

could matter most—in Afghanistan, in the Pacific, in Ukraine, in Iraq, and in Syria. Vetoing the NDAA would be yet another of these failures, and it would be reminiscent of a bygone day, when the fecklessness of those days were so accurately described by Winston Churchill. On the floor of the House of Commons, he said:

When the situation was manageable it was neglected, and now that it is thoroughly out of hand we apply too late the remedies which then might have effected a cure. There is nothing new in the story. It is as old as the sibylline books. It falls into that long, dismal catalogue of the fruitlessness of experience and the confirmed unteachability of mankind. Want of foresight, unwillingness to act when action would be simple and effective, lack of clear thinking, confusion of counsel until the emergency comes, until self-preservation strikes its jarring gong—these are the features which constitute the endless repetition of history.

My colleagues, for 53 years Congress has passed a National Defense Authorization Act, and at perhaps no time in the past half century has this legislation been more important. Everywhere we look around the world there are reminders of exactly why we need this National Defense Authorization Act. I understand the deeply held beliefs of many of my colleagues about the spending issues that have divided the Congress for the last 4 years. But this is not a spending bill. It is a policy bill. It is a reform bill. It is a bill that accomplishes what the Constitution demands of us and what the American people expect of us. It is a bill that gives our men and women in uniform, many of whom are still in harm's way around the world today, the vital authorities and support they need to defend our Nation. And it is a bill that deserves the support of the Senate.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the bill before us is not fiscally responsible. Our troops deserve real funding, not budget gimmickry. This bill does not do the job. My Republican friends like to talk about the deficit and the debt and the need to get our fiscal house in order, but their actions speak louder than their words. Now they are supporting legislation that increases deficit spending and increases the burden on our children and grandchildren. As a result, this bill violates the budget law.

Mr. President, I raise a point of order that the pending measure violates section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional

Budget Act of 1974 and the waiver provisions of applicable budget resolutions, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act and applicable budget resolutions for purposes of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1735, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to waive.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 71, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 276 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Alexander	Feinstein	Murkowski
Ayotte	Fischer	Murphy
Barrasso	Flake	Murray
Bennet	Gardner	Perdue
Blumenthal	Grassley	Peters
Blunt	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Heinrich	Risch
Burr	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cantwell	Heller	Sasse
Capito	Hoeven	Scott
Casey	Inhofe	Sessions
Cassidy	Isakson	Shaheen
Coats	Johnson	Shelby
Cochran	Kaine	Stabenow
Collins	King	Sullivan
Corker	Kirk	Tester
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Thune
Cotton	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	McCain	Udall
Daines	McCaskill	Vitter
Donnelly	McConnell	Warner
Enzi	Menendez	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	

NAYS—26

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Leahy	Sanders
Brown	Manchin	Schatz
Cardin	Markey	Schumer
Carper	Merkley	Warren
Coons	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Nelson	Wyden
Franken	Paul	

NOT VOTING—3

Graham Roberts Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 71, the nays are 26.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to and the point of order falls.

The question occurs on adoption of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1735.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 277 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Alexander	Fischer	Murphy
Ayotte	Flake	Murray
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Bennet	Grassley	Peters
Blumenthal	Hatch	Portman
Blunt	Heinrich	Risch
Boozman	Heitkamp	Rounds
Burr	Heller	Sasse
Cantwell	Hoeven	Scott
Capito	Inhofe	Sessions
Casey	Isakson	Shaheen
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Coats	Kaine	Stabenow
Cochran	King	Sullivan
Collins	Kirk	Tester
Corker	Klobuchar	Thune
Cornyn	Lankford	Tillis
Cotton	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	McCain	Udall
Daines	McCaskill	Vitter
Donnelly	McConnell	Warner
Enzi	Menendez	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	
Feinstein	Murkowski	

NAYS—27

Baldwin	Franken	Paul
Booker	Gillibrand	Reed
Boxer	Hirono	Reid
Brown	Leahy	Sanders
Cardin	Manchin	Schatz
Carper	Markey	Schumer
Coons	Merkley	Warren
Cruz	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Nelson	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Graham Roberts Rubio

The conference report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 96, H.R. 2028.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 96, H.R. 2028, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

The Senator from Utah.

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the recent developments in U.S. trade policy and their implications for the future. Over this past weekend, officials from the Obama administration, along with 11 other countries, reached what they believed will be the final agreement on the terms of the Trans-Pacific Partnership or TPP.

If enacted, the TPP would be the largest trade agreement in history, encompassing approximately and roughly 40 percent of the world economy and setting standards for one of the most dynamic parts of the world, the Asia-Pacific.

I will repeat what I have said many times before. I believe a strong TPP agreement is essential for advancing our Nation's economic and strategic interests in the Asia-Pacific region. However, while I have often touted the potential benefits of the TPP, I have also been very clear that I will not support just any TPP agreement. The United States has only one chance to negotiate, consider, and implement the TPP. We have to get it right. Under our system of government, both the executive and legislative branches play essential roles in developing and implementing our trade policy.

While the administration has the power to reach agreements with other countries, no such agreement can go into force without Congress's approval. Congress is not just a rubberstamp in this process. We have an obligation to evaluate every trade agreement and determine if it advances our Nation's interests and serves the needs of our constituents. Toward that end, as I continue to review the deal that was struck in Atlanta, three important considerations will determine whether I can support this agreement.

First, the deal must be balanced to meet the U.S. negotiating objectives established under our trade promotion authority or TPA statute which Congress passed earlier this year with strong bipartisan majorities in both the House and the Senate. Second, I must have confidence that our trading partners will actually live up to the commitments they have made under the agreement by implementing the terms and obligations included in the deal. Third, the agreement must be subjected to a thorough and rigorous congressional review, including in-depth consultation with the administration.

Before I talk about these factors in more detail, I want to acknowledge the many years of hard work officials in the administration, particularly those at the office of the U.S. Trade Representative, have put in to get the agreement this far. I particularly want to acknowledge the hard work of the lead negotiators at USTR who have sacrificed for years to bring this agreement to conclusion. I also want to acknowledge that over time they made a great deal of progress on a variety of fronts, but now that the administration says it has reached an agreement, it is time for Congress to intensify its review of TPP.

The primary standards by which I—and I would hope all of my colleagues—will judge this trade agreement are set forth clearly in our TPA statute. As one of the original authors of the current TPA law, I worked hard to ensure that it did not just represent my prior-

ities for trade agreements but those of a bipartisan majority in both the House and the Senate.

The congressional negotiating objectives that we included in the statute spell out in detail what must be included in a trade agreement in order for it to get Congress's approval. The negotiating objectives we included in our TPA law are not just pro forma, they are not suggestions or mere statements of Members' preferences. They represent the view of the bipartisan majority in Congress as to the rights and obligations a trade agreement must contain when it is finalized and submitted for our consideration.

I have to say no one in Congress worked harder and longer than I did to get that TPA bill across the finish line. I was joined by many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who put in significant time and effort as we drafted the bill, got it through the committee, and passed it on the floor. In fact, if you will recall, in the Senate we ended up having to pass it twice.

Since the day we passed the bill, I, as well as many of my colleagues in both the House and Senate, have been urging officials and the administration to do all they can to conclude a TPP agreement that a majority in Congress can support. Unfortunately, when we look at some of the outcomes of the final round of negotiations, it is not clear if the administration achieved that goal.

For example, it is not immediately apparent whether the agreement contains administrable and enforceable provisions to protect intellectual property rights similar to those found in U.S. law. As you will recall, this was a key negotiating objective that we included in our TPA law and a necessary component if we want our trade agreements to advance our Nation's interests in the 21st century economy.

I have serious concerns as to whether the administration did enough to accomplish this objective. This is particularly true with the provisions that govern data exclusivity for biologics. As you know, biologics are formulas that are on the cutting edge of medicine and have transformed major elements of the health care landscape, thanks in large part to the effort and investment of American companies. I might add, it is one of the principal industries where we might not only be able to find treatments but also cures. It is one of the three or four things that I think can bring down health care costs immeasurably.

I am not one to argue that parties to a negotiation should refuse to compromise. In fact, I have come to the floor many times over the years and espoused, sometimes at great lengths, the merits of being able to find a compromise. But—and this is an important point—a good compromise usually results in something of greater overall value for all the parties involved, and, at least according to the information now available, it is unclear whether

this administration achieved that kind of an outcome for American innovators.

Aside from biologics, there are other elements that, according to initial reports, may have fallen short of Congress's negotiating standards. For example, there are issues with some of the market-access provisions on agriculture, the inclusion of product—and sector-specific carveouts from some of the obligations, as well as some potential of overreaching on labor commitments. While we can't make final determinations on any of these issues without seeing the final text of the agreement, initial indications are that these items could be problematic when the agreement is submitted to Congress for approval.

In the end, Congress will need to take a good look at the entire agreement and judge whether the agreement satisfies the standards we have put forward in our TPA law.

Beyond the negotiating objectives, we need to have confidence that key elements of a TPP agreement will be implemented and respected by our trading partners. There are a number of important elements to consider when we talk about enforcement and implementation but, for now, I will speak once again about the intellectual property rights.

For too long—indeed, for decades now—American innovators and investors haven't been able to take full advantage of our trade agreements because, quite simply, many of our trading partners either refuse to enforce intellectual property obligations or fail to implement them all together. All too often, this administration has looked the other way as other countries steal U.S. innovation and intellectual property.

If countries want to trade with the United States, we should demand that they respect and enforce the intellectual property rights of American businesses and individuals. That means including strong provisions protecting intellectual property in our trade agreements and a requirement that intellectual property rights commitments be implemented before allowing the agreement to enter into force for our trading partners.

Unfortunately, implementation of these types of commitments is one area where this administration has come up short in the past. Before Congress can approve an agreement as vast as the TPP, we need to be sure this has changed. We need to have detailed assurances that our trading partners will live up to all of their commitments and a clear roadmap as to how the administration intends to hold them accountable.

Finally, I expect that pursuant to both the letter and the spirit of TPA, the administration will communicate and work closely with Congress over the coming weeks and months. In the short term, that means deep and meaningful consultations before the President signs the agreement.

Under our TPA law, the President must inform Congress of his intent to sign an agreement at least 90 days before doing so. This period is an essential part of congressional consideration of the deal. Congress reserved this time in the statute to ensure that we would have ample opportunity to review the content of a trade agreement before it is signed by the President.

In order for that review to take place, Congress must have access to the full text of the agreement, including annexes and any side agreements, before the President provides his 90-day notice. This is a vital element of TPA. The law was designed specifically to give Congress all the necessary tools to conduct an exhaustive evaluation of any and all trade agreements and to ensure that the administration is fully accountable both to Congress and to the public.

There are a number of provisions and timelines in the law that help us achieve these goals. I will not list them all on the floor today. Instead, I will just say that I expect the full cooperation of the administration in meeting all of these mandates.

The American people demand no less. There are no shortcuts. Let's be clear. Our Nation could clearly benefit from a strong TPP agreement, and I hope that in the end that is what we get—and these other nations can too. In the end, I hope this agreement meets all of these challenges that we have thrown out.

Unfortunately, I have real reservations as to whether the agreement reached over the past weekend meets the high standards set by Congress. I will not make a definitive statement on the overall merits of the agreement until I have a chance to review it in its entirety. For now, I will just say that I am worried. I am worried that we didn't get as good a deal as we could have. I am worried that the administration didn't achieve a balanced outcome covering the congressional negotiating objectives set out in TPA. And, ultimately, I am worried there won't be enough support in Congress for this agreement and that our country will end up missing out on important opportunities.

I hope I am wrong. I will continually scrutinize this agreement as details emerge. Before I can support the TPP deal struck in Atlanta, I must be convinced that the TPP is a balanced agreement that complies with the TPA law and that it has clear, implementable rules that our trading partners will follow.

The TPP is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to define high-standard rules for the Asia-Pacific and to gain real access to overseas markets that our businesses and our workers need. I intend to do all I can to ensure that the agreement meets these goals.

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

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I am pleased to come to the floor today to express my support for the final conference report on the National Defense Authorization Act, what we need to do as a Congress to authorize the work that can be done to defend the country. I urge the President to sign this bill.

For 54 straight years the Senate has done its job in authorizing the things that need to be done to defend the country. We have passed the bill. This fulfills part of that responsibility to defend the country. It is the first responsibility of the Federal Government to defend the country. This is something that can't be better done somewhere else. It is something that has to be done by us, and two things have to happen for that to be done. We have to authorize the spending in the way this bill does and then we have to appropriate the money once that spending has been authorized.

The majority voted several weeks ago to debate the appropriating bill, but we couldn't get even six Democrats to join us to debate that bill. Well, now this bill has passed. So maybe the next move is to pass the bill that funds what has just been authorized. It has passed the House, it has passed the Senate, and the Commander in Chief of the United States is saying he would veto the National Defense Authorization Act?

