues.

This is the big one. This is the issue. This is the threat to the entire planet. Young people want us to do something about it. They are wondering when the older generation is finally going to get around to doing something about it, from moving to sending pollution up into the air to moving to clean energy, moving to new energy technologies.

So as they look at this, they look at coal, they look at a 19th century technology—coal—and they say: When are we moving to the new era? Well, that is a good question because in 2005 in the United States of America we deployed a grand total of 79 megawatts of solar. In 2014, we deployed 7,000 megawatts of solar—100 times more—because we started to have a plan.

Democrats put a plan in place by creating tax breaks for solar, by incentivizing more investment in solar across the country. Individual States started to put new regulations on the books—7,000 megawatts. Now we have 20,000 megawatts of solar in the United States. But we only deployed 79 in 2005.

Now, if you really want some great news as to what is possible, in 2015 and 2016, we are going to deploy 20,000 more—in just 2 years. So we are going to double the total amount of all solar ever deployed in the United States in just 2 years.

Over on the wind front, we are going to have about 80,000 megawatts total deployed by the end of next year, bringing it up to 120,000 megawatts. How much is that? When you look at a big nuclear powerplant and you see the picture of it, that is 1,000 megawatts. So we are talking about 120 of them being deployed by the end of next year.

So the young generation looks at us and they say: Can we do this? Can we meet the goals President Obama is setting? Can we meet the objective of having 28 percent of all of our electricity coming from renewables by the year 2030?

Well, if you hear from the coal industry or you hear from the nuclear industry, if you hear from the other fossil fuel industries, they say: Well, that is impossible. You can't do it. It is absolutely just going to be a very small part of the total amount of electricity that we generate in our country.

Well, they are just dead wrong. We are proving that in 2015 and 2016 because of the fight that is taking place at the State level—the tax breaks for wind and solar that were put on the books largely by Democrats here nationally. We are doing it. It is there. We now have over 200,000 people working in the solar industry in the United States. There are only 85,000 people who are in the coal industry. Got that? It is 2015. There are 80,000 people working in the wind industry in our country.

These are the growth industries. These are the Internet corollaries in clean energy. This is where young people are going. This is where innovation is going. This is where venture capital in America is going. This is where the innovation around our planet is going. We can do this. We can reduce greenhouse gases dramatically, increase employment simultaneously, and create wealth and health for our planet.

The President's plan will reduce by 90,000 per year the number of asthma attacks in our country. It will reduce by 90 percent the total amount of sulfur that is sent up into the atmosphere. It will be something that is supported by doctors and nurses and by Presidents and Popes. That is what we have. That is what this plan is. It is a beautiful plan. It is a plan that spans not just the technological and the political but also the moral imperative that is presented by this problem.

So yes, the big question that is being asked is this: Where is the Republican plan? Well, of course, there is none because they are still in denial that there is a problem, notwithstanding the fact that every single national academy of sciences of every single country in the world says there is a problem.

This is basically a small cabal of fossil fuel executives still trying to peddle 19th century technologies in the 21st century. It would be as though there were a cabal to stop us from moving from black rotary dial phones to wireless devices so that people could walk around with the new technologies. Oh, wait. There was a cabal. They fought it for years and years and years and years because they had the monopoly. The black rotary dial phone in the living room was all anyone would ever need. We had to break down those monopolies, and we have to break down these as well.

But here it is more than just having a phone in your pocket. Now it is actually saving the planet. It is ensuring we put in place the preventive measures that will reduce greenhouse gases while creating new jobs.

Senator WHITEHOUSE and I are part of a plan called the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative across New England, New York, Delaware, and Maryland. We already have a plan in place that has, in fact, reduced greenhouse gases, which has simultaneously seen dramatic increases in wealth, creating \$1.5 billion in savings for consumers. We can do this. We can do this.

The auto industry said we could not increase the fuel economy standards of the vehicles that we drive. We just went right past them. The telecommunications industry did not want us to be moving to this wireless revolution. We just went right past them. The coal industry does not want us to act right now. For the sake of the planet, for the sake of generations to come, we must go right past them and ensure President Obama's plan is enacted.

I thank the Chair, and I now yield to the Senator from Hawaii, Mr. SCHATZ.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts and Senators WHITEHOUSE and BOXER for their great leadership. I am really appreciative of the senior Senator from New York for taking the time to come to the floor to demonstrate his commitment to this issue.

There is an incredible opportunity here for American leadership. In Hawaii, in various places across the State, in 1 month we had 33 record highs—in the month of July. So we all know this is the challenge of our generation, and we all know the next most important step is the full implementation of the President's Clean Power Plan.

I wish to make a couple of points about the particulars of the plan. The first is that this is really done well. Normally, regulatory functions can be a blunt instrument. They can be a little less than careful in terms of how they are going to impact the economy. But this is done with great precision, with great care, and with great interaction with the incumbent utility companies and distribution and generation companies. So this is done with enough flexibility to say: Whatever your mix in terms of energies, we are not going to dictate exactly how you do it at a powerplant level, at a county level, at a city level. All we are saying is you have to meet these targets. And if you meet these targets through distributed generation or wind or solar or geothermal or hydro, that is not the Federal Government's concern.

Our concern is that carbon is a pollutant—and that has been determined by the courts, and it has been determined by scientists—and the Clean Air Act requires that airborne pollutants are regulated. So we are simply going to tell every State: This, like all other pollutants, has to be reduced over time.

I think the EPA took great pains to make sure this was done in a way that wouldn't cause too much upheaval in the economy. This is legally sound. There is no question that the EPA doesn't just have the authority and the discretion to move forward with carbon pollution regulations, they are actually required to under the last Supreme Court decision. And it is doable. Hawaii has a 100-percent clean energy goal. The Northeast has its RGGI program.

California has a cap-and-trade program. And all of our economies continue to grow. It is not that individuals and companies don't continue to have their challenges, but it is not because of our leaning forward into clean energy.

I will make one point about the kind of layering of obstruction. The first layer, which I think we have been successful in the last 6 months at breaking through, is the whole "I am not sure whether climate change is real." Then they sort of pivoted to "Well, I am not a scientist." So I don't think that is going to last for very long.

I think the next layer of obstruction is going to be "I think climate change is real. I am not sure what percentage of climate change is caused by humans and how much of it is naturally occurring." I think we will be able to punch through that opposition.

The next layer of opposition will be this: "America should wait." They will tell us that America should not lead in this, that we should wait for China, that we should wait for India, that we should wait for Germany, that we should wait for Japan. So let me ask this question: Since when does the United States wait for other countries to lead? This is the challenge of our generation, and it strikes me as preposterous that anybody who believes in American leadership would be willing to say "Let's see what other countries do about this problem first. Why don't we give this a few years?" We don't have a few years. This is an incredible opportunity for America to display the leadership it has always displayed in the international community. We finally have the high ground going into the Paris discussions. We are on legally sound ground, we are on morally sound ground, and I think politically we are increasingly on sound ground.

I am a full supporter of the President's Clean Power Plan. The one thing that causes me great dismay and I think causes some of the other participants in this colloquy dismay is that we are not even having a debate.

This is the Democrats asking you to come down to the floor and disagree with us. Disagree with the President. Disagree with Gina McCarthy. Tell SHELDON and me that our bill is a piece of garbage and this is what should be done instead. But let's have the great debate in the world's greatest deliberative body. Right now, it is entirely one-sided. If we are going to display American leadership, we need some Republican leadership as well.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question? I don't know if the Senator is aware of this, but I do know Senators WHITEHOUSE and MARKEY know this since they serve with me on the Environment and Public Works Committee. Tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, the Republicans on the Environment and Public Works Committee are going to put forward two bills, and they expect to pass them. One would stop the President's

Clean Power Plan in its tracks without putting in anything to replace it—as a matter of fact, putting up obstacles, as I understand it, to any other plan. So it would stop it in its tracks and set up huge obstacles for another rule. The other one would say that if you spray pesticides on bodies of water and the pesticides get into the water, that spraying should be exempted from the Clean Water Act.

I mean, it pains me. It pains me to say that this is coming from the environment committee. Why don't they just rename it the "anti-environment committee" when they are in charge because every week, every day on the environment they go in the wrong direction for our children and our grandchildren. I know my friend has young children. I have young grandchildren.

Isn't it a shame that at the moment in time when the Environment and Public Works Committee—they did a great job—we did a great job, all of us, on transportation. We had a 20-to-0 vote. We are so proud of it. But on the environment, we are split down the middle, with Republicans trying to stop the Clean Power Plan, stop the advances in fighting climate change, stop the ability of regulators to protect the waters from pesticide spraying. Isn't it just shameful that this will be happening tomorrow?

Mr. SCHATZ. Through the Chair, I understand the time for the colloquy is about to expire. Just to respond to the Senator from California, if there is no objection, I would just say that we really do need Republican leadership here. Prior to about 10 years ago, the Republican Party had a long history and an august history of working with Democrats to protect our air and our water, and we are all sincerely hoping we can get back to that place.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

PRESCRIPTION OPIOID AND HEROIN ABUSE

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a public health issue that is devastating communities and families in New Hampshire and throughout this country; that is, prescription opioid and heroin abuse.

I actually see my colleagues from Rhode Island and Massachusetts here. This is an issue where, on a bipartisan basis, we are focused on important legislation to address this terrible public health crisis.

Right now in New Hampshire, heroin—sometimes combined with a very powerful synthetic drug called fentanyl—is taking lives, ruining families, and harming communities. Public safety officials are confronting overdoses every single day.