The President apparently believes the defense of the country is a legitimate bargaining chip in how we spend all other money. The President somehow has latched onto this idea that he proposed a few years ago that all spending be equal, that you take all of the discretionary spending in the country and half of that would be for defense and half of that would be for everything else that is discretionary—an increasingly small part of the budget, because mandatory spending is what continues to grow. The discretionary spending, the spending that people think about when they think about the Federal Government, gets smaller every year.

But even with that challenge in front of us, the President apparently has the position that no matter how dangerous the world is, no matter what is happening in Ukraine or no matter what is happening in Crimea, no matter what is happening in Syria, no matter what is happening in response to the Iranian agreement, you have to have more money for everything else if you are going to have more money for defense. Somehow more money for the EPA and more money for the IRS are equal to the responsibility that the Federal Government has to defend the country.

We saw a little of that, again, just a few weeks ago when the appropriators

brought the Defense appropriations bill to the floor with a vote of 23 to 7. That means many Democrats and many Republicans voted for that bill, but when we got it to the floor, we couldn't get the number it took to bring it up.

This bill, the authorizing bill, just passed the Senate with 70 votes. It passed the House with 270 votes. This bill fully supports the number the President said we needed to defend the country. This is like not taking yes for an answer. When the President says this is how much money we need to defend the country, the Congress appropriates the money the President says we need to defend the country, and then the President says: Well, but we need a lot of money for a lot of other things too, and I am only going to be for what I was for—this is the President's number—the amount of money I was for to defend the country if I get the amount of money I want to do everything else.

That is not a very good formula for either democracy or making the system work. This has the base funding for the Department of Defense. It has the defense funding and the national security funding for the Department of Energy. It has money involved for the overseas contingency fund that was created for when things are happening outside of the country that we didn't anticipate. And surely that is the case.

The President was just saying 3 years ago that the Russians weren't a problem. That was a Cold War idea that the Russians could be a problem. He was saying 3 years or 4 years ago that Assad must go.

Clearly, things are not working out as we thought. So it is probably time to use the overseas contingency fund, as this does. This provides money for the intelligence-related programs. I am on the Senate committee that the CIA, the Director of National Intelligence, and others report to. They are publicly not at all shy about saying that more things are coming at the country from more different directions with more potential danger than ever before and so they need to be funded. The activities have stressed those agencies in a lot of ways, but another way you can stress them is not to let them know whether they are going to have the money necessary to do their job.

Our allies are constantly confused by the lack of resolve on our part. In fact, when you are looking at this from some other country and you say that the President got the amount of money he wanted in a defense bill that met the needs that the President proposed, but he doesn't want to sign the authorization bill now because he is not happy with all the other spending, that is a pretty confusing message.

It is like the confusing message when the President draws a redline in Syria but it doesn't mean anything. But when you don't enforce the redline, then not just Assad is emboldened but all of our adversaries are determined at that point that there may be new ways

to test the United States and its allies they hadn't thought of before. So, before you know it, the Russians are in Crimea, the Russians are in Ukraine, and now the Russians are in Syria. What we are watching unfold in Syria—and I would want to emphasize “watching unfold” as if we were spectators in an area of the world that since World War II the United States of America has done what was necessary to see that there wasn't a Russian presence there—is clearly the result of a strategy that is confusing, but it is also pretty darn confusing when the President says he is going to veto the Defense authorization bill.

We see China moving in the South China Sea in ways that we wouldn't have anticipated, taking a 5-acre island and turning it into a 3,000-acre military base.

We see Iran spreading its bad influence with the new resources that it now has.

When the United States leaves a leadership vacuum in the world today, bad things rush to fill that vacuum. And when that happens—when there is less U.S. leadership, when there is less U.S. presence, when there is less positive U.S. encouragement in the world—that almost always produces the wrong kinds of results, and it almost always produces hasty decisions that cost America more in lives and international respect than we would have had otherwise.

The President can take a positive step here by just saying: OK. I am going to sign this bill because 70 Senators and 270 House Members voted for this bill. If the President wants to have a fight, there is still a fight to be had. We shouldn't be having a fight about authorizing the money that would then be appropriated, but there is still a fight to be had because, remember, this bill doesn't spend one dime. It just creates the authorization to spend money if that money is appropriated.

This is a good bill. It is a responsible bill. It eliminates waste and unnecessary spending. It trims down bloated headquarters and administrative overhead at the highest levels of the military so that more money goes to the places where the fight is and more money goes to the families and the troops that defend us. It contains the most sweeping defense acquisition reforms in a generation. It helps sustain the quality of life for the people who serve and their families.

By the way, yesterday I introduced a bill along with Senator GILLIBRAND—a bill that focuses on family stability. When we were doing that, I was able to quote the recently retired Chief of Staff of the Army, General Odierno, who said the strength of the military is in the families of the military.

This bill does things that move in the right direction. It authorizes a pay raise for those people serving below the grade of colonel. It requires the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration to establish a joint

uniform formulary to ensure our troops have timely access to the medicines they need.

The bill authorizes commonsense reforms in a 70-year-old, outdated retirement system. Currently, 83 percent of the people who serve in the military don't benefit from the retirement system. If this bill would pass, service-members exiting the military have more choices, resulting in about 80 percent of the people who leave the military getting a retirement benefit instead of 80 percent not getting a retirement benefit.

The bill keeps in place restrictions that bring detainees to Guantanamo and keep them there. It prohibits the transfer of Guantanamo detainees to places such as Yemen, Libya, Syria and Somalia. Six and a half years after taking office, the President has never produced a plan to close Guantanamo. The Congress and the chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services are still waiting to hear what his plan might be. As terrorism spreads across the globe, we also don't appear to have a plan to do what needs to be done with the law of war detainees that are brought under our control and the control of our allies around the country.

The challenges faced by the intelligence community are unlike any past challenges we have seen—cyber security, maybe it is more cyber insecurity than cyber security—from defending the critical infrastructure of the country to too much information on too many people in too many places. Previously, people who wanted to get our information had to be pretty close and were likely to be detectable. Now our adversaries can be in the middle of the desert, somewhere in Syria or anywhere around the world, using satellite technology to hack into us—as it turned out recently our U.S. Government personnel records. One has to hope the military, the dot-mil, is more secure than the dot-gov, but that doesn't happen if we don't provide the money.

There are a number of priorities in my State that are reflected in this. We have a great training base at St. Joseph, MO, where C-130 aircraft pilots from all over our country and from 16 of our allied countries trained last year. This bill would provide the aircraft upgrades for that C-130 training.

It provides the necessary resources for geospatial intelligence activities in the country.

The bill includes military construction funding for a new consolidated nuclear stealth and deterrence facility at Whiteman Air Force Base. Missouri is proud to have Whiteman Air Force Base as the home of the B-2 bomber, the stealth bomber system, where dedicated airmen stand by at a moment's notice to let our allies know we can reach anywhere, anytime from that base, and they are unlikely to know we are there until we get there.

Finally, this bill includes critical funding to keep the Army ready,

equipped, and trained. At Fort Leonard Wood the Army trains approximately 80,000 soldiers every year. While I was disappointed with the announced reductions at Fort Leonard Wood, which are scheduled to occur in 2017, the number of uniformed positions at that installation will still be higher than they were in 2001. The Army's decision to minimize reductions at Fort Leonard Wood was a decision that I think anybody who understands the Fort would agree with.

In summary, I want to say to the President of the United States that this bill provides for our common defense. That is his No. 1 responsibility as Commander in Chief. Blocking this bill will keep us less safe and less secure. So Mr. President, sign this bill.

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

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, it is not uncommon for me when I am at home in Oklahoma to have a mom approach me at a townhall meeting or in conversations or even at a store or restaurant. What she will want to talk to me about is very interesting. Almost always the moms who approach me lately want to talk to me about national security. They want to talk to me about the fear they have that the world is spinning out of control, and they are very concerned about their kids. They are concerned about terrorism coming to the United States. With a lot of moms in Oklahoma, there is a sense of a loss of trust that this is a safe world and a safe place.

I can't say that is isolated. As I have talked to other Members in this body, I seem to find the same theme coming up over and over again. As I talk to people at home, they want to know: Is the American government performing its primary responsibility of maintaining security and protecting American citizens around the world?

I would love to be able to tell them yes, but quite frankly this has become a very chaotic world, and the challenges we face need clear messaging about what we plan to do and our intent to actually follow up on that plan. We need to have a national policy plan for defense, and then we need to follow through on that.

That seems straightforward and simple. Well, the national defense authorization is one of those areas where Congress and the President have for decades agreed on a national policy for defense. They have laid out that perspective, and then it is the President's responsibility as Commander in Chief to fulfill. That is the primary responsibility of the U.S. Government. The

challenge is, our world is in utter turmoil and that primary responsibility is not being fulfilled.

Passage today of the National Defense Authorization Act by 70 to 27—which is a rare vote in the Senate, to have that much bipartisan agreement on something—is a significant next step. It has passed the House already, it has now passed the Senate with a veto-proof majority, and it is headed to the President's desk, and he has threatened a veto, of all things, for a national plan for defense.

There is a sentiment, an emotion from Americans: Please get a clear national policy. We feel like the world is on fire, and somebody needs to provide a clear path. That is what this is, and I am astounded by the conversation about a possible veto threat from the President of the United States, even when it passes the Senate by a veto-proof majority.

Where are we and what is really going on right now? Let's take a look at the world and what is happening in real time. The Middle East is absolutely rocked to its core with violence, and there is this perception that the United States is disconnected from it. I would say that is untrue. We are just not providing clarity in the plan.

At a time when we have men and women in harm's way across the entire Middle East, I am astounded that the President is talking about a veto, which will provide even more instability. Let me give an example. When I talk about men and women in harm's way, there are many Americans who don't hear about the ongoing battle happening now in Iraq and Syria and how our sons and daughters are already very engaged in what is happening there. There is this belief—I believe fostered by the President—that we are really not there because we never talk about it.

So let's talk about yesterday. This is yesterday over Iraq and Syria and what happened. Near Abu Kamal, there were three strikes from the Americans on two separate ISIL crude oil collection points. That was in Syria yesterday. In Iraq, one strike destroyed two ISIL rocket rails. Near Kirkuk, two strikes struck two separate ISIL tactical units and destroyed two ISIL heavy machine guns and an ISIL fighting position. Near Kisik, three strikes suppressed two ISIL rocket positions, an ISIL mortar position, and an ISIL sniper position. Near Makhmur, one strike suppressed an ISIL heavy machine gun position. Near Mosul, three strikes struck an ISIL tactical unit and destroyed three ISIL heavy machine guns and three ISIL fighting positions and suppressed an ISIL rocket position and an ISIL mortar position. Near Ramadi, five strikes struck four separate ISIL tactical units and destroyed three ISIL fighting positions, three ISIL weapons caches, two ISIL buildings, an ISIL bunker, and denied ISIL access to terrain they were pursuing. Near Sinjar, one strike struck an ISIL tactical unit

and destroyed an ISIL heavy machine gun and two ISIL fighting positions. Near Sultan Abdallah, one strike suppressed an ISIL rocket position. Near Tal Afar, two strikes destroyed an ISIL fighting position, an ISIL trench, and an ISIL berm, and suppressed an ISIL mortar position. Near Tikrit, one strike destroyed four ISIL obstacles. That was yesterday.

Americans have this belief that we are disconnected. We are a nation that is engaged, but the challenge is that there is no clear plan, there is no end game that is being laid out. In a moment when we have this many strikes that are happening in Syria and in Iraq—and I can go on and on about what is happening with our Special Forces in Afghanistan and across the rest of the region, as I will describe in a moment, but at this moment, with this going on, the President is going to veto a national defense authorization with this kind of bipartisan support, when the whole Nation is saying: Give us a plan because we feel insecure.

Currently, we are trying and failing to train and equip moderate opposition forces against ISIL in Syria. Currently, we are trying to give Kurds all the equipment they need to hold the line against ISIL. There are millions of displaced people who are fleeing across Europe, who are trying to find some place of respite.

In Yemen, we are supporting the Saudi-led coalition as the Iranians are causing a coup to become a reality in Yemen by the Houthi rebels.

In Libya, there is still an unbelievable vacuum left by the incomplete campaign, which resulted in ISIS getting a foothold in Libya and a bloody civil war in a very divided Libya. They have not been able to form a central government in several years now.

Egypt is facing a growing terrorist threat in Sinai. There are all kinds of tit-for-tat violence happening right now in Israel between the Palestinians and Israelis.

In Africa, we are still hunting Joseph Kony—a despicable madman—but with no success. AFRICOM is also trying to assist forces working to kick al-Shabaab out of Somalia. Bloody sectarian violence is breaking out in the Central African Republic. South Sudan has an extremely fragile peace agreement. Boko Haram continues to rapidly grow in West Africa.

In Mexico and other parts of Latin America, drug thugs are running rampant, and they are pushing drugs into the United States in record amounts, destabilizing many of our cities.

In Afghanistan, a new offensive by the Taliban threatens to roll back the progress we have made.

DNI Clapper testified that the world is still facing an emerging and rapidly growing cyber threat. It is not just a cyber threat to the American Government, it is a threat to every American citizen, as many American citizens have personally experienced in recent days.

Let's look to the future and some of the plans that are ongoing.

Iran. We heard from Secretary Kerry and this administration that a nuclear deal with Iran would lead to a more peaceful Middle East. Since the agreement was announced, we have seen Iran continue to arm the Houthi rebels in Yemen, continue to support Hezbollah and their expansion, and continue to aggressively prop up the Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad. Some of us have stated quite blatantly our suspicion that this deal would make the region less stable. Indeed, in just 5 years Iran could begin importing large amounts of conventional weapons under this deal. So an Iran that is already supporting large amounts of terrorism will only become better equipped in the days to come.

China. They had a state visit here recently with lots of broad promises about cooperation. Meanwhile, we know that much of the cyber threat emanates from China. They are building islands in disputed waters—airfields capable of hosting military assets there. They are beginning to build a world-class navy that could threaten our closest allies in the region. China continues to be one of the world's leaders in human rights violations.

Russia. We have heard several of our top military commanders say there is a long list of threats, but the threat they are most concerned about is a growing Russia. Putin walked into Crimea, and the world watched. He continues to threaten eastern Ukraine, and the world watches. He is now expanding Russian adventures into the Middle East, supporting Iranian-backed Bashar al-Assad in Syria, and attacking the moderate opposition forces attempting to defend their own families. This is not a new vanguard against terrorism; this is an expansion of the "Russian Bear."

So what are we doing about it? We are trying to actually put out a clear plan. Where are we going in national defense? What are we going to do to stop terrorism and the expansion of terrorists around the world? Instead of the White House cooperating with us, they are threatening to veto the NDAA. It is unbelievable. It is astounding that the White House is spending more time trying to make a deal with Iran than they are trying to actually support our own military. What does this do? What does this agreement really accomplish?

For those who aren't familiar with the national defense authorization, let me share a few things that are in this national defense authorization that the President is now saying he is going to veto.

Here is one: personal carry of firearms. Post commanders are empowered to permit a member of the Armed Forces to carry appropriate firearms on our posts or bases. After the attack that happened in Chattanooga, this is something the American people have called out for. It is included in this bill, to allow it.

It provides for stronger cyber operations capabilities and looks to safeguard our technological superiority.

It ensures that military intelligence analysis remains a priority at the national level.

The NDAA extends vital authorities for our forces in Afghanistan as we try to deal with what is happening on the ground there. It authorizes the Iran military power report for 10 additional years, reflecting Congress's view that Iran's illicit pursuit of a nuclear weapons capability and its malign military activities constitute a grave threat to regional stability and U.S. national security interests. The NDAA reinforces the mission against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, ISIL.

Congress authorizes through this the European Reassurance Initiative to address Russia's employment of conventional and unconventional warfare methods to counter U.S. and Western interests, whether it be in the Ukraine or across the area—bicameral, bipartisan efforts to provide assistance and sustainment for the military forces in Ukraine.

The NDAA allocates \$30 million for DOD-unique capabilities to address the threatening levels of violence, instability, illicit trafficking of drugs, and transnational organized crime in Central America.

Dealing with the Pacific region, this conference remains concerned about America's strategy in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region, and the NDAA requires the President to make a clear strategy for this "pivot to Asia."

The Defense Department has also placed greater emphasis—under this agreement, the NDAA—on security cooperation with all parts of the world to make sure we have a consistent strategy.

If we want to talk about individual members of the military, this NDAA changes how retirement is done. Now, 83 percent of the individuals who serve in our military don't receive any kind of retirement at the end. This allows those individuals to actually be able to participate in retirement benefits, in their retirement from the military, even if they don't make it all the way to 20 years. This is a dramatic shift not only in supporting the warfighter but in actually setting a strategy for where we need to go to provide some clarity to individuals at home and to our troops in the field.

The President's statement that he is going to veto this has come under two areas. He said he is going to veto this because the funding mechanism comes from the Overseas Contingency Operations Fund, OCO. Because the funding is coming from OCO, he is going to veto it. The second thing he said: I am going to veto it because I don't like what it says about Gitmo—about Guantanamo—and keeping those individuals who are terrorists who have attacked our Nation at Guantanamo.

The ironic part is that when I started to pull this to be able to look at the

figures—let me just give the last several years. In 2013, the OCO funding was \$89 billion. The President signed that. In 2014, OCO funding was \$81 billion. The President signed that. In 2015, OCO funding was \$64 billion. The President signed that. This year's OCO funding is \$89 billion, which is right there in the same range as the previous 4 years, but this year he is saying: I can't sign it; it has OCO funding. Can somebody tell me the difference on this? This is very similar to what has been done the last 4 years.

His statement about Guantanamo Bay and preventing funding—moving the terrorists from Guantanamo Bay to the United States—I can tell you that in my State people are adamantly opposed to moving the terrorists from Guantanamo Bay to the United States. Going all the way back, let's say, to 2011, that NDAA prevented moving prisoners from Guantanamo; 2012, prevented it; 2013, prevented it; 2014, prevented it; 2015, prevented it. All of those, the President signed, but for some strange reason, this year the President has said: It has OCO funds and it deals with Guantanamo—just like every other year in the past.

This is the season when we need to bring clear voices and a clear mission, not politics. This is the primary mission we have as a federal government: Take care of our national defense and provide a clear messaging.

I am proud of this Senate for finishing the conference report on the NDAA and sending it to the President's desk. Now I would ask the Commander in Chief to stand with the troops, to sign this, and let's get on to providing some clarity in the days ahead.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, first, I want to commend my colleague, my partner on the Senate Intelligence Committee, for his recent remarks delivered here on the floor.

It was our Director of National Intelligence, Admiral Clapper, who said that in all of his 50-plus years of serving in intelligence functions—first in the military and now as the Director of National Intelligence—he has never seen a world so troubled, he has never seen such a proliferation of threats, threats to our way of life, threats to our country, threats to our allies, threats to world order. And my colleague from Oklahoma, Senator LANKFORD, just laid out in specific detail the multitude of threats, the multitude of dysfunction and chaos that exists not just in the Middle East but throughout the world. I won't repeat any of it, but I thank him for bringing attention to the fact that we live in very uncertain times, times which require decisive leadership, and that leadership—over the years and over the centuries, world nations have pointed to the United States as the democratic leadership absolutely necessary to deal with these types of issues and provide directional

leadership to our allies and to the world, as well as show strength to our adversaries that has restrained some of their actions. That is missing.

There is a huge void being left by the lack of any kind of sensible policy—if there is a policy at all—coming out of this particular White House and from this President. This vacuum that has been created has allowed the opportunity for those who seek to do us harm, to do others harm, and those who seek to use power to achieve their means—literally, a blank check and a free hand, knowing there is no order here in terms of addressing this in a successful way.

So I thank my colleague for defining this on the floor, and I certainly want to support—and hopefully my colleagues will pay attention to this serious challenge that America faces with the lack of a coherent strategy and lack of decisive leadership that is coming to us from the White House.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. President, today we face something far less consequential but still consequential from the standpoint that it is a contributor to another major threat that Americans face.

I have been engaged in everything from major programs—done in a bipartisan way, with support from the President, all of which have failed—to address this and bring us to the small, sometimes almost ridiculous and embarrassing, spending that has taken place here for those who are looking at it from bottom up instead of from top down. It is something I have tried to identify every week—now for 23 weeks—called the waste of the week, hopefully it will provide the kind of embarrassment to my colleagues and knowledge of the fact that we simply cannot keep spending money that we do not have.

These waste of the week sums are substantial, into the tens of billions of dollars. Some are there to show the American people or describe to the American people the fact that there is a significant amount of unneeded spending, of waste, fraud, and abuse that occurs on an almost daily basis throughout all of our agencies and throughout Federal spending. People are saying: Given the kind of debt crisis we are looking at, why are we spending hard-earned tax dollars to address this or that or whatever?

Today I want to address one small but yet another example of unnecessary Federal spending, and it involves the role of robots replacing humans for certain functions. Those who have watched "The Jetsons"—I don't really tune in, but my grandkids do—perhaps wish that they, too, could have a Rosie the maid, the robot that cooks, cleans, and tells jokes to the Jetson family. This obviously is a cartoon presentation, but it reflects a role for robots that provides us interesting entertainment or perhaps the robot from "Lost in Space" that played the electric guitar and exhibited human emotion or

Michael Knight's trusted robot sidekick KITT on "Knight Rider."

This is a little bit beyond my generation, but I am told robots are now part of the entertainment scene. While this makes for good television and draws viewers, we all know robots can never replace the care of a human being, the care of a parent, the efforts of a teacher, those who are reaching out to provide support and encouragement for young people. Yet the National Science Foundation is currently spending \$440,855 trying to do that with robots. The agency recently awarded a taxpayer-funded grant to develop the use of "autonomous, personalized social robots" in the classroom.

The first thing that came to my mind was what in the world does a personalized social robot look like and how do you personalize a robot to provide social interaction with children? The purpose of this grant, which began last month and continues until August 2017, is to create robots that can tell stories to children.

This might be a cute thing to do. I don't know. Is this something the Federal Government, at a time when we are in the middle of deficit spending, evermore borrowing, should ask the taxpayer to send out their hard-earned tax dollars for—this kind of thing? If private industry wants to do this and can sell the product to schools, more power to them, but why do we have to go to the Federal Government to do a test case to see if this works? We know we do basic research here. We support that through NIH and the National Science Foundation. This is not basic research. I am questioning this.

Let me quote from the grant description. This will "offer unique opportunities of guided, personalized and controlled social interaction, whatever that means, during the delivery of a desired curriculum. They can play, learn and engage with children in the real world—physically, socially, and emotively."

Maybe the effort here is to build a robot that can physically, socially, and emotively connect with children. That might work on "The Jetsons." That might work on television. I can't believe how that works in real life.

What parent wants a preschooler to be read to by a so-called social robot instead of a teacher or a parent? And why are we spending taxpayer dollars on reading robots? Actual human teachers provide what robots cannot. They relate to our children. They understand their individual needs, and they tailor their instruction to bring out the very best in our children and on a personalized basis. I don't think a robot can adjust emotively and socially to different children in the classroom. Yet obviously the teacher is trained to do that.

Even the most advanced robot can't sense when a child is going through a rough time or provide the right touch to ensure a child's learning. Should the Federal Government, which is over \$18

trillion in debt, be spending any money, let alone \$440,000, on this research? Is this something the private sector could be conducting instead? Certainly, if that is what the goal is.

My purpose throughout the Waste of the Week Initiative is to drive home the point that the Federal Government should be stewarding taxpayers' dollars for essential functions and in a way that truly helps people.

Let me be clear. I am not criticizing all Federal research spending or the National Science Foundation. The government does play an important role, as I have said, in promoting basic science research that cannot be done elsewhere, but there are many private companies that offer products that use technology to help children learn. Is it the role of the government to also perform this sort of research? Just because something is interesting to do doesn't mean it rises to the level of priority, particularly at a time when we are continuing to spend more money and go deeper into debt each and every day.

Families and small businesses have to prioritize all the time. The Federal Government needs to do the same. So let's pull the plug or take out the battery and short circuit this funding for this grant.

Today I am marking more money on our ever-increasing amount of waste, fraud, and abuse. We are adding \$440,855 to the nearly \$117 billion that over the last 22 weeks we have brought to this floor.

60TH ANNIVERSARY OF CRISPUS ATTUCKS
CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. President, while I am here, let me switch and for a couple of minutes speak to something that I think speaks well of our State; that is, celebrating an important anniversary.

In Indiana, few things better personify the Hoosier spirit of hard work and overcoming adversity, persistence, and sportsmanship more than high school basketball. It is rabid in our State, and it always has been. It defines our State.

Every year the high school basketball season culminates in February and March with what we call Hoosier Hysteria—the postseason tournament. Half a century ago, the height of Hoosier Hysteria was before school consolidation and before the advent of class basketball. At that time we had one single athletic class and crowned one high school basketball team State champion each year. For the final game of the tournament, fans would fill Butler University's historic Hinkle Fieldhouse to standing-room-only capacity. Throughout those weeks of tournament, as the small, medium, and large-sized schools worked their way through the system to that championship game, it captured the hearts and minds of Hoosiers in a way that nothing else does.

This phenomena was immortalized by the award-winning 1986 movie "Hoosiers"—one of my personal favorites—

and based on an improbable but true story. Back in the 1950s, hundreds of small high schools existed across our small State, but no small school had ever won the basketball State championship. In 1954, Mylan High School—a rural school with an enrollment of only 161 students in all four grades—faced a much larger school, Muncie Central High School, whose enrollment was 2,200 students in the State championship game. The Mylan Indians defeated the Muncie Central Bearcats to win the State title. It has been immortalized through the movie "Hoosiers," which any Hoosier, and hopefully people outside the State, watched more than once. I watch it on a regular basis. It is a great story.