My good friend, Manchester police chief Nick Willard, said recently: "I'm up to my eyes in heroin addiction." Unfortunately, the statistics underscore Chief Willard's statement. In all of 2014, Manchester police seized over 1,300 grams of heroin. As of just last month, Manchester police had seized

over 27,000 grams of heroin in 2015. That is nearly 26,000 more grams in just 7 months. In 2014, there were over 320 fatal drug-related overdoses in New Hampshire—up from 193 in 2013—and heroin and fentanyl were the primary drivers of nearly 250 of those deaths. In Manchester alone—our largest city—overdose deaths so far have increased 90 percent over 2014 and over 269 percent if we go back to 2013. That is the crisis we are facing. That is how many lives are being taken by opioids, by overdosing on prescription drugs and heroin, and it is devastating.

I worked with law enforcement when I was attorney general of New Hampshire. I know how hard they are working on this. They are working tirelessly to get these drugs off the streets. But they will tell you that we simply cannot arrest our way out of this problem. I have actually heard from law enforcement in New Hampshire that what they believe we need most to confront this public health crisis and to confront the public safety issues that go with it are more prevention, more treatment options, and more support for individuals in recovery.

We know that addiction to prescription pain medication can often become a gateway to heroin abuse. Unfortunately, right now the price of heroin on the streets has gotten so cheap that people are often going from prescription drug addiction to heroin addiction because of the price and the high and the way they feel. It is so tragic. According to a study from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, approximately 4 out of every 5 new heroin users previously used nonmedical prescription opioids before using heroin.

I wish to briefly mention two pieces of legislation that I believe represent critical steps in the right direction.

In February I helped reintroduce the bipartisan Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. I thank my colleague from Rhode Island, who is in this Chamber, as well for his important work on this legislation. This legislation would expand opioid prevention and education efforts and expand the availability of naloxone to first responders and law enforcement. It would also support additional resources to identify and treat incarcerated individuals suffering from substance abuse disorder and encourage prevention by expanding drug take-back sites to promote the safe disposal of unwanted or unused prescription drugs, strengthening prescription drug monitoring programs, and launching a prescription opioid and heroin treatment and intervention program.

This summer I had the privilege of doing a ride-along with the Manchester fire department. Within half an hour of being at the fire department, we were called to a heroin overdose. I watched the first responders give Narcan to a young man who was on the ground who I thought was going to die, and he came right back. But what I noticed

was that in that room in a corner was an infant—an infant child whom the firefighter gave to another young woman in the room. Think about the impact of that. What chance does that child have when her father is on the floor, is not getting treatment, and is getting back in this cycle?

Often what I hear from our first responders is that when they save someone's life using a drug such as Narcan, they see the same people again because they are not getting the treatment they need to get the recovery they need from this horrible addiction they have.

Earlier this year I also reintroduced the Heroin and Prescription Opioid Abuse Prevention, Education, and Enforcement Act with Senator JOE DONNELLY of Indiana. This bipartisan bill would reauthorize programs related to prescription drug monitoring programs that are helpful to our physicians so they can get good information when they are prescribing pain medication; grants for local law enforcement; and establishing an interagency task force to develop best practices in prescribing pain medication.

The headlines we are seeing in New Hampshire every day in our local newspapers underscore the sad reality of this problem. Here are some we have seen in recent weeks:

The Union Leader: "Mom, dad overdose on heroin while bathing child."

The Nashua Telegraph in May: "Nine die from drug overdoses in Nashua so far this year, including three in one weekend." Nashua is where I was born and where I lived.

The Telegraph on May 14: "Toddler left in care of men, one of whom died of an overdose."

There was more on that same day: "Hampton man on heroin causes 5-car crash."

May 29: "Ossipee mom accused of selling heroin with 2 kids in the car."

These news stories mirror the heartbreaking personal stories of loss I have been hearing about from families in our State. I want to share a couple of these stories.

Recently, I met with the family of Courtney Griffin, a 20-year-old young woman from Newton, NH. Tragically, Courtney lost her life to a heroin overdose last September. I was very moved by her family's story.

Courtney aspired to join the Marine Corps and had already attended boot camp. She was a charter member of the Kingston Lions Club. She played the French horn in high school and was a member of the tennis club.

During high school, Courtney started hanging out with a different crowd, and at some point the Griffins' prescription medication in their cabinet started disappearing. After Courtney graduated from high school, her addiction grew worse. She was stealing from her father's business and from her family in a desperate attempt to feed her addiction.

Courtney entered drug treatment, but she relapsed. When she finally ad-

mitted she had a problem, she tried to seek treatment but was denied coverage because the Griffins' insurance company said it wasn't a life-or-death situation. With some help from local law enforcement, Courtney was finally able to find a place to receive treatment. Tragically, she died of a heroin overdose about a week before she was set to begin treatment.

Her father Doug is doing everything he can to turn Courtney's story of tragedy into a cautionary tale so that he can save other families from what his family has been through.

Doug and others like him have a perspective on this crisis that is impossible for anyone who has not personally experienced a loss like this to understand. I admire his courage in sharing the story of his family so that he can save other families' lives.

Unfortunately, this story is all too common. In April, Molly Parks, a waitress at Portland Pie Company in Manchester, lost her life to a heroin overdose while she was at work. Her father is also speaking out to warn other families of the dangers of drug addiction.

I want to share as a final point one story that really moved me on Memorial Day. That story came from Keith Howard. He served our country with distinction. I know him personally. When he returned home from his enlistment, he struggled with alcohol and heroin abuse and he became homeless. Unfortunately, we hear too many of these stories about our veterans, what they are carrying with them, the wounds from war, and they become addicted to drugs and alcohol. Keith was one of those individuals who served our country and who became addicted. Today Keith is sober, and he helps run Liberty House in Manchester, NH, which provides sober housing for American veterans transitioning out of homelessness and helps our homeless veterans. Keith has dedicated his life to this.

On Memorial Day—on that important day on which we honor those who have sacrificed so much and made the ultimate sacrifice for our freedom—he shared stories with us of veterans who have come to Liberty House and turned their lives around, but he also shared stories of others who came but could not overcome their addiction, eventually costing them their homes, their families, and in some cases their lives.

Keith and Liberty House are doing incredibly important work for veterans in Manchester, but he believes there is more to be done. On Memorial Day of this year when we were honoring those servicemembers who gave their lives in service to our country, Keith reminded us of something else when he told a crowd at Veteran's Park in Manchester—and you could have heard a pin drop when he said this: "Let us honor our dead by creating hope for our living." He is absolutely right.

It is clear to me that we need to work together. This is a bipartisan issue. This is a public health crisis.

This is about the quality of life in our country. This is a problem on which we need to work together at the local, State, and Federal level in partnership to identify effective strategies to help save lives and take back our communities.

For my part, I will remain committed to fighting against this public health epidemic and taking it up at its roots to make sure for our children that this addiction and heroin—that we get it off our streets but that we get help for those who are addicted and that they understand they shouldn't feel the stigma I know many of them do, that we want them to come forward, we want to help them, and we understand this is incredibly difficult. We want them to know we stand with them so they can get the help and the treatment they need to lead productive lives.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Hampshire leaves the floor, I wish to thank her for her work on the comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. She has been a very good partner in that effort. I know her home State, like Rhode Island, is suffering an extraordinary wave of opioid addiction and opioid fatalities. I know she is also working hard to make sure we get a hearing in the Judiciary Committee under present leadership. I am getting good signals on that. I hope we can pin that down before too long. I think this is a very important issue for us to get a hearing on, and I think it is one that all of the Presidential candidates are seeing. It is one so many of us see in our home States.

One of the smallest towns in Rhode Island is a little town called Burrillville. It is a beautiful place. It is in the northern rural area of our State. People laugh when I say "the rural area of Rhode Island," but we really do have them. Burrillville is a very bucolic area, and there are very wonderful people there.

In the first quarter of this year, in little Burrillville, six people lost their lives to overdose. When I went to the Burrillville High School to do an event there about this bill and to listen and get ideas for our legislation, there were three recovering folks who came to talk about their situation. Like so many folks in recovery, they were unbelievably inspiring and noble in the way they discussed it. All three of them had gone to Burrillville High School.

It is a real problem, and I appreciate very much the leadership of the Senator from New Hampshire.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. President, this is actually the time of the week for me to deliver my 109th "Time to Wake Up" speech. I find it a little bit frustrating these days because climate change used to be a bipartisan issue. Over and over again, we

had bipartisan, serious climate change bills. In fact, the first big climate change bill in the EPW Committee was Warner-Lieberman—John Warner, Republican of Virginia, and Joe Lieberman, Democrat of Connecticut. But then came Citizens United and all that dark money began to flow, all that fossil fuel money began to flow, all that Koch brothers money began to flow. Now, even as the evidence of climate change deepens to irrefutability, it is hard to find a Republican in Congress who will do anything. Here is the formula: Duck the question, deny the evidence, and disparage the scientists. Duck, deny, and disparage. That is some strategy for an issue which so many people take seriously.

As Congress sleepwalks through history, the warnings are painfully clear. Carbon pollution piles up in the atmosphere. Temperatures are rising. Weather worsens at the extremes. The oceans rise, warm, and acidify. These are all measurements. This isn't theory. The measurements confirm what the science has always told us about dumping so much excess carbon into oceans and atmosphere.

So hurray for the President's Clean Power Plan. For the first time, we have a national effort to reduce carbon pollution from powerplants, which are the largest source of U.S. carbon emissions. This plan is big. This plan is good. And this plan is urgently needed. I congratulate the President, I congratulate Administrator McCarthy, and I congratulate the good and public-spirited people of the EPA and other Federal agencies who worked hard to listen and make this plan final.

Of course, we will still have the usual complaining from all of the usual suspects. The Senate majority leader, the senior Senator from Kentucky, opposes any serious conversation about climate change. In fact, he is ready to lead his modern version of massive resistance against the Federal Clean Power Plan. The Republican leader has written to Governors urging defiance of the EPA regulations, calling them "extremely burdensome and costly," which would be a more credible conclusion had he not reached it months before the regulations were even finalized.

Actually, if we want to get into the actual world here, a report just out from that famous liberal, Socialist bastion Georgia Tech found that the clean power rule could be enacted in a very cost-effective manner and could lower folks' energy bills in the long term. But let's not let the facts get in the way when there are fossil fuel interests to be placated.

As the Washington Post reported, folks expect to comply with the Clean Power Plan with relatively little effort, even in Kentucky. "We can meet it" is what Dr. Leonard Peters, Kentucky's energy and environment secretary, has to say about the Clean Power Plan. "We can meet it." In fact, Dr. Peters praised the EPA for working with States like his to build this rule.

"The outreach they've done, I think, is incredible," he said. EPA had an "open door policy. You could call them, talk to them, meet with them." The Kentucky experience was echoed around the country, as EPA listened closely to the concerns of utilities, regulators, experts, and citizens. They have made big adjustments to accommodate the concerns of stakeholders in the States.

When the usual complaining comes from the usual suspects, please ask them: What is your plan? How would you do a better job of addressing the carbon emissions that are polluting our atmosphere and oceans? What is your alternative?

Spoiler alert: You will look far and wide before finding a Republican plan. Don't look here. Don't look in the Senate. Republicans in the Senate have exactly zero legislation for addressing carbon pollution in any serious way. None. Zip. Nada. Duck, deny, and disparage is all they have. Don't look at their Presidential candidates. In recent weeks I have used these weekly climate speeches to look at Republican Presidential candidates' views on climate change. It is pathetic. There is nothing. What are we up to—87 Republican Presidential candidates? And not one has a climate change plan. OK, I was exaggerating about the 87.

Florida, ground zero for sea level rise, two Republican Presidential candidates, and what do the two of them have? Nothing. Republican mayors from Florida, State universities in Florida, the Army Corps office in Florida—nothing gets through to the candidates. Duck, deny, disparage is all they have.

The Wisconsin Presidential candidate ignores his own home State university, his own State newspapers, and his own State scientists. But Governor Walker can actually top duck, deny, and disparage. His response to climate change? Use your budget to fire the scientists at the State environmental protection agency.

How about our Presidential candidate, the junior Senator from Kentucky? What do we hear from him? He has said that the EPA rules are illegal, and he has predicted that they will result in power shortages—no lights and no heat. But does he have an alternative he would prefer? No. He has nothing, and, like all the other got-nothing Republican Presidential candidates, he is out of step with his own home State.

Kentucky isn't just easily able to comply with the Clean Power Plan; agencies and officials all across Kentucky are working seriously on climate change.

By the way, here is a look at why compliance is easy in Kentucky: Kentucky's fuel mix, which this charts, is a wall of coal. As the song says, the Sun shines bright on my old Kentucky home, but good luck finding any solar in there. You will need a magnifying glass to find this tiny little green line at the top that is barely visible that is

solar and wind combined. I mean, really? Iowa can get to 30 percent wind. Iowa has two Republican Senators. It is not impossible. In Kentucky, they haven't even tried.

Kentucky's cities—Lexington, Louisville, Frankfurt, Bowling Green, and Villa Hills—get it. They have signed the U.S. Mayors Climate Protection Agreement in order to—quoting officials from Lexington—"act locally to reduce the impacts of climate change by lowering (manmade) greenhouse gas emissions."

The hills of Kentucky are some distance from the shores of Rhode Island and the shores of New Hampshire as well. Living by the sea, I have to worry about climate change and what it is doing to our oceans and coasts. Kentucky is landlocked. So imagine my surprise to read the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources warning about sea level rise. I will quote them.

With the predicted increases in severity of hurricanes and tropical storms, coupled with potential shoreline losses in Florida and throughout the eastern seaboard, people may begin migrations inland. If and when these events occur, Kentucky may experience human population growth unprecedented to the Commonwealth.

So I say to our candidate from Kentucky, the junior Senator, and our majority leader, the senior Senator, with Kentucky, their home State, projecting that people on the coasts will be hit so hard by climate change that we may have to flee inland to landlocked Kentucky, I hope the Senators from Kentucky will understand my persistence on this issue when their own State thinks that my citizens might have to flee to Kentucky to get away from this threat.

Kentucky is renowned for its horses. So I turned to Horse & Rider magazine and found a great article on "how climate change might affect our horses' health." Horse & Rider's expert was none other than Dr. Craig Carter of the University of Kentucky. He had specific concerns in the article for equine health, but he also offered us this general reminder:

It's not just horses (and people) at risk: crops are being affected, as are trees, due to beetle infestations. Climate change affects all forms of life.

That is from Dr. Carter of the University of Kentucky.

Kentucky Woodlands Magazine reports that "the world is changing right before our eyes. . . . [O]ur natural systems are changing as a result of a warming climate." The magazine even warns that "climate change is happening as you read this article."

Meanwhile the Senators from Kentucky are not sure why that may be. The junior Senator has said that he is not sure anybody knows exactly why all of this climate change is happening. The majority leader invokes that climate denial classic: I am not a scientist. Well—and I say this thankfully—the scientists are here to help, including Kentucky scientists.

At Kentucky's universities, the science seems pretty clear about exactly why all of this climate change is happening. Dr. Paul Vincelli is a professor at the University of Kentucky Cooperative Extension Service. He says:

In the scientific community, it is widely accepted that the global climate is changing and that human activities which produce greenhouse gases are a principal cause. Greenhouse gases have a strong capacity to trap heat in the lower atmosphere, even though they are present at trace concentrations.

Elsewhere, Professor Vincelli and his University of Kentucky colleagues write:

Scientific evidence that our global climate is warming is abundant. . . . Practicing scientists consider the evidence of human-induced global warming to be extremely strong.

The University of Kentucky is not the only place. Eastern Kentucky University offers concentrations in environmental sustainability and stewardship, including courses on global climate change. Northern Kentucky University signed the American College and University Presidents' Climate Commitment, pledging Northern Kentucky University to "an initiative in pursuit of climate neutrality."

At the University of Louisville, Professor Keith Mountain is the chair of the department of geography and geosciences. He has lectured about "how climate change is a measurable reality and how people have contributed to the trends."

Despite all of the experts in Kentucky saying that human-caused climate change is real, despite the harms that State and local officials foresee for Kentucky and the rest of the country, and despite the easy steps being taken in Kentucky to comply with the President's Clean Power Plan, the Senators from Kentucky have no plan—nothing. They are part of the "duck, deny, and disparage" caucus.

And the Presidential candidates? There is almost nothing they won't make up to try to jam a sick in the wheels of progress—imaginary wars on coal when it is really coal's war on us, imaginary cost increases that have been completely debunked by actual experience, imaginary reliability failures when the real reliability problem is already happening around us thanks to climate-driven extreme weather. On and on they go. Yet they offer no alternative. Republicans simply have no plan other than a shrug.

Why do they have no climate plan? Why do they present nothing by way of limits to carbon pollution? Here is a clue: Look where the money comes from. It comes from fossil fuel billionaires and fossil fuel interests. Look at the beauty pageant hosted this weekend by the Koch brothers in Dana Point, CA, where Republican Presidential candidates went to display their wares to the big donors.

Do you think the Koch brothers want to hear about climate change? Here is

another clue: Americans for Prosperity, part of the Koch brothers' big-money political organization, has openly warned that any client who crosses them on climate change will be "at a severe disadvantage"—subtle as a brick from an outfit threatening to spend part of the \$889 million total that the Koch brothers have budgeted for this election. And yes, \$889 million in one election is big money. "For that kind of money, you could buy yourself a president," said Mark McKinnon, a Republican and former George W. Bush strategist and a good Texan. "Oh, right," he continued, "that's the point."

Even the Donald called the Republicans out on this one, calling the Koch brothers' California event a "beg-a-thon," and saying: "I wish good luck to all of the Republican candidates that traveled to California to beg for money, etc., from the Koch Brothers."

What a shame, to be a Presidential candidate willing to ignore your home State universities, ignore your home State newspapers, ignore your home State scientists—unless, of course, you are trying to fire them—ignore your own home State farmers, foresters, and fishermen, all so you can prance successfully at pageants for the big-money fossil fuel interests that today control the Republican party. Duck, deny, and disparage is what gets you through the beauty pageant. So duck, deny, and disparage it is.

Eventually, the Republican Party is going to have to come up with a plan on climate change. The American people are demanding it, Independent voters, whom they will need in 2016, are demanding it. Even Republican voters demand it, at least if they are young ones. And it really matters that we get this right. It is the responsibility of the United States of America, as a great nation, to set an example for others to follow and not just sit back and wait for others to act.

Failing to act on climate change would both dim the torch we hold up to the world and give other nations an excuse for delay. Failure, I contend, when the stakes are so high becomes an argument for our enemies against our very model of government. How do we explain the influence of this special interest interfering with what must be done? There will be no excuse when a reckoning comes to say: I really needed the political support of those fossil fuel billionaires; so, sorry, world.

President Abraham Lincoln, a native Kentuckian, warned us that "the dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present." Before the present gets too stormy, I urge my colleagues from Kentucky to heed the experts in their home State, heed the local leaders in their home State, and wake up to what needs to be done.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I came to the floor expecting to hear my

friend and colleague talk about the bill that we are trying to get on, which is the cyber security bill, but again, I hear him returning to his favorite topic, which is climate change. I know he thinks that is the most important subject that we could possibly discuss on the floor of the Senate.

I will just say—and I certainly don't purport to be the expert he is—that when you look at the President's proposed new rules with regard to electricity generation, it looks to me like it is all pain and no gain. The experts, perhaps that he has referred to, said that CO₂ reductions would actually be less than one-half of 1 percent, and, of course, energy prices on low-income individuals, seniors, and people on fixed income would go up—people who have already been suffering through flat wages and slow wage growth for a long time. Of course, in this economy, which grew last year at the rate of 2.2 percent, it would be a further wet blanket on economic growth and job creation.

The Senator and I have worked together closely on a number of issues, and I enjoy his company, his intellect, and his energy, but I would say he is all wrong on this one. It sounds to me like so many of our colleagues sound like Chicken Little: The sky is falling, the sky is falling. Well, I don't think the facts justify it.