Even today, Mylan's incredible accomplishment is widely admired and discussed by Hoosier basketball fans. Indiana high school basketball in this era produced not only this "David and Goliath" episode but also another truly inspirational team. This is their 60th anniversary.

En route to winning the 1954 State championship, Milan defeated the Crispus Attucks Tigers in the semi-State. That is no small accomplishment. That was a large school with an exceptional team. At that time, Crispus Attucks was an all-Black high school in Indianapolis. Despite their loss to Milan in 1954, the Tigers were back the next year. On March 19, 1955—60 years ago—Crispus Attucks won the State title by defeating Gary Roosevelt High School 97 to 74 in that championship game.

The next year Crispus Attucks went undefeated, riding a 45-winning streak to State title. The Tigers finished the 1950s with a third championship in 1959.

Crispus Attucks High School's 1955 State title was one of several firsts. Not only were they the first team from Indianapolis to win the State title, they were the first African-American school in the Nation to win an open State tournament.

Through the perseverance and leadership of their coach, Ray Crowe, the players learned not just the game of basketball but also valuable lessons about discipline, patience, and perseverance. These lessons resulted in back-to-back State titles, as I have said.

On the court, the Crispus Attucks teams of the mid-1950s were led by a future professional all-star, champion, and Hall of Famer named Oscar Robertson. Oscar Robertson said of those Crispus Attucks teams: "The way we played and won, we did it with a lot of class."

The Tigers' success on the basketball court helped tear down many lingering racial barriers of that time. This team inspired the State of Indiana with their hard work, graciousness, and sportsmanship. Today I join my fellow Hoosiers in marking the 60th anniversary of this milestone and honoring this team of champions.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for up to 10 minutes; that following my remarks, Senator SCHATZ be recognized for up to 10 minutes; and that following his remarks, Senator WHITEHOUSE be recognized for up to 10 minutes.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, the evidence and impacts of climate change are clear and they are undeniable. Scientists can measure the increase of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. They can measure the rising temperatures. They can measure the increasing level of the sea. They can measure the increase in extreme rainfall. All of this increases the risk for extreme weather events that threaten people and the economy. While addressing the challenges of climate change will take a comprehensive approach, we have many of the policies, the workforce, and the technologies we need to address the problem already.

To illustrate that point, I want to tell you a tale of two tax policies—one for wind and solar and one for oil, gas, and coal. Let's look at the last decade of our tale of two tax policies.

In 2005, we, the United States, installed 79 total megawatts of solar in the United States. Seventy-nine megawatts was a teeny amount back in 2005. Last year we deployed nearly 100 times that amount—7,000 new megawatts in the year 2014. Look at that. We have nearly 100 times more solar.

Well, what happened? First, technology costs plummeted. Everybody has heard of a Moore's law for semiconductors. It told us that today's iPhones would be more powerful than last generation's supercomputers. We all know Moore's Law. We knew we would move from this pocket phone to an iPhone because the technology keeps getting more powerful.

There is a Moore's law for solar as well. Every time solar panel deployment doubles globally, the cost of solar falls by 18 percent. It is predictable. It is why we are seeing the cost of a solar panel drop 70 percent since the year 2010, and it is why costs will continue to fall.

Next, 30 States enacted renewable electricity standards. Yes, now more than half of the States in our country have a standard to get a sizable portion of their electricity from renewable sources, and finally, and most importantly from a national policy perspective, we passed an 8-year extension of the Solar Investment Tax Credit in 2008. We gave this industry and these companies certainty. We now have more than 20,000 megawatts of installed solar capacity in the United States. More than 60 percent of it was added in just the last 2 years, and we

are projected to double that installed solar capacity over the next 2 years. We are forecast to add 8,000 megawatts this year and 12,000 megawatts next year, and that is because we put smart tax policies on the books 7 years ago.

Look what happened. If we go from the beginning of the American Revolution until 2005, we were still only installing 79 megawatts—just a teeny, tiny amount of solar energy. But when we started putting State renewable electricity standards on the books and a new tax policy, it started to explode 100 times—1,000 times more solar in America, by the way, with all the experts saying: This can't happen. Solar isn't real. Wind isn't real. You Senators, you House Members, you have to get real. Well, this is the proof that bad policies had stopped this explosion of these technologies.

By the way, the same thing is true for wind power. We are projected to add 9,000 new megawatts of wind power in our country this year, and we are projected to add another 8,000 megawatts of wind power next year. We can see what is happening with the combined totals of wind and solar once we put the new policies on the books. It was basically an era where almost no electricity in the United States was generated by wind and solar to the next year having 5 to 6 percent of all the electricity in America coming from wind and solar. It is like the explosion of cellphones that turned into smartphones. People didn't have anything in their pockets just 20 years ago—it was like the wind and solar industry—but we changed policies in the United States. We said: We can do it. We can untether ourselves from a telephone line in our living rooms. We can let people walk around with their phone, and we began to make the same decisions on wind and solar. We can untether ourselves in the United States from coal-generated electricity that emits greenhouse gases that dangerously warm our planet, and we are now doing it. It is accelerating, and that is the beautiful part of the story.

By the end of next year, there are going to be 300,000 people employed in the wind and solar industry in the United States. Right now, there are 73,000 people building these wind turbines. Steel and iron workers are out there doing this work right now, and it generates clean, renewable, nonpolluting energy. We can do this. We are the United States of America. We are the innovation giant on the planet. We can solve this problem.

What has happened with the wind industry? Well, their tax break has now expired. Has the tax break for the oil industry expired? Oh, no. Has the tax break for the coal industry expired? Oh, no.

Those tax breaks have been on the books for 100 years. They will never expire—never. There are too many people who want to help the fossil fuel industry here in the Senate and over in the House of Representatives, but the tax

breaks for the wind and solar industry—the ones that are showing the tremendous growth, innovation, and capacity to develop new technologies that we can export around the planet—are expiring.

If we look at the green generation—young people within our society—which technology do they want us to invest in? Do they want black rotary dial phones and coal-burning powerplants or do they want the new technologies of the 21st Century, their generation? Do they want the past dirty carbon pollution or do they want future clean energy? It is not even close. This is a choice that has to be made by this generation. The green generation expects us to be the leaders on this issue.

The oil and gas industry get \$7.5 billion a year in tax breaks. The oil industry doesn't need a subsidy to drill for oil any more than a bird needs a subsidy to fly or a fish needs a subsidy to swim. They are going to do it anyway. What they do though is lobby to take away the tax breaks for solar and wind because they know that will displace them. Our goal, of course, should be to have a massive ramping up of these energy technologies.

Do you want to hear an incredible number? The Chinese government, while the Pope was in town here in Washington, announced that China was going to deploy wind and solar and other renewable technologies by the year 2030 that would equal the total of all electrical generation capacity in the United States of America. They are going to deploy all their coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, and solar. Again, I said earlier that every time there is a global doubling of the deployment of solar on the planet, the price of solar drops by 18 percent. China is going to be doing that.

Last week India announced that they are going to have a massive increase in their renewable energy resources as well.

Unfortunately, the tax breaks in our own country have already expired or are going to expire for the wind and solar industries. Our country is supposed to be the leader. We are supposed to be the technological giant on this planet.

All I can say is, if we want the jobs, this is the sector where the jobs are being created. There will be 300,000 jobs in this sector by the end of next year. If we want to reduce greenhouse gases, this is the sector that can make it possible for the United States to be the leader.

If we want to be the leaders to ensure that we are acted on the message that Pope Francis delivered to the Congress just 2 weeks ago, we have to move toward these technologies. The Pope asked us to use our technological capacity in order to solve this problem. The Pope pretty much said three things. No. 1, the planet is warming dangerously, and the science is clear. No. 2, the cause of the warming is

largely by human beings, and the science is clear. No. 3, we have a moral responsibility.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a huge day because we have Members coming out to the floor to talk about this revolution and how we can find a solution so we can deal with this issue in a positive, affirmative job-creating way. We can engage in massive job creation in order to save all of God's creation. We can do it, but we have to decide that we are going to be the leaders in this sector, and all I can say is that in the end we are going to win because technology always triumphs—always. You can hold it back for a while, but in the end it is going to ultimately change our world. By the year 2100 people will look back and wonder why we ever did generate electricity by the use of fossil fuels on our planet.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I see that Senator SCHATZ and Senator WHITEHOUSE have arrived.

With that, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for explaining to the public and this body what we are all becoming increasingly aware of. The technology is there. This is no longer pie in the sky. This is not hopeful ecological utopia thinking. This is real stuff. These are real jobs that are being financed by banks and financial institutions. This is already upon us.

I wish to tell the story of Hawaii's clean energy transformation. Of course the clean energy transformation is taking place across the country, but it is especially true in Hawaii. For decades—since the demise of the sugar plantation—Hawaii relied on imports of fossil fuel for our energy needs. As recently as 2010, we derived nearly 90 percent of our electrons from burning oil. In just 4 years we have driven this number down to around 80 percent, and we are on our way to a 100 percent clean energy target.

Hawaii's reliance on imported fuels isn't just bad for the climate, it is also bad economics. We have the highest electricity rates in the country. Our rates are three times higher than the national average. For the privilege of burning LSFO, low sulfur fuel oil, we are paying higher prices than anywhere in the Nation, and so something had to give.

In order to bolster our own energy security and economic prospects, we made the decision to transition away from fossil fuels to solar, wind, and geothermal. Clean energy is Hawaii's future, but it is important to point out that in the beginning we had naysayers on the left, right, and center, much like the current debate in the Congress. There are those who think that what we do in the clean power plan or with the carbon fee will not be nearly enough, and there are those who think that we are doing too much too fast.

I remember having this exact conversation in Hawaii in 2001. In 2001, we started small and passed a voluntary renewable portfolio goal that encouraged utilities—didn't mandate—to generate 9 percent of their electricity from clean energy by the year 2010. The target, frankly, was unambitious. It was voluntary and it was unenforceable, but it was important because it was a start. For some it was little and for others it was too radical, but it was a start. So we kept pushing.

In 2004, we replaced the original goal with a requirement of 20 percent clean energy by 2020. Two years later, we added incentives for compliance and established penalties for noncompliance.

In 2008, Hawaii partnered with the USDOE to identify the technical, regulatory, and financial barriers preventing the State from reaching its clean energy potential. This partnership, the Hawaii Clean Energy Initiative, was crucial to helping Hawaii realize that a 100 percent clean energy goal was actually realistic.

A year after starting this partnership, the State increased its Clean Energy Standard to 40 percent by 2030, establishing an energy efficiency standard of 30 percent and enshrining into law the requirement to reduce emissions from the power sector by 70 percent by the year 2030.

I want to give context here. People thought this was totally unrealistic and that we would even at the first 2- or 3-year increment already miss our goals, but what happened was the opposite. We started exceeding our interim targets, and then we ratcheted up our goals. Progress toward these goals demonstrated that an even more ambitious, audacious goal of 100-percent clean energy was a real possibility.

So this year Governor Ige in Hawaii signed the law requiring utilities to generate all of their electricity from renewable sources by 2045. We are currently meeting or exceeding our interim targets, thanks in large part to big increases in wind power and in distributed generation, especially solar rooftops.

It is important to say that progress towards our clean energy goals hasn't impeded economic growth. Hawaii's unemployment rate is among the lowest in the Nation and 1.5 percent below the national average.

Strengthening this law required consistent efforts by advocacy groups, businesses, and government agencies to bring about the change. It also showed the importance of taking those first steps down the road to a low-carbon economy. Whether they seem too small to make a difference or too large to be possible, we have to start. Once we do, ambitious goals are more within reach than they may have originally seemed.

Now, Hawaii is blessed in a number of ways, including with ample sunlight, steady winds, and volcanic energy. But Hawaii is not unique in its ability to generate substantial quantities of electricity from clean renewable resources.

The National Renewable Energy Laboratory analyzed clean energy potential across the country and found that "[r]enewable electricity generation from technologies that are commercially available today . . . is more than adequate to supply 80 percent of the total U.S. electricity generation by the year 2050."

That is with technologies available today. As these technologies improve and the cost of clean energy continues to fall, wind and solar power will be increasingly competitive with electricity generated from fossil fuels in States across the country. As my home State of Hawaii illustrates, we just have to start.

This is a lesson that we must take to the international context as well. As the world meets in Paris later this year, I urge representatives from all countries to think of Hawaii's experience moving towards a zero carbon energy system. The climate negotiations in Paris are shaping up to be at least a moderate success. But whatever agreement emerges from Paris will likely be a political Rorschach test, which is to say that some will say that we are promising too much and others will say that we should be offering more. Whatever one's predisposition about climate, Paris will prove it to the world.

But what truly matters is not exactly what the particulars of each agreement in Paris are but what happens next. It is doing the work. It is power purchase agreements. It is public policy. It is tax incentives. It is permits. It is public utilities commissions. It is actually getting the work done across the country and across the planet.