There are more important things we can do today and this week—for example, to pass a cyber security bill.

WORK IN THE SENATE

But first, I want to take a minute to consider what we have done this year under the new leadership. I know some like to focus on things that we haven't done, but I assure my colleague that we are just getting started, and there is a lot of important work that remains to be done. Last November the American people elected a new majority in the Senate, and I believe they elected us to represent their interests, to flesh out legislation, and to get this Senate back to work. We were elected to run the government and get things done; that is, of course, in a way that is consistent with our principles.

I even heard some people suggest that working with folks on the other side of the aisle in a bipartisan way is wrong, that we shouldn't do anything with Democrats on the Republican side or that Democrats shouldn't do anything with Republicans. That is a completely warped perspective.

I think the better perspective is that expressed by one of our conservative colleagues whom I asked when I got to the Senate: How is it that you work so productively in an important Senate committee with Senator Teddy Kennedy, the liberal lion of the Senate? This question was asked to one of the most conservative Members of the U.S. Senate. How can a conservative Senator and a liberal Senator work together productively to the best interests of their constituents and the American people? And he said: It is easy. It is the 80-20 rule. Let's find the

80 percent we can agree on, and the 20 percent we can't we will leave for another fight on another day. I believe we have been applying for the benefit of the American people the 80-20 rule, trying to find those things we can agree on, and we have been making substantial progress.

Since January we have delivered real results, proving that our back-to-work model was not just another empty campaign promise. Early this summer we passed the important trade bill, legislation that will help American goods get to global markets. Then we passed the Defense authorization bill, a bill that provides our men and women in uniform the resources and authority they need to keep us safe in an ever more dangerous world. We passed an important education bill, the Every Child Achieves Act, legislation that would actually do what my constituents in Texas want us to do, which is send more of the authority from Washington back into the hands of our parents, teachers, and local communities and out of the Department of Education here in Washington, DC. Just last week we passed the 3-year highway bill. Actually, it is a 6-year highway bill. We were able to come up with funding for the first 3 years and left open for us work to be done to come up with additional funding working with our colleagues in the House. Transportation infrastructure is something that supports our States and local communities and allows them to prepare for the growing infrastructure needs in the future while keeping commerce rolling, public safety protected, and protecting our environment.

Of course, we all know that we are just getting started. We have been here in the new Congress for 7 months. We are now on another important bill requiring every Senator's full and immediate attention. The Cyber Security Information Sharing Act is legislation that is long overdue. If it sounds familiar, it is for a good reason because we actually tried to pass this earlier this summer before it was blocked by our friends on the other side of the aisle. This legislation would provide for greater information sharing by people who have been subjected to hacks and would address the rampant and growing cyber threats facing our country.

One of the things that is so dangerous now is when a private company or an individual is hacked, they can't actually share that information through a central portal with other people to protect them if they haven't yet been hacked themselves. Of course, there are all sorts of concerns about liability and the like, but we need to address this to help the Nation deter future cyber attacks and to help the public and private sector act more nimbly and effectively when attacks are detected.

As I said, we had a chance to vote on this in June as an amendment to the Defense authorization bill. Unfortunately, this was about the time that

some on the other side—I think most notably the next Democratic leader—announced something they called the filibuster summer. These are not exactly encouraging words when it comes to trying to work together to get things done. In spite of the real and frightening threats all around us, our Democratic friends filibustered that cyber security bill in June. We know what happened soon thereafter. The need for real cyber security legislation became even more apparent.

Many of us recall that in June there was an initial disclosure that hackers had accessed sensitive background information used for security clearance purposes at the Office of Personnel Management. The estimate in June was that about 4 million people were affected—their personal information. Then on July 9, after our Democratic friends filibustered the cyber security bill on the Defense authorization bill, there was a second report. This time that report informed us that more than 21 million people's private, secure information had been accessed. This information, illegally accessed, includes passport information, which would show anywhere and everywhere you have traveled; Social Security numbers, which are portals to all sorts of secure financial information; private information, background details, extensive information from previous places of residence. You can imagine. On a form you fill out in order to get a security clearance, you literally have to give your whole life history. That is the kind of sensitive information that was acquired on 21 million people as announced on July 9. Of course, it also provides the names of contact information, close friends, and family members.

While many of these reports indicate that China, one of the worst offenders along with Russia when it comes to malicious cyber attacks—many reports indicate China was responsible. The Obama administration for some reason has been unwilling to acknowledge that or tell us who attacked and accessed 21 million sensitive pieces of information. Of course, they have done nothing to respond to this growing threat of cyber attacks.

The Office of Personnel Management was not the only government agency affected. In early June, it was also reported that the Internal Revenue Service had similar problems and that data from more than 100,000 taxpayers had been stolen—again, the kind of information that if you were to disclose it about private taxpayers, it would be a felony. It would be a criminal offense. This is sensitive information that has now been stolen for 100,000 taxpayers. This breach included access to past tax returns, sensitive information such as Social Security numbers, addresses, birthdays—all stolen and potentially in the hands of criminals. It is exactly the kind of information that identity thieves want in order to pretend they are somebody they are not in order to steal your money.

Clearly, we don't have time to waste when it comes to cyber security legislation. I would point out that the Democratic leader himself, someone who is quick to dismiss the earlier vote when we tried to do this in the context of the Defense authorization bill in June, has said that he is committed to getting cyber legislation done. Well, I would ask: If not now, when?

This bipartisan legislation that passed the Intelligence Committee in the Senate by a margin of 14 to 1 provides us another opportunity this week. With cyber threats so clearly in evidence all around us, we should act quickly to implement a solution. I would encourage all of our colleagues to try to find that 80-20 solution on this bill.

No one is claiming it is perfect. I already talked to the committee chairmen in the House who say they have some different views, but that is customary around here. Once the Senate passes the bill, it can be reconciled with the differences in the House bill in a conference committee.

Surely we all agree that this type of legislation and the protection it provides is desperately needed. As the vote in July suggests, this is a bill in and of itself that will be the product of a functioning bipartisan Senate. Let's continue our progress for the American people.

I would add, by way of closing, that more than 70 pieces of legislation have passed the Senate since January 1, and 30 of those have been signed into law. More than 160 bills have been reported out of committee. That is what a functioning Senate looks like.

As I said before and I will say again, even our colleagues who are in the minority must enjoy getting to do what they were elected to do, which is to come here and cast a vote on behalf of their constituents on important issues that the Senate is addressing. I hope we can get this legislation passed this week.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, yesterday Republicans in the Senate put forward legislation to defund Planned Parenthood. Unfortunately, this bill was a clear partisan attack on access to health care for women, and especially women in rural and underserved areas.

One in five American women have relied on Planned Parenthood health centers at some point in their lifetime. Often, Planned Parenthood is the woman's only option for basic, preventive health care, including prenatal care, physicals, and cancer screenings.

For example, take Mary, a 20-year-old student in my home State of Michigan, who went through her campus health center when she found a lump on her breast. They told her it was nothing and not to worry. When she visited Planned Parenthood a year

later for an unrelated matter, the clinician expressed concern that the lump was still there. Through Planned Parenthood she got referred to a program for low-income women with breast cancer, and she received the treatment that she needed. Today, Mary is thankfully cancer free. Planned Parenthood provides upward of a half million breast cancer exams every year and can save the lives of women just like Mary across the Nation.

Planned Parenthood also provides about 400,000 potentially lifesaving cervical cancer screenings annually. Katie, another young woman from Michigan, went in for her annual exam at a Michigan Planned Parenthood center. Her exam revealed that she had cervical cancer, and Planned Parenthood helped her weigh options to cover the biopsy and subsequent surgery. Today she, too, is thankfully cancer free.

The doctors and nurses at these facilities provide affordable, potentially lifesaving health care to 2.7 million people per year. Michigan has 21 Planned Parenthood health centers, 11 of which are located in rural or medically underserved areas. These numbers mirror national numbers, with over half of their 700 health care centers located in areas with limited access to medical care. Federal funding for Planned Parenthood supports access to treatment at these health centers for women like Mary and Katie in States all across this country.

Let's be clear. Federal funding for Planned Parenthood or any other organization is not used for abortion. Let me say this again because it is a very important fact. Federal funding for Planned Parenthood or any other organization is not used for abortion. This has been settled Federal law for decades.

Despite this fact, we have seen the adoption of extreme measures that restrict a woman's fundamental right to make her own decisions about her reproductive health, including in Michigan. A woman should have access to reproductive health services and the freedom to make her own decisions about her health care, and I will fight to protect this right each and every day that I serve here in the U.S. Senate.

Yesterday evening I voted to stop the Senate from moving forward with legislation to defund Planned Parenthood. This bill would have jeopardized access to health care for 2.7 million men and women who rely on Planned Parenthood for their health care needs. While I am pleased that the Senate did not move forward with the bill, it is clear that we have not seen the end of these types of partisan attacks on Planned Parenthood.

I urge my colleagues to move away from efforts to restrict access to health care and, instead, focus on crafting bipartisan agreements to fund our government, provide certainty to Amer-

ican employers and workers, support small businesses, and grow our middle class.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

(The remarks of Mr. HATCH pertaining to the introduction of S. 1922, S. 1923, and S. 1929 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative 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.

CLEAN POWER PLAN

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues in commending President Obama for putting forth his Clean Power Plan.

Theodore Roosevelt said:

Of all the questions which can come before this nation, short of the actual preservation of its existence in a great war, there is none which compares in importance with the great central task of leaving this land even a better land for our descendants than it is for us.

I think it captured very well the challenge we face with carbon pollution and global warming because we are facing that great central task of leaving this land better for our descendants than it is for us.