When something as consequential as climate change is on the table, it is going to require global capital, technological breakthroughs, and political will. That political will will only occur if people understand that, yes, this is a problem. It is real. Yes, it is urgent, and yes, it is caused by humans. But, most importantly, we can, in fact, fix it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues from Massachusetts and Hawaii to talk about the tax credits for wind.

We have had a remarkably exciting new thing happen in Rhode Island this summer. From time to time, I am able to get out on Narragansett Bay and, over and over, whether driving on the bridges over Narragansett Bay or actually out on Narragansett Bay, we saw the sites of these enormous barges traveling down the bay, bringing these huge structures that were carried out, located off of Block Island, and sunk to the ocean floor to provide the platforms for the first steel-in-water offshore wind energy in the country.

Now, we can go over to Europe and see wind energy all over the place. We are behind them in developing it, but

Rhode Island is the start. And whether we saw these enormous structures that were the legs—the frames for the pylon and the turbine—or whether we saw enormous pilings that get carried out there and in the same way that you drive a nail through the hole for a hanger and put it through wall, they take these enormous pilings that reach way up into the sky and drive them through the hollow legs of the framework and down to anchor them in the ocean floor.

So this is under construction right now. It is big. We see these barges coming by and they are enormous. The structures run hundreds of feet in the air. It is exciting to see this happening, and it is part of the wind revolution that Senator MARKEY and Senator SCHATZ talked about.

So there is a conflict in my mind between this exciting sight in Rhode Island—these big yellow structures coming down the bay in the bright light—and then coming to the darker Halls of Congress and moving from that exciting sight to the tedious fight that we have over and over to protect the wind production tax credit. Over and over we have to go through this fight. Why? I will tell my colleagues why. It is because opposition to the wind tax credit is one more little wriggling tentacle of the fossil fuel industry. They have huge tax subsidies, tax credits, and tax advantages baked permanently into the Tax Code, and they sit on those and they defend them and they are merciless about anybody who tries to take those away. But let a little wind come along and try to get a competing tax credit of its own, and they try to crush it, over and over and over.

Nobody runs for office to come to the Senate and says: The thing that drives me, the thing that motivates my candidacy is to make sure that our wind energy in the United States gets knocked down; let's take their little tax credit away. Nobody runs on that. In fact, if I recall correctly, the Presiding Officer ran for office with a picture of a wind turbine in Colorado. So it is not as if there aren't friends to wind in this Chamber.

But once someone gets here, the oil and fossil guys are very powerful. They are very remorseless. They have made immense threats to squash any action on climate change. And as a little sidebar, they always try to beat the little wind energy subsidy. They will never give up their own, and their own are much bigger. We have probably \$50 billion over 10 years in cash tax benefits going to these companies, which are the most profitable companies in the history of the planet. They are the last companies that need any help.

If we look at people such as the International Monetary Fund—not exactly a liberal, green group—the International Monetary Fund estimates that if we put in all of the subsidies that fossil fuel gets around the world, it adds up to more than \$5 trillion—trillion. I am from Rhode Island. I

think \$1 million is a lot of money. I am starting to get used to talking about billions of dollars being here. Trillions is what the fossil fuel subsidy, in effect, is around the world, and just in the U.S. it is \$700 billion in a year. Yet, greedy, big corporations that sit and defend that benefit to the last trench also want to crush the poor little wind benefit. It is just not fair and it is just wrong.

But I think we are going to be able to prevail. We have seen some real progress here. Bloomberg just published an article that wind power is now the cheapest electricity to produce—cheaper than anything else—in both Germany and in the United Kingdom. It is a powerful industry in States such as Colorado and in Wyoming, where they have so much wind that they export wind energy to other States. Iowa is probably our leader. Iowa generates nearly 30 percent of its electricity from wind. TPI Composites is a Rhode Island company. It builds composite materials in Warren, RI. They have a facility in Iowa where they manufacture wind turbine blades and, in the last decade, they have manufactured 10,000—10,000—wind turbine blades. There had been a Maytag factory in a town called Newton, IA, and the Maytag factory went bust because, of course, we are offshoring jobs to China. But guess what. They came in and started building these wind turbines. They are really too big to ship from China, so it has been a boom industry. It has put little Newton back on its feet.

If we don't pass the wind production tax credit, then States such as Wyoming and Colorado and Iowa that depend on this are really going to be hurt. This is bipartisan in these States. I don't know why the fossil fuel industry primarily runs its mischief through the Republican Party here in Congress, but it doesn't work in Iowa. In Iowa, a year ago, the Iowa State Senate unanimously passed a resolution supporting extension of the production tax credit—unanimously.

So we have a really strong case to make that this is the technology of the future. We have a fairness case to make that the great big brutal fossil fuel lobbyist organization shouldn't be allowed to hold on to all of its subsidies—depending on how we measure, they are measuring into the hundreds of billions of dollars—and, at the same time, try to squash poor little wind when it wants to get some subsidies in order to compete with this massive and malevolent incumbent.

Then I think we have the practical politics of this, which is that in State after State after State, wind has become real enough that it is going to be very hard for some of our colleagues on the Republican side to go home and say to their home State industry: Sorry, we put you under the bus. We put you under the bus. We protected your competitors in oil and gas; we absolutely would never touch them. We protected

them. They are sacrosanct on our side. But we put you under the bus. That is going to be a little hard to explain.

So I very much hope that as we come together and pull together the continuing resolution or the omnibus—that avoids, I pray, another shutdown and that puts our country on a sensible budgetary footing going forward—this tax credit is a part of it, because we need these jobs. People are working in Rhode Island, and I will tell my colleagues this: When you are building a giant, enormous, big frame offshore, you are paying good wages. You are paying good wages to the people who operate the barges. You are paying good wages to the ironworkers, the steelworkers, and the electrical workers. You are paying good wages to the stevedores who are helping to load it up. These are really strong economic businesses, and we want to support them.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the issue of the fiscal year 2016 Energy and Water Development appropriations bill—the bill that, in fact, is now before the Senate.

We just voted at 2 o'clock this afternoon on the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act. That is very important because we need to pass that legislation for our military. In fact, we did, and we passed it with 70 votes. That is incredibly important because the President has threatened a veto on the National Defense Authorization Act.

This is legislation that has passed the House, and now it has passed the Senate and it is going to the President. If he vetoes it, we have to have the votes to override because we have to get that legislation done for our men and women in uniform. Not only, as I spoke earlier on the floor, is it about making sure we are doing our job on behalf of our military but also on behalf of our Nation's defense.

The other thing I mentioned in regard to that legislation is we also need to pass the companion bill, which is the Defense appropriations bill. So very soon we will be taking up the Defense appropriations bill, which is the funding that goes with the National Defense Authorization Act. We authorize those military programs and then we have to fund them. That is why the Department of the Defense appropriations bill has to be passed along with the Defense Authorization Act in order to get the job done for our military. I make that point because until we have done both of those things, we have not funded the military the way we need

to. I make that point as part of a bigger point and that is this: The Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, has passed all 12 appropriations bills out of committee, and they are awaiting action on the floor of the Senate. Those bills have been passed with strong bipartisan votes. Instead of having each and every one of those bills filibustered, we need to take those bills up and debate those bills. People should offer the amendments they have, we can debate those amendments, and then we can vote. That is our job. That is how the Senate works. That is what the people of this great country send us to do. That is the work of the Senate. That is regular order.

As we talk about authorizing programs for men and women in uniform, we also have to pass the Defense appropriations bill. That will be coming before this Senate. I make that point because what we have been facing is a filibuster of all these appropriations bills. We will have another test. We will have another test now this week, and this is on the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill. This is energy, Corps of Engineers, vital fundamental infrastructure for this great country. So we will see if our colleagues will join us. Can we join together in a bipartisan way and advance through this appropriations bill, have the debate, offer the amendments, and get this work done? I hope the answer to that is yes. We will find out over the course of today and tomorrow if our colleagues would join together and get this work done for the American people and then on we go.

We may have to deal with a Presidential veto on the National Defense Authorization Act. If so, let's do so. Let's do so in a bipartisan way. Then let's take up the appropriations bill that goes with that Defense authorization. Let's make sure all 12 of these bills, all of these appropriations bills are brought to this floor, people have their opportunity for the debate, people can offer their amendments, and we will have our votes. If something can get 60 votes, it passes. That is the work of the Senate. That is the work of the Senate. If it is not done, the reason it will not be done is because there will be an ongoing filibuster. It is very important that the American people understand that because this is the work of the Senate, this is the work of the Congress, and we need to be clear about whether we are getting that work done or whether we continue to face a filibuster that does not allow us to bring this legislation forward to debate it in an open, transparent debate. Put it out there in front of the American people, make the argument, offer the amendments, and vote. That is how it is done. That is how it is done in this democracy. That is how it is done in this Senate.

So I rise to talk about the merits of the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill. This measure appropriates funding for the U.S. Depart-

ment of Energy, including national nuclear security and energy research and development, as well as critical infrastructure projects administered by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The Senate Appropriations Committee approved this bill in May. I am a member not only of this Appropriations Committee but this subcommittee, and we voted out of committee 26 to 4. So there are 30 members on the full Appropriations Committee, Republicans and Democrats, and by a vote of 26 to 4 we voted in favor of this legislation. That is about as bipartisan as it gets. It was supported by all of the Republican members of the committee and 10 of the Democratic members.

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, I thank Chairman ALEXANDER and Ranking Member FEINSTEIN. They have crafted a bipartisan bill within our budget framework that balances our energy priorities and our national security preparedness.

I also commend Senate Appropriations Chairman COCHRAN and Ranking Member MIKULSKI. They brought the measure up in regular order, allowing amendments and debate, and they advanced this bill, as I said, with a very strong bipartisan 26-to-4 vote. The fact is, this is the first time in 6 years the Appropriations Committee has passed all 12 appropriations bills. All 12 have been passed in a bipartisan manner, awaiting action on the floor.

As I said, this legislation is within the budget guidelines. The Senate Energy and Water bill includes \$35.4 billion in overall funding, which is \$1.2 billion more than last year's funding level.

The Energy Department's nuclear security program is funded at \$12.3 billion, which is \$856 million more than last year. The Department of Energy programs receive an additional \$270 million. This is important because our Nation has significant infrastructure needs, and that is what we are addressing, basic infrastructure needs of this kind. The longer we wait to improve America's infrastructure, particularly our waterways, the higher the cost will be. So it is very important that we get this legislation moving.

One of the ways we can cost-effectively improve the Nation's infrastructure is by using public-private partnerships, P3s, to fund water projects. I worked closely with Senator ALEXANDER, the chairman of the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee to include support for P3-style projects in this legislation.

I see that our chairman has joined us. Again, I commend him for not only the overall legislation but for his support for the P3s, public-private partnerships. By leveraging the resources of the private sector, we can accelerate construction and reduce overall project costs. This creates a win for citizens who benefit from the project and a win for taxpayers who save money on

projects that are constructed on a more cost-effective basis. I look forward to passing this legislation so we can advance this P3 concept.

In fact, we have a project in Fargo, ND, that is perfectly suited for this type of approach. A P3 project can save the government hundreds of millions of dollars in construction costs, but we need to get this legislation passed so the Corps has the ability to start these types of projects and get them constructed for our country.

I am also pleased the legislation permits the Army Corps of Engineers to get a handful of new feasibility studies. Mother Nature doesn't wait on the Senate or Congress, so we have to keep looking at areas where we need to upgrade infrastructure and respond to things as they occur; for example, some of the recent events, as the Presiding Officer knows, which occurred in Colorado, the Animas River. One area I am very familiar with that needs better protection is Minot, ND, where we had a devastating flood in 2011. We need to do a feasibility study to determine how best to make sure that flood protection is put in place.

Finally, I am strongly supporting funding included in the legislation for improvements to water infrastructure across this country. Whether it is our ports or whether it is large or small, this is basic infrastructure we need for quality of life in this country. This is a long-term investment for the future of our country, the quality of life, the welfare of our people, and the ability to grow our economy.

Let me touch on a couple of areas before I turn over the floor to our chairman. In addition to the Corps of Engineers, this legislation provides funding for the National Nuclear Security Administration, the agency that develops and maintains the Nation's nuclear warheads. NNSA relies on the funding provided every year in the Energy and Water bill to preserve the Nation's nuclear deterrents. It is critical that this legislation moves forward. I am particularly pleased the legislation meets the fiscal year 2016 budget request for funds needed to refurbish the W80 warhead, which is the warhead that goes on our nuclear cruise missiles.

The W80 warhead is aging and needs to be refurbished so it can move to the new cruise missile being developed by the Air Force. The W80 is critical to the air leg of the Nation's nuclear triad. I am glad this legislation provides the funding to help keep our triad intact and in fact modernized.

The bill also makes advances in our energy security priorities. It increases funding for the Energy Department's energy research and development, which will help provide the research for technologies that will advance coal, natural gas, oil, and other fossil energy resources and innovations. This is important in order to pursue a true "all of the above" energy policy that enables our country to produce both traditional and renewable energy with better environmental stewardship.

The bill also provides support for the coal Advanced Energy Systems Program to research the efficiency of coal-based power systems and enabling affordable, commercially viable CO₂ capture technologies.

It continues funding for many other research and development programs that will strengthen our energy future, not only by enabling us to produce energy more cost-effectively and more dependably but also with better environmental stewardship.

I will start to wrap up and turn the floor over to our esteemed colleague from the other side of the aisle and the outstanding Senators who are members of the committee who are here and looking to speak in support of this very important legislation, but I want to finish on the aspect I started on earlier.

We have passed all 12 appropriations bills out of committee. This is the fundamental work of the Senate, making sure we fund the government, we fund the enterprise we are talking about, and we do so within the budget that was duly and properly passed by this Senate and by this House—by the Congress. This is the work we need to do. That means we have to proceed to these bills, that we have to offer the opportunity for debate, the opportunity for amendments, debate those amendments, and vote. That is our job. That is our responsibility. That is how we get the work done for the American people who sent us to do just that.

This is good legislation. These bills were passed with bipartisan support. As I said in the case of this bill, 26 in favor, only 4 opposed. Let's get going. Let's get the work done we were sent to do.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from Michigan.

WISCONSIN-LAKE MICHIGAN NATIONAL MARINE
SANCTUARY

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, this week I was pleased to hear some good news about a very special place in the Great Lakes. On the bottom of Lake Michigan, right off the shores of Wisconsin, lies an incredible collection of shipwrecks. People across the Great Lakes region, especially in Wisconsin but also in my home State of Michigan and elsewhere, recognize that this stretch of Lake Michigan is a national treasure because of its historical significance and its great beauty.

Through a bottom-up community-driven process, many people teamed up to put together a proposal to protect this area as a National Marine Sanctuary. The Obama administration listened, and this week they announced they will be moving forward to establish a Wisconsin-Lake Michigan National Marine Sanctuary.

A National Marine Sanctuary designation, as Michiganders know from firsthand experience, helps to improve access and resources for special maritime places in order to enhance visitor

access and preserve irreplaceable resources for future generations.

The Wisconsin-Lake Michigan sanctuary proposal would preserve an 875-square-mile area of Lake Michigan with waters extending from Port Washington to Two Rivers. As Michiganders watch a pure Michigan sunset over Lake Michigan on beaches from Ludington south to Muskegon, the Sun would set over the new sanctuary directly across the lake. The new sanctuary has 29 known shipwrecks, 15 of which are listed in the National Registry of Historic Places, with many of those wrecks almost completely intact—a very rare occurrence. Research shows the proposed sanctuary includes 123 reported vessel losses, so there are many more wrecks to discover in these waters.

Local community leaders in Wisconsin deserve much of the credit for building the support needed to move this proposal forward, but it would not have made it to this point without the tireless work of my friend and colleague Senator BALDWIN of Wisconsin.

In 2013, Senator BALDWIN urged the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, to reopen the public nomination process for the first time in 20 years, and she continues to advocate for additional funding for national marine sanctuaries through her role on the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Earlier this year, I was pleased to introduce a bill with Senator BALDWIN and my good friend Senator STABENOW called the Great Lakes Maritime Heritage Assessment Act, which would require NOAA to review maritime heritage resources in the Great Lakes and suggest areas worthy of designation.

In addition, I teamed up with Senator BALDWIN to introduce the Waterfront Community Revitalization and Resiliency Act, which can work hand in hand with marine sanctuaries to boost the local economies of waterfront communities across the Great Lakes and the country. The bill would improve areas along the water to increase access to public space, grow business development, and create a new vision for waterfronts that can boost tourism, recreation, and small business.

The administration also identified another new potential sanctuary, the Mallow's Bay—Potomac River National Marine Sanctuary, which is a 14-square-mile stretch of the tidal Potomac River with the largest "ghost fleet" of World War I wooden steamship wrecks and one of the most ecologically valuable waterscapes and landscapes in Maryland.

These two sanctuary proposals, if finalized, would be the first sanctuaries established since 2000 and would be just the 15th and 16th additions to the national marine sanctuaries network. The last addition to the network was in 2000, and that was Michigan's very own Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and Underwater Preserve, located in Lake Huron, with the main

NOAA office based in the great city of Alpena. The Thunder Bay sanctuary is a remarkable maritime treasure. It is known as Shipwreck Alley. Throughout history, it has been one of the most highly traveled and dangerous parts of the Great Lakes system. Nearly 100 shipwrecks have been discovered within the sanctuary, with a wide range of vessel types that makes the collection nationally significant.

The cold, clean, fresh water of the Great Lakes keeps shipwrecks in excellent condition, and the archaeological research that is conducted at Thunder Bay is world class.

Pictured here is the helm of the F.T. Barney, a two-masted schooner located at a depth of 160 feet near Rogers City. On October 23, 1868, the F.T. Barney was en route from Cleveland to Milwaukee with a cargo of coal when it was run into by the schooner T.J. Bronson. The ship sank in less than 2 minutes in very deep water. The wreck is one of the most complete you will find anywhere, with masts and deck equipment still in place.

Another impressive wreck, lying at a depth of only 18 feet near Alpena, is the wooden steam barge Monohansett. On November 23 of 1907, the ship burned at the water's edge at Thunder Bay Island. Today, the Monohansett's wreck lies in three sections. The stern portion has hull features, propeller, and shaft all in place, and the boiler is nearby.

You can still go up to Alpena and take a glass-bottom boat to tour these wrecks and see the crystal waters of Lake Huron, and you can even snorkel or scuba dive amongst some of the most well-preserved ships. It is truly a one-of-a-kind and once-in-a-lifetime experience.

Not only is Thunder Bay the only freshwater marine sanctuary among the 14 marine-protected areas—at least until these two new proposals—but it is unique in that it is also a State underwater preserve. It is jointly managed by NOAA and the State of Michigan. A joint management committee makes major policy, budget, and management decisions, and an advisory council represents the community's interests. It is part of the local community up north, and it is refreshing to see local, State, and Federal officials all working together to protect a national treasure.

The Thunder Bay sanctuary is a major tourist draw and economic driver for the area, and the Great Lakes Maritime Heritage Center in Alpena attracts out-of-State visitors and educates school groups.

Over the last decade or so, the benefits of preserving Thunder Bay were widely recognized, and a process was set in motion to expand the boundaries of the sanctuary. In September of 2014, after holding many meetings and completing a thorough environmental impact statement, Thunder Bay was expanded from 448 square miles to 4,300 square miles, driven by strong public and congressional support. This map shows the original boundaries and the

new expanded boundaries. The process was successful in part because of the work of Senator STABENOW, and, of course, my predecessor, Senator Carl Levin, who was a champion for the Great Lakes every day of his long service here in the Senate.

As we move forward to protect the Great Lakes and other valuable marine resources in the Great Lakes and across the country, we must devote robust resources to these deserving places. Many agencies, including NOAA, are operating on shoestring budgets. While their work is impressive as they stretch their funding, the benefits these designations bring to communities such as Alpena and the surrounding area are sustainable and provide a foundation for the local economy.

As a member of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, with jurisdiction over NOAA and the National Marine Sanctuary System, I am committed to working every day on protecting the Great Lakes and the fantastic waters and marine places within the boundaries of the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

EB-5 REGIONAL CENTER INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, there is an immigration program that is out of control and not conforming to the reason the program was put into effect in the first place. It needs to be reformed or it needs to be eliminated. So I come to the floor to talk about this immigration program known as the EB-5 regional center investment program and the serious concerns I have about continuing this program without reforms. The program was just extended in the continuing resolution to keep the government funded, but I want to talk about changes that need to be made before and if it is extended again.

The EB-5 program was created in 1990. A foreign national under this program can invest \$1 million in a new commercial enterprise that creates 10 full-time jobs, and then, in turn, that person receives lawful permanent residence and then, if they want to, citizenship. The required investment amount is only \$500,000 if the investment is made in what is called a targeted employment area, defined to be a rural area or an area with high unemployment. The EB-5 program allows investors to pool their investments for a project, and they can meet the job-creation requirements by providing evidence of not direct jobs but evidence of indirect jobs.

In previous speeches on the floor, I have talked about the national security and integrity issues associated with the program. I have detailed the risks, and I have expressed concern about the lack of oversight by the administration. Today, I will focus on one particular abuse of the program and how this program does not fulfill the intent of the law passed in 1990.

Perhaps the greatest violation of congressional intent that has evolved over the years is the manner in which so much of the investment money coming into targeted employment areas has been directed toward lavish—and I mean lavish—building projects in well-to-do urban areas, not in the areas of high unemployment and not in rural areas, as the 1990 law implied. Four-star hotels and commercial office buildings are being built with foreign investment dollars in very affluent urban neighborhoods rather than the high-unemployment and rural areas which Congress intended to benefit. This has been done by gerrymandering the boundaries of the targeted employment areas to include at one end the affluent census tract in which the building project is located and at the other end, perhaps many miles away, a census tract with high unemployment.

In other words, the word “gerrymandering” is the word that is used in forming some congressional districts that are very strangely arranged so somebody can be reelected to office. The same approach is being used here to form a targeted employment area to get all of this money into urban areas that are very affluent.

One of the most notorious examples of this gerrymandering, to push the boundaries, is the Hudson Yards project, a group of luxury apartment buildings and office towers in Midtown Manhattan—in midtown Manhattan, meaning New York.

Even the Wall Street Journal, which never met a business project it did not like, reported on how this program has been abused. The Wall Street Journal explained how the Hudson Yards project qualifies for the lower investment threshold despite the affluent Midtown location of the project because the boundaries of the targeted employment area were manipulated—or let me say gerrymandered—to include a public housing project in Upper Manhattan.

Another project that flies in the face of congressional intent—meaning the intent of the 1990 law—is located in Lower Manhattan near Wall Street. As the New York Times reported, the Battery Maritime Building has been classified as being located in a targeted employment area based on a gerrymandered area that “snakes up through the Lower East Side, skirting the wealthy enclaves of Battery Park City and TriBeCa, and then jumps across the East River to annex the Faragut Houses project in Brooklyn.” In other words, the developers did everything they could to include the Faragut Houses project, which is a public housing community, to come in at the lower investment level. The New York Times went on to say that “the small census tract that contains the Faragut Houses has become a go-to-area for developers seeking to use the visa program: its unemployed residents have been counted towards three projects already.” That is the New York Times.

Watchdog.org, a national watchdog group that has followed abuses of the program closely over many years, has also identified another problematic, gerrymandered targeted employment area. They reported that a 21-story residential building project, which included trendy restaurants and shops, was built with foreign investments despite its location in an upscale neighborhood with only 0.8 percent unemployment.

These are just a few examples, yet they point to a clear problem with this program.

When it was created by Congress, we set two different investment levels and clearly tried to steer foreign capital to high-unemployment and rural areas. Obviously, I am showing you that has not been fulfilled by the way this program has finally evolved.

The Wall Street Journal reports that at least 80 percent of program money is going to projects that wouldn’t qualify as being in targeted employment areas without “some form of gerrymandering.” Meanwhile, the article adds, people wanting to raise money for projects in rural areas and low-income parts of cities say they find it increasingly hard to compete.

Even the Washington Post has become fed up with the way in which the intent of Congress has been violated. In a September 6 editorial, after discussing the program’s numerous economic and integrity failings and suggesting that the program lapse, the Post writes: “The EB-5 program is supposed to favor distressed economic areas, but the definition of a needy zone has been stretched to include nearly the whole country, including hot downtown real estate markets.”

I wish to end by saying, again, that the program is in need of reform. In June, Senator LEAHY and I introduced S. 1501, a bill that would substantially reform the program by improving program oversight, addressing national security vulnerabilities and restoring the program to its original intent. I hope my colleagues will look at this very bipartisan bill and will take an opportunity to understand how this program is being used and abused and review the proposal that Senator LEAHY and I have put out there.

Mr. President, I refer my colleagues to the Wall Street Journal article “U.S. Visa For Cash Plan Funds Luxury Towers—Program to spur jobs in poor areas supports projects in well-off neighborhoods,” dated September 10, 2015, by Eliot Brown; the Watchdog.org article “Upscale Dallas project cashes in on EB-5 visa program,” dated September 24, 2015, by Kenric Ward; an article from the Washington Post “It’s time for the corporate visa giveaway to go away,” dated September 6, 2015; and the New York Times article “Rules Stretched as Green Cards Go to Investors,” dated December 18, 2011, by Patrick McGeehan.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

ARKANSAS AND 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL RICE MONTH

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, the rare blend of soil type, environment, and availability of water make Arkansas an ideal location for rice to thrive and grow, making Arkansas the Nation's largest producer of rice.

Last year, production in the Natural State accounted for more than 50 percent of rice produced in the country. Farmers in more than half of Arkansas' counties grow rice; 96 percent of those are family owned and operated.