We are facing a situation in which there is an accelerating quantity of carbon dioxide pollution in the atmosphere, and it is having a profound impact on, basically, the temperature of our planet. If we simply look at the carbon pollution itself, scientists have said that we are in trouble if it rises over 350 parts per million. Well, here we are with pollution that last year hit 400 parts per million. So we are above the danger zone. We are going deeper into the danger zone—let me put it that way—and that is not where we need to be.

Furthermore, we are accelerating the rate at which we are polluting the planet with carbon dioxide. It was just a few decades ago that the rate of carbon pollution was increasing by about 1 part per million per year, and now it is increasing by something closer to 2 parts per million per year. So where we need to be decreasing the overall pollution, bringing it down, we are increasing it and increasing the rate at which

we are polluting, and that is a very bad place for humankind to be on this planet.

There is incontrovertible evidence of how quickly the planet is warming. We have, by scientific record—14 of the warmest 15 years in recorded history have occurred in the last 15 years. So 14 of the 15 warmest years over the centuries of measurement have all occurred in the last 15 years. That is not just one little warm spell on some little piece of land; that is a global temperature.

As carbon pollution is increasing, we see the global temperature increasing, and it is reverberating all across the planet. We see dramatic changes in the Arctic. The rate of warming in the Arctic is roughly four times the rate of warming in more moderate latitudes. So we are seeing an incredible decrease in the ice, huge changes that are coming so quickly, it is very hard for animals to adapt. Of course, people are well aware of the crisis the polar bears are facing, but that is just one particular visible species as an indicator of the challenges that are going on.

We are seeing the feedback mechanisms in the polar zone. We are seeing the open waters where ice is not reflecting the sunlight back up. More water is absorbing more sunlight, and that is creating an accelerated heating impact. We are seeing that as thawing occurs in the permafrost, we have these situations with what are called drunken forests, where the trees that all stood straight are now staggering in one direction or the other as they lean slightly, as the ground underneath them that was frozen is melting. As it starts to melt, it will start to release methane gas, which is a very potent global warming gas. So that is another feedback mechanism we should all be concerned about.

Let's take my home State of Oregon, and I think one could do this type of checkup, if you will, on any State in the Union. In my home State, we had a very severe series of droughts in the Klamath Basin, which is a major agricultural basin. We have had the three worst ever droughts in a period of 15 years. It corresponds with the period of the warmest years on planet Earth in recorded history. And that has a huge impact on our farming industry. So if you care about farmers, you should care about global warming.

Then we had a big challenge with our forests because as these summers are becoming dryer and as the types of storms we have are producing more lightning strikes, we are having a lot more forest fires. The fire season is getting longer and more devastating. Far more acres are being burned. Over several decades, the fire season has increased by several weeks in length, and the amount of acres burning each summer, on average, is increasing. So if

you care about timber, if you care about forests, then you should care about global warming.

Another impact of this changing pattern is that we are getting very little snowfall in the Cascades. Just as Glacier Park is now becoming the park of disappearing glaciers—you have to look very hard to find any glaciers left in Glacier Park—the Cascades also—a different mountain range—are losing their snowpack. In fact, we have virtually no snowpack now feeding the mountain streams that come down. So if you are a fisherman, you are looking at smaller and warmer streams, which is very unhealthy for fish.

That is not all. Right now we have sockeye coming up the Columbia River and getting to the Snake River, and they are dying because the temperature of the river is too warm for them to continue upriver to spawn. Some estimates that I have seen in the last week are that as many as 80 percent of the sockeye now returning are dying in the Columbia River before they make it to the Snake River. So if you care about fishing, you should care about global warming.

Then we look at our coastal shellfish and we discover that we have a significant problem with our oysters. Oregon produces a lot of oyster seed. Those are the baby oysters that get distributed to oyster fishermen. There is a similar process going on in Washington State at another hatchery. The challenge for the hatcheries is that the water that is pumped out of the ocean to produce the baby oysters, get them going, is becoming too acidic. This also is about global warming because the higher rates of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere are being absorbed by the ocean, and that creates carbonic acid. It has been enough that there is a 30-percent increase in the acidity of the ocean, and that is causing a big problem with baby oysters as far as forming shells. So if you care about the seafood industry, you should care about global warming.

When we talk about the issue of global warming, we are not talking about computer models and things that are 50 years into the future; we are talking about real-life effects seen on the ground right now, things that are having a big impact on our seafood, a big impact on our fishing, a big impact on our farming, and a big impact on our forestry. If you care about rural America's resource-driven economies across this country, you should care about global warming.

As a nation, it is incumbent on us to take on this challenge. We are the first generation—as has been said by others—to feel the impact of global warming and the last generation that can do something about it. It is incumbent on us, the Senators in this Chamber, the U.S. Senate, to take on this issue. It is incumbent on the Presidents and the executive teams they put together to take this on in partnership with the rest of the world because this is absolutely a tragedy of the commons.

Very clearly, if the United States takes some action to reduce our carbon dioxide or to reduce our methane production, it will have a modest impact but not enough. Nations across the planet have to act, and they will act more or less as a community because very few nations are going to say they will act alone knowing they won't have a big enough impact unless nations join together. So it is up to our leadership role in the world that we act actively, aggressively, and reach out with other nations to partner.

Earlier this year there was an agreement struck with China. China is going to produce as much renewable energy from electricity by 2030 as all the electricity we currently produce in the United States. I am not just talking about our renewable energy. If you take the U.S. renewable energy, our nuclear energy, our energy produced from gas-fired plants, our electricity produced from coal-fired plants, and you add it all together, that is the amount of electricity China is going to produce with just renewable energy between now and 2030. They are taking on a massive commitment to renewable energy. They wouldn't be doing it if the United States wasn't also responding aggressively. India is starting to become interested in doing their share, seeing that other nations are stepping up.

The United States should never be sitting on its hands and saying: We will wait for everybody else to act—not when there is an issue that threatens the success of the next generation of humans on this planet and the generation after and the generation after.

I said earlier that not only are we the first generation to feel the impact of global warming, but we are the last generation that can do something about it. What do I mean by that? What I mean is that the further you get into global warming, the further you get into carbon pollution, methane pollution, and more feedback mechanisms, the harder it is to stop. There is momentum that builds behind the warming of the planet. It becomes much harder to take it on. That is why we need to act decisively now.

So the Clean Power Plan the President launched, put forward yesterday, is responding to the moral demand of this generation to take on carbon pollution. It is doing so in a most cost-effective fashion, a fashion that will create jobs in the United States, a fashion that will reduce deaths in the United States.

Let me give an example of the health benefits. It will avoid up to 3,600 premature deaths, lead to 90,000 fewer asthma attacks in children, and prevent 300,000 missed workdays and schooldays. That is incredible. It will save the average family nearly \$85 in their annual energy bill by the year 2030. So that is powerful.

In addition, we are going to create jobs in this fashion. It has the tremendous impact of putting people to

work—tens of thousands to work, driving new investments in cleaner, more modern, and efficient renewable energy technologies.

I close by turning back to President Theodore Roosevelt, who said there is no more important mission than “leaving this land even a better land for our descendants than it is for us.”

There are individuals who will come to this floor and they will say: Let's act someday but not now. Let's do it when it will not have an impact on jobs. Well, this will actually create jobs right now. Let's do it when it will cost less. Well, it never costs less if the problem gets bigger. It costs less to invest now. Let's pass it on to the next generation. They will solve it. That is morally irresponsible.

Every State is feeling the direct impact. Every rural community, timber community, fishing community, shellfish community, and farming community is feeling the impact today of our failure to address this yesterday. Our children, our children's children, and our children's children's children are counting on us in the Senate to act aggressively, to support a strong plan to take on carbon pollution—a strong Clean Power Plan. So let's do so.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

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

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I come from an energy State—Oklahoma. We truly do all of the above. We have coal, oil, gas, wind, solar, hydro, geothermal, and we are just missing nuclear. Quite frankly, we probably would have nuclear if the regulations weren't so incredibly high and so incredibly expensive to do. In my State and in my region, we want diverse, inexpensive, healthy, plentiful, and reliable energy. We don't think that should be such a high goal that it is only limited to Oklahoma. Quite frankly, I think just about every area of the country wants that.

In fact, that used to be a bipartisan goal. It used to be that Democrats also supported “all of the above” energy. At some point, they shifted to the ways of Solyndra and determined if you want to be in that party, you have to commit to a certain environmental orthodoxy. It makes it a tougher conversation to have about real energy policy based around facts.

It is another day. It seems to be another day for the EPA to release massive new regulations. People wonder why their paycheck doesn't go as far nowadays, why food costs more, why products cost more, and why energy costs more. I can tell you why. It is this ever-growing regulation on the basic cost of energy. It changes the cost of everything.

The EPA stated they are not responsible for determining the benefits of

climate change, just that it would happen. As they put out their new Clean Power Plan, they said they didn't have to actually list or abide by the cost. They did determine the cost anyway—\$8.4 billion a year to the American consumer; \$8.4 billion on top of the energy regulations that already exist.

They also said they weren't responsible for having to be able to run through the actual effects on climate change, they just said it is happening and so we need to do something. In fact, it has been interesting for me to hear so many of my colleagues in the past 24 hours say: Republicans, put out your plan. We are doing something. You need to put out a plan to show you are doing something as well.

We ran the numbers on it and tried to evaluate it through the EPA models and looked for somewhere where someone who ran the EPA model would note how much change there would be in the environment if this plan is fully implemented. The model came back that it would slow the rise of the sea 0.3 millimeters once this is fully implemented—0.3 millimeters of sea change difference. To give an example, the head of this pen is 0.7 millimeters. So half the head of this pen is what we are going to save in sea level change if we fully implement this plan.

This seems to be about fear—severe weather, imminent danger. If you don't change everything in your life to the way we think you should live your life, the whole Earth is going to fall into chaos and ruin.

We need to have an energy debate on this floor. I completely agree. We even need to have a climate debate on this floor, but it doesn't need to be out of fear. It needs to be about the facts—what really needs to happen.

Let's start with some basic questions about energy policy and about energy future: What will it take to have reliable energy for the United States during a summer heat wave so we don't have rolling blackouts and senior adults suffering from heatstroke during an August afternoon?

What will it take to protect our grid so that doesn't occur? What will it take to have reliable energy for the hardest nights of winter to make sure Americans are protected in those coldest nights so their power doesn't go out because of rolling blackouts? What energy sources are plentiful in the United States and what energy sources leave us vulnerable to international pressures? What energy sources do we have that we should export to gain economic benefits and geopolitical power for the United States? What energy sources are economical so we can attract manufacturing to the United States to create more jobs for America? How can we ensure that the energy we use has the least amount of health risks so we can have a healthy nation and a healthy world? How about this question. What is the best way to keep energy diversity and distribution to protect our economy from rapid price swings or localized acts of terrorism?

That is how you begin to set an energy policy, which is to ask some general questions and then start answering some of those and asking, What is the best way to accomplish that? Instead, our energy policy is being run by environmental policy and fear of what could possibly happen in the future or protecting ourselves from 0.3 millimeters of sea rise.

Over the past 10 years, CO₂ emissions have drastically been reduced. Since 2005, CO₂ emissions from electric generation has been reduced by 364 million metric tons to 2,051 metric tons. The future goal, by the way, in this new Clean Power Plan is to have 788 metric tons of reduction from 2005, but we are already 364 metric tons there because there has already been a pretty dramatic reduction, much of that from a very slow economy—so 424 more metric tons by 2030. That would mean, even with an ever-increasing population, increasing energy needs, and hopefully a recovering economy, we need to cut much more.

Let me try to set this in context. I am going to throw around some numbers for a while, but I think we as a body can handle it. Let me give some perspective on where things are going on this.

The last time the United States emitted this target amount for CO₂ that has now been laid out as the targeted amount was in 1985, with 237 million people. If you want a little bit of throwback time, that is when Duran Duran, Huey Lewis, and the Commodores had all the big hits. That is when there were no personal computers or cell phones or iPads, cloud computing had never even been discussed, and there weren't all the electric devices we have now. We had 237 million people at the time.

The target is to get to that same amount of CO₂ usage, but we will have 363 million people at the time. That is the estimate from the Census Bureau. So the plan is to have 126 million more people emit less carbon and use less electricity. That sounds like an interesting plan. If you want the real number by percentage, let me break that down for you. In 1985, every 1 million people used 6.86 metric tons of CO₂—6.86 metric for every 1 million people. Now, in 2015, every 1 million people use 6.38 metric tons of CO₂.

That means, in the past 30 years, we have reduced for each 1 million people about half a ton of CO₂ because of energy efficiencies, because of the changes in the way we do energy. We do it much cleaner now than we did it in the 1970s and 1980s. Good for us. We achieved a lot in 1985—a lot of changes—but we have half a ton less CO₂ per 1 million people.

What the administration is proposing in their plan is that for every 1 million people in the United States in 2030, we would use 4.48 million tons of CO₂. That means, in the last 30 years, with the energy efficiency movement, with everything that has been done, with the

remarkable shift in renewables, we have gained half a ton. The administration wants us now to get 2 tons of additional amount in the next 15 years.

Do you understand why a lot of people say this is just not rational? You can't get to an acceleration that fast with that big a goal. Here is what happens, though. I look at the facts and the requirements and immediately I am called a Neanderthal who just wants dirty air and dirty water. Actually, I have children, too, and I like clean air and clean water, but facts are very stubborn things.

A government mandate doesn't create reality. Remember Jimmy Carter in 1979? He declared his policies would create an energy path so that by the year 2000, 20 percent of America's energy would be produced by solar power—20 percent by the year 2000. How are we doing with that? Less than 2 percent of our energy in 2015 is produced by solar power.

Mandates don't create realities. If we drastically change all our electric generation to wind, solar, nuclear, and some natural gas, we will hit our annual number, but the amount of decrease per year will amount to approximately what China puts out in 1 month. You see, they are talking about reducing per year about 450-or-some metric tons of CO₂ that America would put out. China emits 800 metric tons per month. This is why so many people say this is a very expensive goal for America that will have no effect on the global reality.

Just to add a dose of cold water to the reality, it usually takes more than 10 years for a powerplant to even get a permit and start the construction because the Department of Energy, FERC, and EPA restrictions are so high. So this plan that in the next 15 years we are going to have all this roll-out, we can't even get through the permitting time in that time period.

I haven't even touched on the legal issues of the new mandates of the administration. They haven't been in front of the American people or in front of the Congress. The existing law—the Clean Air Act—does not allow EPA to add another layer of regulations on top of the existing regulations. That is clear in the law. You cannot do that. Even the former Sierra Club general counsel, David Bookbinder, found this new proposal is based on what he called a "legally dubious ground."

As a nation, we don't need more pie-in-the-sky energy ideas. We need real solutions and a right direction that will benefit the United States and the world. We lead the world in power and ideas. We should set high goals. But our goals should help us as a nation, not hurt us. Every American pays more at the pump right now because of the increasing regulations in the ethanol mandates. Every American is paying more for gasoline than we should. Every American is paying more for electricity than we should because of

the cost of all these mandates. People ask me all the time why their dollars don't go as far; the regulations are the reason.

Many people want to talk about our energy future—great, so do I. But I also want to talk about our energy present. The goal of a quarter of America's electricity produced by renewables is a good goal. It is a huge jump. We are just at around 5 percent right now in renewables. But that will still leave us—even if that goal is accomplished—with 75 percent of our energy coming from coal, oil, natural gas, and nuclear. That is base power. It is not effective at night or on hot still days in the summer when the wind doesn't blow. It is base power.

Solar is more efficient than ever. Let's keep going. It is a good thing. I am glad we are able to harness some of that. It takes a massive amount of acreage. There is a new solar facility that just came into Oklahoma. Great, we are glad to have it. It has 15 acres of solar—15 acres of panels. It powers two neighborhoods—two neighborhoods—and it takes 15 acres to get that accomplished.

Windmills are much more efficient right now than they have ever been. In fact, they are efficient enough that we should probably stop subsidizing them. They are not a startup anymore. We started subsidizing utility-grade windmills more than 20 years ago, saying someday this thing is going to be efficient enough that it is going to work. I think we are already there. In fact, there are more than 48,000 utility-scale wind turbines in the country right now—48,000 windmills in the country right now. To give some perspective, there are 36,000 McDonald's in the world. We have 48,000 windmills. There are 36,000 McDonald's in the world. I don't exactly think the windmill thing is a startup anymore. I think maybe that is fairly well established. So maybe the need for the subsidy is not there.

Geothermal is a great energy source. We have yet to tap the full potential for heating and cooling our homes and businesses. But we still need natural gas, oil, coal, and nuclear to provide power for the foreseeable future. Even the Obama administration lays out over the next 30 years what they anticipate energy use will be, and they still anticipate we are going to need gas, coal, oil, basic base power.

So let's do it the cleanest way we can, the most efficient way we can so the consumer is not punished for using energy. We should keep innovating for the future, but we should make rational choices on energy.

Let me give an example of an irrational choice. Can I do that? Here is an example of an irrational energy choice: the Keystone XL Pipeline. Now, I know everyone is going to say we are going to talk about Keystone again. This is day 2,510 of a permit request to build a pipeline. Today is day 2,510 of a permit request sitting on the President's desk for a pipeline. Let me give an example.

All of these black lines that we see here are crude oil pipelines in the United States currently there. This is how many thousands of miles? More than 60,000 miles in the United States of crude oil pipeline—60,000. It is another pipeline. Why does it take 2,510 days to be able to make a decision on this? Oh, it is an international pipeline. That is right. Well, let me add something to it. We have 19 international pipelines currently running—19 of them. This would be No. 20. This is not something new and radical. We are already buying a significant amount of Canadian oil. That oil is coming from right up here. Look at all of these pipelines already coming from the same spot. Look at that, they cross the border, and it has been safe and reliable. This has not been a big challenge for us.

That oil is not just being blocked from Canada. Many people think that if we don't put in a pipeline, it won't come. Actually, it is coming by rail already. It is already moving into the country. This is just cleaner and more efficient to be able to move it that way. Canada is discussing taking a pipeline and bringing it all the way over here, dropping it off and bringing it to the coast, and bringing it by ship over to the U.S. gulf coast.

Does someone think that is more efficient than bringing a pipeline in? Now, it is not more efficient by rail. It is not more efficient by this way. If we are going to bring it in and Canada is going to sell it, why don't we have an international pipeline—that No. 20, right there—and be able to bring it in?

Now, I have heard multiple people say it is because of the aquifer in Nebraska. Let me try to discuss this because I have heard this over and over: We can't run pipelines because of the aquifer in Nebraska.

Here is the aquifer that is being discussed all in the purple here. Every line that we see is an existing pipeline running through that aquifer. This tiny blue line is the proposed Keystone that is to go right through there as well.

They make these comments: We can't run it through the aquifer because, oh, my gosh, we can't run a pipeline there. That is how many we already have in that spot. This is not radical. This is not different.

In fact, let me give one more image. This is the number of pipelines that we have in America right now of all types. This is both natural gas and crude and all kinds of petroleum products that move through the United States all the time—every single one of those lines. This is irrational energy policy that is knee-jerk that is happening. To say that we can't add one more pipeline because somehow that would go over the top ignores the reality of what we already have in the United States.

Moving energy by pipeline is clean and efficient. It is also a rational way to do it. We have to move from fear-based energy policy to fact-based energy policy—to look not only at our

energy future but what may happen in the decades to come. I hope my car one day runs on a pinwheel on the hood ornament. That would be great. But that doesn't happen right now. My car still runs on gas. So does everyone else's here. And for every single person here that gets on an airplane every week, it doesn't run on water. It still runs on energy that we pull out of the ground.