As the No. 1 producer of this crop, Arkansas has a unique role in the industry. That is why I am proud to recognize the 25th anniversary of National Rice Month. I am also proud to promote policies that enable our farmers to manage risk and ensure that high-quality U.S. rice remains a staple on tables throughout the globe.

This industry is not only contributing to a nutritious and balanced diet, it is also an economic engine. Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana, Missouri, California, and Texas all produce rice. Nationwide, this industry accounts for 125,000 jobs and contributes more than \$34 billion to the economy. In Arkansas, it accounts for more than 25,000 jobs. The rice industry stands to benefit from a change in policies toward Cuba because it is a staple of the Cuban diet.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that U.S. rice exports could increase up to \$365 million per year if financing and travel restrictions were lifted. Arkansas' agriculture secretary recently said that the economic impact on the Natural State's rice industry could be about \$30 million. Rice production is efficient. More rice is being produced on less land, using less water and energy than 20 years ago. As great stewards of the land, rice farmers are committed to protecting and preserving our natural resources.

Arkansas' location on the Mississippi Flyway makes it a duck-hunting capital of the world and draws hunters from around the globe.

I am proud to support our rice industry and celebrate 25 years of recognizing National Rice Month.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Democratic Senators for their courtesy. We are running a little behind, and they have allowed me to go on and make my remarks.

I ask the Chair to let me know when 12 minutes have expired of my 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be so notified.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, tomorrow we will be voting on the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill. I come to the floor to make two points about that very important legislation.

No. 1: if our Democratic friends would allow us to vote on it, allow us

to debate it, amend it, pass it, send it to the President, and do the same with the other 11 appropriations bills that our Appropriations Committee has reported, we could easily say that this year in the Senate is one of the most productive years in a long, long time.

No. 2: the other point I wish to make is the importance of this bill. Ben Bernanke, the retired Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board wrote an article in the Wall Street Journal this week in which he said that you cannot rely on the Federal Reserve Board to create jobs in a growth economy in the United States, and that what you need to do is have better educational opportunities, more research, and you need supercomputing. I would add to this that you need to have infrastructure. This bill, the Energy and Water bill, has all of those things. It is a pro-growth bill for the United States of America.

Let me take the first point first. This is the first time in 6 years that the Appropriations Committee has reported all 12 appropriations bills. You might find that unusual because that is the Appropriations Committee's basic job. As much as it is for the Grand Ole Opry to sing, our job is to pass appropriations bills. That is article I of the Constitution. It is the first time in 6 years. The bills are all sitting there waiting. Most of them passed in a bipartisan way.

The one that we are bringing to the floor tomorrow passed 26 to 4 on May 2. Senator FEINSTEIN and I worked on it with most of the Members of this body. It is a very good bill, passed in a bipartisan way.

What would usually happen in a properly functioning Senate is that we would spend the two months of June and July dealing with those 12 appropriations bills. That would mean that not just the members of the Appropriations Committee would have a chance to vote on them. It would mean that the Senator from Utah, who is not on the Appropriations Committee, would have a chance to make his points about the appropriations bills, which is part of his job here, yet he is shut out of that.

Why? Because Democrats say: We won't even let you bring them to the floor.

It is an extraordinary thing to do.

But despite that, I want you to know what this body has accomplished. In the last 7 months or 8 months we passed the Keystone Pipeline. The President vetoed it. We overruled the ambush elections rule from the NLRB, and the President vetoed it.

But listen to all the things we accomplished with the cooperation of Democrats on the other side of the aisle. Then, as I said, if we could add the appropriations bills, we would have the most productive Senate in many, many years. There is the trade authorization law. It passed, and it is law.

We fixed No Child Left Behind, and we ended the common core mandate.

We reversed the trend of the national school board, and we did it with 81

votes in the Senate. It was a bipartisan bill.

We passed a long-term highway bill after we had 34 short-term highway bills.

There was a permanent fix of what we call the doc fix—the way we pay doctors for Medicare payments. A long-term permanent solution passed this body. It is now the law after 17 short-term fixes. This law changed the way we pay for doctors so that we pay them more for quality rather than fee-for-service.

We have dealt with what happens when a terrorist calls from Afghanistan to Nashville on the phone. That is the USA FREEDOM Act. It is now the law.

We passed the Defense authorization bill, terrorism risk insurance, and the Iran review act. Waiting in the wings is the chemical safety bill, which has bipartisan support, and—believe this—it is 39 years since it has last been touched. And there is a cybersecurity bill right after that.

That is an impressive list of accomplishments for this Senate. Think of what we could say if we had spent June and July, as we should have, debating the appropriations bills.

Now let's move to the Energy and Water appropriations bill. On May 21, it was approved by the Appropriations Committee. The Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and I recommended it, and 26 Senators voted for it and 4 voted against it. It stays within the law. The law that we passed and the President signed tells us what we have to spend.

Yet Democrats said: Well, we are not going to let you bring it to the floor because we think you should spend more than that.

Well, maybe we should, but the law says we should spend what we spent. So we followed the law.

When you block our bill and don't allow it to be brought to the floor, what do you do? You cut 70 Senators out of having a say on the Energy and Water appropriations bill. And what does that mean? They don't have a say over it. They don't have a say over nuclear weapons.

Half of our bill is about national defense. Are we properly funding nuclear weapons? They don't have a say over National Laboratories, the laboratories where we are inventing new ways to manufacture that will help grow jobs. They don't have a say over how much money we are going to spend on the Missouri River floods. They don't have a say over how much money we are going to spend on the locks and the dams that we have. The Panama Canal is widening, and if we don't deepen our harbors, the ships are going to go to Cuba. So we want them to go to Savannah, Mobile, and to other places like that.

They don't have a say over nuclear waste. Where do we put nuclear waste? So the Democrats, by blocking the bill from coming to the floor, have cut

their own Members out of having a say about this. Half of the Energy and Water bill funds national defense activities, and the other half of it funds other essential non-defense items. And all the Democrats asked for was 3 percent more funding than what we're already spending in the bill.

What I said in the Appropriations Committee was this: You know, this is really a pretty good way to budget. Let's appropriate it as if we had 97 percent of what you want, and if we get 3 percent more in the discussion at the end of the year, then we will add it. That shouldn't be hard to do. We could do it in 24 hours.

The way the Senate is supposed to work is the Energy and Water bill is supposed to come to the floor. We are supposed to debate it, we are supposed to amend it, and we are supposed to send it to the President. If he doesn't like it, he can veto it and send it back. That is what should happen.

If Senators don't like the bill now, they can block it. They can vote against it after we amend it. They can vote against it after we conference with the House. That takes 60 votes too. If the President vetoes it, it takes 67 votes to override the President's veto.

My friends on the other side said: Well, that takes too much time.

What do you mean it takes too much time? That is what we are here to do. We are elected to have a say on these issues. This is \$1 trillion in funding for the national defense of the United States of America and for its essential services—locks, dams, national laboratories, and where we put the nuclear waste—and the Democrats are saying: We don't even want to vote on the appropriations bills. We don't even want to have a say about them. We don't even want to send them to the President for him to consider.

Let's take an example. The bill includes funding for inland waterways. Those are the avenues that carry the commerce that creates the jobs in America. They need to be in good shape. We have agreed on that in a bipartisan way. We have even asked the barge owners to pay more to go through the locks, to which they have agreed, and our bill matches what the barge owners are paying and increases the funding for inland waterways in Kentucky—Olmsted Locks and Dams, and Kentucky Lock—and Chickamauga Lock in Tennessee.

It also provides \$1.254 billion from the harbor maintenance trust fund. That means we will be spending more to deepen harbors in Savannah, Charleston, Texas, Memphis, Jacksonville, Mobile, and Louisiana, in Pascagoula, Big Sandy Harbor, Cleveland Harbor, Anchorage Harbor, and Wilmington Harbor. Do Senators not want to have a say about that? Do you not want to support that or oppose that if you think it is too much?

What about the National Laboratories? The National Laboratories are

the source of the research that produces the jobs that gives us our family incomes. One of them is in Tennessee, the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. I was there the other day. They have a new thing called additive manufacturing, where they are 3-D printing automobiles. Let me say that again: 3-D printing automobiles or parts of automobiles. It may revolutionize manufacturing in America and the world as much as unconventional gas and oil has revolutionized our national energy policy.

Do other Senators—the other 70 who are not on the Appropriations Committee—not want to have a say about how much we spend on our National Laboratories?

What about how much we spend for nuclear weapons? We had a big debate in this body over the proper level of spending for nuclear weapons. We had a big debate over something called the START treaty, which regulated the weapons that we were getting rid of. We agreed at the time that we would spend a certain amount of money to make sure we could defend the country. Do Senators not want to have a say about that?

So why do we not pass appropriations bills that were ready in May, debate them in a day or two, and send them to the President? If the President doesn't like them, under the Constitution he can veto them and send them back.

If we are spending 97 percent of what he thinks he should spend and he wants to veto it for that reason and then send it back to us and if we decide after negotiations to spend 3 percent more, we can add 3 percent in 24 hours, send it back to him, and that is the end of the result.

This is not the way the Senate is supposed to operate.

I hope that my friends on the Democratic side will recognize that they would like to have a say in our nuclear weapons policy, and that they would like to have a say in how much we spend on our National Laboratories.

This bill has a record level of funding for the Office of Science—as written, the highest ever in this bill. You don't want to vote on that? You don't want to support that? You want to cut that? You want to stop that?

I don't want to stop it. I want us to support research. I want to support our national laboratories. I want to support national defense. I want deeper harbors all around our coast. I want inland waterways that aren't broken down. I want us to move ahead in this country.

This bill is a pro-growth national defense bill. It came out of the Committee on Appropriations with 26 votes for it, 4 votes against it. Senator FEINSTEIN and I worked with almost every Senator in this body for it. Why should we not consider an appropriations bill that has that kind of support?

Now, if we get on that path every time we change majorities here—let's say the Democrats win the next elec-

tion and Republicans say: Well, look at what you did to us in the last election. We are going to block all your appropriations bills because we would like to spend less. We won't ever do any appropriations bills again in the Senate because one body or the other blocks the amount of money. We are supposed to vote on that.

In the last Congress the Democrats were in control, and they wouldn't bring the appropriations bills to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 12 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Chair. I will conclude within the next 3 minutes, and I thank my Democratic friends for their courtesies.

In the last Congress, when Democrats had the majority and Republicans had the minority, the Committee on Appropriations completed its work in a bipartisan way on most bills, but the majority wouldn't bring the bills to the floor last year. Or when it did, it wouldn't let the Republicans offer amendments to it. They were afraid Senators might have their say.

This year we are in the majority for the first time in 6 years. In a bipartisan way we produced 12 appropriations bills out of 12. We would like to bring them to the floor, but they are saying no. We are not even going to vote on them. We are not even going to amend them. We are not even going to debate, even though if they do not like the bill at the end of that process, they can kill it with 60 votes. They can kill it after it comes out of conference with 60 votes. And if the President vetoes it, it can take 60 votes to override.

We don't have time to do appropriations bills here? Traditionally, we have always consumed June and July for the 12 appropriations bills. Previous Congresses have had time to do it. We should have time to do it.

Let me conclude where I started. This has been a very productive Senate. Most of that work has been because of bipartisan cooperation, whether it was the trade bill, the bill to fix No Child Left Behind, the highway bill, the doc fix—paying doctors for quality instead of fees—the USA Freedom Act, the Defense Authorization Act, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, or the Iran review act. And we have chemical safety and cybersecurity waiting. That is all the result of cooperation between Democrats and Republicans. Why can we not do that on appropriations bills, which is our most basic responsibility?

We did it in committee. I couldn't have a better person to work with than Senator FEINSTEIN. That vote was 26 to 4. It involves our national defense, it involves our growth, and it involves our security. I would hope every Senator would want to have a say on those issues tomorrow when we vote. So I hope they will vote yes on the Energy and Water bill tomorrow—yes to considering it; and then after we have considered it and debated it, we can send it

over to the House, come up with a conference, and we can see what they think.

That is the way the Senate ought to work. I am eager to see the Senate get back to that, and I think the American people are as well.

I thank the Chair and my colleagues for their courtesy, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor tonight to talk about something I would like to see done in the United States Senate—passage of reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Definitely the Senate and Congress have disappointed us in not passing the Export-Import Bank reauthorization—which is something I am a big proponent of. And now, here we are with the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

For the first time in 51 years since this program was created, it has expired.

My colleagues are here on the floor to join me—I thank the Senator from Montana and the Senator from New Mexico—to talk about why this is such a vital program to all of our States and why we should have it reauthorized immediately.

The bill creating the Land and Water Conservation Fund was championed by Senator Scoop Jackson at the request of then President Kennedy. Why? Because the American population was growing and there was a need for outdoor recreation, open space, and public lands.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund was created to help protect some of our most popular national parks, forests, public lands, and iconic places.