So for the foreseeable future we need to deal with the facts. Stop hurting consumers for some proposed future hope of what may happen. Let's do it clean. Let's do it innovative. But let's not hurt consumers in the process.

People want to know where their money has gone. It is being spent away on regulations. Let's get to work on an energy plan.

I am glad to have this conversation, but this should not be a conversation in the hallways of the EPA. This should be a conversation in this room to determine where energy policies go.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about seizing the opportunity to drive real economic growth right now. But first, I wish to give a little context by referencing our great Nation's desperate fiscal condition.

Decades of overspending by both parties and mismanagement by both parties have led to a crushing \$18 trillion of Federal debt. Even more sobering to me is the upcoming over \$100 trillion of future unfunded liabilities coming at us like a freight train. We have a fiscal crisis in this country. Everybody can see it. People back home can feel it. As an outsider, my role is to bring a new sense of urgency to Washington to help solve this fiscal crisis.

While I am encouraged by the work my colleagues on the Budget Committee completed this year—we completed a balanced budget for the first time since 2001—it was merely a good first step in the right direction. But we have a lot of heavy lifting to do. We must act right now to get our fiscal house in order before it is too late.

Yes, we must cut unnecessary spending. Yes, there are redundant agencies and programs that should be eliminated. And yes, we do need to have a national dialogue on how we keep the commitments that were made to our seniors, while saving those important programs for future generations. However, discretionary spending cuts and long-term reforms to mandatory programs alone will not solve this problem. The numbers just simply don't add up to solve this crisis. Economic growth is really the only answer.

Economic growth supports good-paying jobs across the entire country, and economic growth eventually means

more revenue for the Federal Government without raising taxes. If we are ever going to get out of the hole that Washington has dug for our country, we are going to have to grow our way out of it economically. One of the biggest opportunities to infuse energy and investment into our economy right now is before us as I speak, just waiting for us to act on it.

There are approximately \$2.1 trillion in corporate profits of American multinational companies sitting abroad trapped by our archaic tax laws. Imagine if we could lure just a portion of that back in terms of capital investment in our economy. The multiplier effect alone would be incredible as it rippled its way throughout our domestic economy.

In recent weeks we have heard a lot of talk about how we in Washington can get those overseas earnings repatriated back into the United States economy. For me, the solution is quite simple. We simply eliminate the barrier to repatriation by completely eliminating the tax on repatriation.

My approach isn't just based on my business career. It is not just based on my desire to give our economy a much-needed shot in the arm. Completely eliminating this tax on repatriation is an absolute necessity for global competitiveness and to create a level playing field with the rest of the world.

I rarely compare other countries to the United States for simple reasons. No. 1, we have an 18 trillion economy. No. 2, we are the innovator in the world. No. 3, we have the rule of law. No. 4, we have really a very dynamic and diverse economy. Very few countries compare. But this is one time where a comparison is warranted because it is about how we compete for economic development and jobs with the rest of the world.

A company headquartered in the United States not only has to pay taxes in every single country in which it does business, but when it elects to bring back the remaining profits from abroad, that corporation is forced to pay an additional tax—a repatriation tax. This doesn't happen if the corporation is based in Canada, France, Germany, the United Kingdom, Australia, Japan or, indeed, the remainder of the 39 OECD countries. In fact, there is only one country on the list of 39 OECD countries that has a repatriation tax—the United States. The United Kingdom actually eliminated their repatriation tax in 2009, and over the last decade they have reduced their corporate tax rate from 28 percent to 18 percent.

We continue to see companies leave the United States because they can go pretty much anywhere else and benefit from much lower tax rates than here in America. We have seen a rash of those inversions over the last few years, and it is not going to stop until we deal with the underlying problem; that is, our corporate tax rate is not competitive with the rest of the world. The repatriation tax is a derivative of that primary causal problem.

What I am talking about today is simply the elimination of the repatriation tax. But sooner or later, we have to deal with the fact that our corporate tax rate is simply not competitive. The question simply before us is, Do we want multinational companies—in many cases iconic American brands—to continue to call the United States home or not?

As a former CEO of a large branded company that manufactured in dozens of countries and sold in dozens more, I have firsthand experience, and I can tell you that, based on that experience, we are losing our competitive advantage with the rest of the world. In fact, I see us now at a growing disadvantage for our American companies to compete with companies in other countries.

The hostile regulatory environment the current administration has created is killing American jobs, and our outdated tax system is forcing them to expand abroad. Executive orders and regulatory mandates have created a punitive atmosphere in which to try to grow businesses or start businesses here in the United States. Unfortunately, in typical Washington fashion, the dialogue on repatriation is focused on how to get a short-term solution—a short-term Federal tax increase—instead of using repatriation as a tool to grow the economy and make us more competitive. In my estimation, this kind of thinking is dead wrong and another example of how we got in this mess in the first place.

We should not be looking at repatriation as a way to pay for the highway trust fund or any other short-term solution to Washington's spending problems, for that matter. That kind of shortsighted thinking will only make our fiscal situation worse. It will only cause more American companies to look for a new home.

Repatriation is a big idea with a big potential impact for our economy. If we encourage repatriation the right way, it means sustained growth for our economy. It means more American jobs and innovation. Ultimately, it means an organic increase in Federal tax revenue based on pure economic growth. This growth can allow us to deal with our economic and fiscal priorities and finally develop a long-term plan to begin to pay down our overburdened debt.

Before I conclude, I have one final thought. I hope this thought will compel my colleagues to act with a sense of urgency on this issue and others that impact our economy. We actually have fewer people working than at any time in the last 30 years. When I go back home, the number one question that is put before me is: How can I get my hours up? How can I get more work?

People back home know we have a crisis. It is not just bureaucrats in Washington looking for a few more tax dollars so we can make government bigger. This is about putting people back to work—helping us compete

against the growing economies of China, India, Russia, and other rivals in today's world.

The approval rating of Congress today is somewhere in the mid-single digits, and that is only because our mothers voted. I believe it is because this town's priorities are not aligned with those of the people who sent us here for their bidding. Folks back home know that shortsighted, short-term solutions to the big problems are how Washington got in this mess in the first place.

Today we can continue to argue about temporary ways to pay for trust funds that are going bankrupt every few weeks, or we can simply finally get serious about solving this systemic problem before we have to hand it to our children and our children's children. I know the American people expect the latter. In fact, they are demanding it. That can happen, but we must make real tax reforms right now that will set us on a new course for economic growth and opportunity for generations to come. The time for serious debate about repatriation has come.

We have an opportunity. I implore my colleagues in the Senate to debate this earnestly, and let's move on this right now and put people back to work and make America more competitive for our children and our children's children.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

ARENA ACT

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, yesterday President Obama and his Environmental Protection Agency announced their final clean power grab, continuing the economic assault on energy-producing States like West Virginia.

Yesterday, Alpha Natural Resources, one of the Nation's largest coal producers, filed for bankruptcy. As of the end of 2014, Alpha had 4,870 employees at 33 active mines and 13 prep plants in West Virginia. Alpha follows Patriot Coal, Jim Walter Resources, and James River mining—all of which have filed bankruptcy since 2014.

According to the Mine Safety and Health Administration, coal mining employment has dropped from 143,437 in 2011 to 98,310 in the first quarter of this year. That represents a 31-percent drop over the last 4 years.

Earlier this year when Murray Energy announced hundreds of layoffs in northern West Virginia, the Wheeling Intelligencer newspaper reported that the impact would mean almost \$62 million in annual income lost wages for Ohio Valley residents. Other communities have also been hard hit. Nicholas County—a small county in my State—was forced to lay off sheriff's deputies because they could no longer pay their county commitments because of a decline in coal severance revenues.

Now, 17 coal units in West Virginia have retired due, at least in part, to

EPA policies. The electricity produced by these units is enough to power 2.7 million homes. Put another way, the units that have already closed in West Virginia would generate enough electricity to power the entire State of Hawaii.

These are not the same old talking points, as the administrator of the EPA and the President said. These are not stale. This is not motivated by special interests. These are real Americans, real jobs, real families, and real communities that have been negatively impacted by this administration's overreaching regulations. These are people like Tammy Rowan of Coalton, WV, who wrote me a letter:

My whole family has concerns with the regulations that seem to be out of control. EPA, government officials, and the president are putting families out of work.

Or Patrick Sparks in Warriormine, WV, who said:

I know the EPA has been trying to force strict regulations on coal. It's hurting a lot of people, not just here in West Virginia, but a lot of businesses are suffering from it.

And Theresa Simmons of Tridelpia, WV, whose family has worked in coal mines for generations, wrote:

My husband was able to provide for our family with just his income. We were able to donate money to local charities and help needy families around the holidays. Now that is going to be my family, looking for donations.

Put simply, yesterday's announcement will make an already bleak situation in our State much worse. Working families across the Nation woke up to the sad news that their jobs just don't count. Much has been said about the open process that led to this final rule. In fact, West Virginia, which is one of the States most deeply affected by this regulation, was not even visited by the EPA after I and others extended many invitations. Instead, they went to cities like Chicago, Boston, and San Francisco. Talk about special interests. Talk about being bold.

The administration's final clean power grab will force States away from affordable, reliable energy toward expensive, intermittent power sources, many of which are heavily subsidized by the taxpayer. It proposes benchmarks that are more stringent and less attainable.

In West Virginia, our emissions rate under the proposed rule was to drop 20 percent. On Monday, the final rule requires our rate to drop by 37 percent—a drop that is almost twice as severe. There is no way for West Virginia to comply with this rule without significant cuts to our coal production, coal jobs, and coal use.

According to the EPA's own calculations, the final rule is worse for coal than the proposed rule. Coal's share of electric generation will go to 27 percent by 2030 under this rule—as compared to 39 percent, which we currently have or did have in 2014.

If this misguided final rule is ever implemented, pain will be felt by all

Americans with fewer job opportunities, higher power bills, and less reliable electricity. Studies of the proposed rule projected that the Clean Power Plan will increase electricity prices in a State like mine 12 to 16 percent.

What does this mean for American jobs? A recent study by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association found that a 10 percent increase in electricity prices can mean as much as 1.2 million jobs lost. Roughly one-half million of these job losses will be in rural communities like those in West Virginia. Put simply, affordable energy matters. It especially matters to those who the administration incorrectly says will benefit the most from this rule, which is the low and moderate income.

More than half of West Virginia's households take home an average of less than \$1,900 per month and already spend 17 percent of their income on energy. These families are especially vulnerable to the administration's clean power grab. While States are given additional time to comply under the final rule, it does not change the fact that the EPA is picking winners and losers in the energy economy. The losers will be the American families who rely on affordable and reliable energy. We can and we should innovate for the future but not with a sledgehammer bearing down on us. Thankfully there are several legislative options that Congress can pursue to challenge this rule.

Tomorrow the EPW Committee will be taking up my legislation—the ARENA Act. Let me explain that briefly. This bipartisan legislation would empower States to protect families and businesses from electric rate increases, reduced electric reliability, and other harmful effects. It will force the EPA to reconsider this misguided rule-making.

The ARENA Act holds the EPA accountable by requiring the agency to issue State-specific model plans demonstrating how each State will meet the required reductions. It gives States the ability to opt out if the plan hinders economic growth.

For existing powerplants, the ARENA Act delays implementation of the Clean Power Plan until the courts determine the legality of the rule. Recently, the Supreme Court ruled that EPA had unlawfully failed to consider costs when formulating its MATS regulation. Because the rule went forward while it was still being litigated, millions of dollars were spent to comply with a rule that was ultimately deemed illegal. States should not be forced to proceed until the legality of the rule has been determined. I hope that many States will follow Leader MCCONNELL's suggestion and delay implementation of this rule until the legal process is completed.

Mr. President of the United States, your clean power grab will devastate already hurting communities in my State. It will cause economic pain for

working families across the country. It will forever harm our energy landscape.

The proposed rule was bad. The final rule announced yesterday is even worse, doubling down on the destruction of our economy. There is no question that we must take steps to protect our environment, but it simply cannot be at the expense of our families.

We can do better. Let Congress, the elected representatives, make these decisions. That is the way it should be. I ask my colleagues to join me by supporting the ARENA Act and sending these overreaching EPA regulations back to the drawing board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

WILDFIRES IN THE WEST

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, as the Senate prepares for the month of August in our home States, I want to discuss tonight what I believe to be an urgent issue: The West is on fire. There is a really serious prospect that my part of the country is going to get hit by what I call the terrible trifecta—drought, high temperatures, and enormous fuel load on the forest floor. When you couple that with a lightning strike—which is not exactly a rarity in my part of the world—all of a sudden you can have on your hands an inferno. The fires are getting bigger, they are lasting longer, and they are doing more damage.

Senators here on both sides of the aisle—Democrats and Republicans—have come to realize that our system for fighting fire is a broken, dysfunctional mess. What happens is, historically, prevention gets short shrift. The agencies can't do enough thinning; they can't do enough of the preventive work to reduce the fuel load on the forest floor. Then you have one of those lightning strikes, and all of a sudden there is a huge fire because the fuel buildup is so great on the forest floor.

The agencies then run out of money putting these fires out because they are getting bigger, and they are lasting longer. The problem just keeps getting worse because the agencies then have to rob the prevention fund in order to fight these big fires. In other words, the agencies borrow from the prevention fund, and the problem gets worse because by shorting the prevention fund it creates the prospect of still more big fires in the future.

With the West burning, the Western Governor's Association—a bipartisan group—put out a new update of how big the recent fires are. So far in 2015, nearly 6 million acres have burned. That is an area bigger than the State of New Jersey, scorched in massive fires.

In my home State, a wildfire in Douglas County in southern Oregon has spread to over 16,000 acres, with 1,400 crew members battling a blaze that is threatening more than 300 homes. According to recent reports, 20,000 acres were scorched by one single fire in northern California in a matter of only

5 hours. That is 20,000 acres—nearly the size of the entire city of Bend, OR—that burned in the time span of an extra-inning baseball game.

With the Forest Service budget effectively flatlined and the higher cost of fighting fires producing this robbing of other programs that I have described—the fire borrowing—what you have is a vicious, self-defeating circle of fire-fighting and shoddy budgeting, which, in effect, will cause an even bigger crisis in the future because you shorted the prevention fund. In 10 years, if this isn't fixed—what is known as fire borrowing—the Forest Service says it will be spending two-thirds of its entire budget on suppressing wildfires, and my constituents say they will be calling the Forest Service the Fire Service because that is essentially what they will be.

This is particularly serious right now, which is why I came to the floor tonight to try to drive home the urgency of this issue, because it is so dry in the West. This year Governor Brown of my home State has declared drought emergencies in 23 of our 36 counties. All 36 counties are experiencing severe drought, according to the National Drought Center. It is a very dangerous mix of factors, what I have come to call the terrible trifecta of drought and temperatures and fuel load. They all came together and turned the West into a virtual tinderbox.

To try to fix this, my colleague Senator CRAPO and I have worked together for quite some time to in effect say that what we ought to do is break this dysfunctional system of fighting fires and go with a different approach. What we would say is that the biggest fires—the 1 or 2 percent of the megafires—we ought to fight them from the disaster fund because they really are disasters. Use the prevention fund for what it is intended, which is prevention, so we can keep from having those megafires.

The good news is that the Congressional Budget Office—my colleague is new here, but he already knows that the Congressional Budget Office is our official scorekeeper—says that there really aren't added costs for this approach because while you would spend a bit more money trying to put out those megafires, you would save some money by not cheating the prevention fund and not having so many fires in the first place.

In effect, it is a lot smarter for the agencies to focus on keeping our forests healthy and clear of the fuels that go up in flames when lightning strikes. So we do the preventive work and we no longer are shorting it by all the fire borrowing which I have just described.

Senator CRAPO and I have been able to get well over 250 organizations to go on record in support of our idea. These are groups associated with forestry policy, environmental folks, industry personnel, people across the political spectrum. More than 250 groups have said they are in support of this. The Under Secretary of Agriculture, Robert

Bonnie, noted in a recent letter that the proposal Senator CRAPO and I have offered is one that both fixes fire borrowing and provides the resources needed to prevent these catastrophic wildfires down the line. Fifteen of our colleagues here in the Senate have supported the bill, and 123 Members in the other body have also supported the bill. The administration is on board. The agencies that battle these fires are waiting for the Congress to act.

Each day, the reality in the West is that immensely brave men and women are on the ground fighting fires, and they risk their lives to keep our homes and communities protected. It is long, long, long past time for the Congress to step up, fix this budgetary mess, and guarantee that the funding is there to fight fires and to prevent them in the first place.

I filed our bipartisan bill as an amendment to the Transportation bill. I filed a wildfire amendment to the budget resolution. I filed the Senate Interior appropriations wildfire language as an amendment to the Transportation bill. And I believe this is the fourth time in recent months I have been on the floor talking about this issue, and that is in addition to talking about it in the budget markup and in several hearings in the natural resources committee that I had the honor to chair in the last Congress.

I see my new colleague in the chair, and he has been doing good work on this fire borrowing issue. And even with everything else we are dealing with here in the Senate, I think it is very important that we focus on an actual way to leave with an agreement on how this is actually going to get fixed and get done. In that regard, I have been talking in the last day or so with colleagues in both political parties, and I think there is now this sense of urgency because we see it not only on TV, but every time we are home, we go to fire briefings. As the Presiding Officer knows, even fire briefings have changed very dramatically. We used to have a fire briefing in July, and now we have fire briefings—as I did—in the winter because the Forest Service and the folks at BLM often say they are not even sure when one fire season has ended and the next one has begun because these challenges have gotten so great.

Senator CRAPO and I, with this bill that has gotten more than 250 organizations sponsoring it, have talked in just the last few hours. We want to work with all of our colleagues to make sure that we get some sense because our constituents are going to ask about this. They are going to ask about this issue this summer. They are going to ask: How is the Senate actually going to get this done? How is the Senate going to fix this broken, dysfunctional system of fighting fires? In effect, year after year—and I gather there will be some new analyses coming out—the entire budget for the Forest Service is getting eaten up in fighting these counterproductive fires.

Senator CRAPO and I have a proposal that received a favorable score from the Budget Committee. I know my colleague in the chair has also done very good work on these issues, as have a number of Senators on both sides of the aisle. Given the good will I have seen among Senators here in the last couple of days as we talked about what this really means, given the urgency and because we are going home and seeing constituents in August, I am convinced we can have an agreement on how this is going to get fixed. That is why I wanted to come to the floor tonight, because there are a lot of topics that are still going to be tackled in the next few days before the Senate wraps up. I want it understood that our part of the country is on fire. It is on fire. We have communities burning up, and business as usual is unacceptable.

Senator CRAPO and I have offered a proposal that we think will turn this around, and other colleagues have very good ideas as well. What is nonnegotiable is just saying: Oh, you know, maybe we will take care of it at the end of the year or on standard congressional time. That is not good enough for the West, which is burning up.

I invite my colleagues here, as we move forward in the last few days before the August recess, to join me, Senator CRAPO, and colleagues in both political parties to make sure that people see—as we go home to talk to the people we have the honor to represent—that this is now going to actually get fixed and that the Senate is coming together to make sure it actually gets done. We are going to turn this around so that we can do more to prevent fires in the rural west, No. 1, and No. 2, fight them in a more cost-effective way.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate 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.

TRIBUTE TO SCOTT WATTS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the distinguished career of Scott "Scotty" Watts, who served as the president of the Nevada Alliance for Retired Americans, NARA, from 2001 until his retirement in 2014.

Building on the work of its predecessor, the Nevada National Council of Senior Citizens, NARA has been at the