For me, this is an incredibly important program because it has provided opportunities for hunting, fishing, hiking and other recreational uses that so many people use when traveling to the Pacific Northwest for vacation or for their livelihood.

Those of us who are from States with large amounts of public lands recognize the importance of outdoor recreation.

Nationwide outdoor recreation supports more than 6 million jobs. This is an economy in and of itself. In the State of Washington, outdoor recreation contributes more than \$11.7 billion annually to Washington's economy. It is clear that protecting our public lands is good for both our environment and our economy.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund has been credited each year with funds from outer continental shelf oil and gas revenues. The success of that program has helped us authorize and make these investments for the American people, as I said, for more than 50 years.

We are here to remind our colleagues that we are going to put up a fight until we get the conservation fund reauthorized. And to make sure that peo-

ple in our states and all across the Nation that enjoy public lands have access to them.

The issue is important to us, and in the energy bill we passed out of the Senate Energy Committee, I worked with my colleague, Senator MURKOWSKI, on a bipartisan basis to include a permanent reauthorization of the LWCF.

And I was joined by 31 Senators to introduce the American Energy Innovation Act that also permanently reauthorized and fully funded the LWCF.

So you can see from these two pieces of legislation that there was a lot of support from our colleagues for maintaining this vital program that is used by cities, counties, and jurisdictions in my State and in my colleagues' states and many others across the nation and that it is a vital tool for helping us to thrive in our outdoor economy. We want to see this legislation reauthorized as soon as possible.

I thank my colleagues again from New Mexico and Montana again for being here and for their leadership on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I want to thank Senators CANTWELL and HEINRICH for not giving up on the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and I need to point out that while there are three of us Democrats standing here, we speak for our entire caucus. We believe that the LWCF is something that needs to be reauthorized and, quite frankly, needs to be fully funded.

We are not going to play games with this issue. We are working to get this bill passed—not for show, not for politics, but because it is good for our economy. And I will get into that in a second.

There was a Republican gentleman who served in the Presidency of this great country some time ago—Teddy Roosevelt—who called on Americans to cherish our Nation's vast natural resources and to ensure that we safely pass them on to future generations. After all, they are the birthright of every American. That is what the Land and Water Conservation Fund is all about.

We take special pride in our public lands in Montana. They are a part of our way of life. We have just over 1 million people in our great State, but we lead the Nation in the percentage of residents who hunt, fish, hike, and enjoy our public lands. And the Land and Water Conservation Fund is a big reason for that.

Montana's outdoor economy brings in nearly \$6 billion a year. Let me say that again. The outdoor economy, supported by the Land and Water Conservation Fund, brings in nearly \$6 billion a year.

Last week, when I flew out of Montana, there were several fishermen who were flying out with me. They didn't live in Montana. All the money they brought into the State while they were

fishing was outside dollars that wouldn't have been there otherwise. They probably used some of the fishing access—some of the 150-plus fishing access the Land and Water Conservation Fund has helped developed—when they enjoyed the great outdoors in Montana.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund also supports over 60,000 jobs. We talk about economic development all the time. We talk about how if we tweak our Tax Code or if we build this piece of infrastructure or if we make this education program more affordable, it can have an incredible impact on our economy. But the fact is, if you want to talk about economic development, if you want to talk about dollars invested for a return, the Land and Water Conservation Fund is an incredible investment.

To help preserve these lands and create these accesses, Montana has received some \$540 million from the Land and Water Conservation Fund—money that has been very well spent. Montanans used this Land and Water Conservation Fund to preserve more than 8,000 acres of elk habitat in Meagher County, known as the Tenderfoot.

Montanans used the Land and Water Conservation Fund to protect some of the most pristine habitat in the lower 48, from conservation easements in the Rocky Mountain Front to acquisitions in the Crown of the Continent.

While Montanans certainly benefit from the fund, there are Land and Water Conservation Fund projects in nearly every county of the United States. Yes, this fund is responsible for protecting prime hunting and fishing, but it is also responsible for building trails and improving parks, playgrounds, and ball fields in every State in the country. That is why Congress must reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund—to protect our best outdoor places and to reestablish this critical tool to build our communities in a way that will make future generations proud.

With that, Mr. President, if it is appropriate, I would like to ask my good friend from New Mexico a question.

I thank Senator HEINRICH for being here today. My question is, As he comes from New Mexico, is the Land and Water Conservation Fund something Senator HEINRICH hears about from his residents?

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, let me thank my colleague from Montana. I think one of the great things about New Mexico and Montana is that we are both from States that absolutely cherish the outdoors, and we have a lot of constituents who care about the activities that generate so much income from the outdoors.

Obviously, I hear from an enormous number of my constituents asking us to reauthorize and permanently authorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund—to fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund. In fact, recently there was a letter which was sent to me but was also sent to the chair of the

Energy and Natural Resources Committee—to the chair and to the ranking member, the good Senator from Washington. It was signed by dozens of businesses saying: Hey, this is important to our bottom line. Please extend the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Please continue to support this bipartisan legacy of standing up for our natural resources in this country.

My good friend from Montana mentioned the scale of what that means in his State, and it is not a dissimilar story in New Mexico. In fact, over \$6 billion annually comes from outdoor recreation activities, and 68,000 jobs in our State are directly related to outdoor recreation.

In fact, when I go home this weekend, we are going to be celebrating the Valles Caldera National Preserve and its management by the National Park Service. That was a property that for decades my constituents could not access. They could not hunt; they could not fish. It was private property. It was because of the Land and Water Conservation Fund that this place, which had really been on the radar screen of the National Park Service since the early part of the last century—probably since the 1930s—could come into public ownership and now be one of the true gems in the entire Nation of our public lands.

We are going to be celebrating that with our constituents on Saturday. The Secretary of Interior is coming. There are literally 100,000 acres of some of the most spectacular high-elevation grasslands and conifer forests and trout streams and elk habitat that we have ever seen, and there are businesses that rely on that. Tourism is an enormous part of our economy in New Mexico. So this is something which has been absolutely crucial to our State's economy, especially in the midst of the last decade and the challenges we have had economically. I know one of the groups who will be there on Saturday are the sportsmen, who care about utilizing the outdoors.

I would ask my colleague from Montana if in Montana he hears from people who hunt and fish, as I do in New Mexico, about the importance this particular legislation has had in protecting habitat and protecting access to the places that regular, blue-collar folks can go to hunt and fish.

Mr. TESTER. Absolutely. We hear from sports men and women nearly every day, if not every day.

Here is where the problem is, and this is why we need to get the Land and Water Conservation Fund authorized and funded—and funded at \$900 million, I might add. If you want to go hunting and fishing today in this country, things have changed from the way they were 30 or 40 years ago. You used to be able to access private lands and go hunting and fishing, and you still can, but there are many fewer acres. So the real opportunity to go hunting and fishing in this country is on our public lands, whether those are State or Fed-

eral, and this Land and Water Conservation Fund allows access to those public lands.

There are some in this body and there are some in this country who don't think the Federal Government should own one stitch of land. Well, without those opportunities and our outdoor economy, No. 1, our way of life would change forever in States such as Montana, and No. 2, our economy would be severely distressed.

So, you bet, I hear from sports men and women, because when they want to go hunting and fishing, they go to those Federal public lands. That is where the good habitat is that they can access, and that is where the good fisheries are that they can access.

So this is very important. For those in this body who want to see this program go away, they are literally driving a nail in the coffin of rural America's economy.

Mr. HEINRICH. I would ask my colleague from Montana—we have heard a lot about reform. When we had the hearing in front of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, we heard people on both sides of the aisle talking about how well this program works.

Does the Senator think the opposition that is holding this up, that is holding back the majority of this body—a bipartisan majority, I would add—does the Senator from Montana think that reform is really what this is about or is it about a more basic, more ideological opposition to public lands and the current efforts to either sell off or transfer those public lands that our constituents rely on for access to go camping, to go hunting, to go rock climbing, to recreate, to spend time with their families?

Mr. TESTER. It is hard to say what the agenda is. I do know that earlier this year there was a proposal put out to use the Land and Water Conservation Fund for fighting forest fires. Now there is a proposal put out to use the Land and Water Conservation Fund to manage forests.

The fact is, the Land and Water Conservation Fund works. It works to create habitat, and it works to access that habitat. It also works for playgrounds and parks and ball fields all across this country.

If we take a look at our overall budget and what we spend on a lot of stuff around here, \$900 million for a nationwide program that impacts so many people, that impacts our economy in such a very positive way—there must be some agenda out there that I cannot see to do away with this fund. It makes no sense to me. And it is particularly frustrating to see folks on the other side of the aisle come down here to the floor and bring their friends in and say: I am going to make this glorious speech about this Land and Water Conservation Fund, and then I want you to stop the unanimous consent.

The bottom line is that things get done in here when we work in the mid-

dle. As I told some folks the other day in Montana, we need to bring these folks around who think this is just excess government spending because, quite frankly, there are a lot of places where there is excess government spending in our budget. This is not one of them. This is a good program that helps promote a great way of outdoor life and also helps promote our economy.

Mr. HEINRICH. Ironically, the money in the Land and Water Conservation Fund is not tax dollars. It is literally a deal that goes back five decades now where we opened up large swaths of our natural resources, our oil and gas offshore, and took a percentage of that and invested it back into protecting our natural resources. Obviously, those are natural resources that are one-time. You only get to drill for oil and produce natural gas one time. So the idea was that we would invest that in something to protect our environment, to protect our conservation lands, and to make a permanent contribution to that level of conservation.

Mr. TESTER. That is absolutely correct.

One of the things that makes this moment in time so important when it comes to the Land and Water Conservation Fund is that we are losing habitat, we are losing fisheries every day. There will be limited opportunities to keep these pristine lands available for hunting and fishing in the future, but the habitat will be gone if we don't deal with it. That is why it is very important not only to reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund but to fully fund it so we can take care of these landscapes that help support incredibly great elk and deer and trout fisheries. It is very important. Plus, there are a lot more opportunities in our great outdoors, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund really helps people enjoy life and have quality of life. And I am not just talking about the folks who have incredibly thick wallets; I am talking about everyday, average Americans who work for a living and work darned hard for a living and want to be able to enjoy some of the great things this country has to offer.

Mr. HEINRICH. That is absolutely right. I hear from constituents all the time who will never be able to afford one of those \$5 or \$10,000 elk hunts on private land but who can enter the lottery every year and who do and often-times rely on that to get their family through the winter and to also just pull their family together in a tradition they have had as a part of who they are for years and years.

On Saturday, when we go to celebrate the Valles Caldera National Preserve, I am going to be taking my fly rod, and I am looking forward to spending the dollars that will go back into our State's game and fish coffers to make sure that resource is there again and again and again. That is what this Land and Water Conservation Fund is all about.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I inaugurated a series of speeches about religious freedom. In the first speech, I said that the rights of conscience and religious exercise go to the very heart of who we are as human beings and how we make sense out of this world. No decisions are more fundamental to human existence than those regarding our relationship to the Divine, and no act of government is more invasive of individual liberty than compelling a person to violate his or her sincerely chosen religious beliefs. This is why religious freedom in and of itself is so important and must be specially protected.

Last week I spoke about religious freedom in practice here in America. At no time in world history has religious freedom been such an integral part of a nation's origin and character. As Congress said when we unanimously enacted the International Religious Freedom Act in 1998, the right to freedom of religion undergirds the very origin and existence of the United States.

Professor Michael McConnell, director of the Constitutional Law Center at Stanford, describes how, by the time the Bill of Rights was ratified, America had "already experienced 150 years of a higher degree of religious diversity than had existed anywhere in the world."

Together, those two speeches told some of the story of religious freedom in America. Today I will build on that foundation and examine the status and the substance of religious freedom. More fully understanding these three aspects of religious freedom—its story, its status, and its substance—will help us better evaluate where we are today and inform where we should go in the future.

The status of religious freedom can be summarized as inalienable and preeminent. James Madison repeatedly identified the free exercise of religion according to conviction and conscience as an inalienable right. To America's Founders, as they expressed in the Declaration of Independence, inalienable rights have two dimensions. They come from God, not from government, and these rights are endowed—that is, they are inseparable from us and part of our very humanity. Government did not provide them, and government cannot take them away.

When Virginia developed its Constitution in 1776, George Mason's draft of a declaration of rights said that the exercise of religion should receive the fullest toleration by government. Madison objected and offered language that became section 16 of the Virginia Declaration of Rights, setting what one scholar calls a new standard for freedom of conscience. Here is Madison's language. He said:

That religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging

it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and therefore all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience.

This understanding of religious freedom did not end with America's founding generation. In 1853 the Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved a resolution asserting that in treaties with foreign nations, the United States should secure for our citizens residing abroad "the right of worshipping God, freely and openly, according to the dictates of their own conscience." The committee report on this resolution described religious freedom as fundamental, allowing the "utmost latitude and freedom of conscience" so that each individual "is absolutely free to act in conformity to his own convictions."

The fact that religious freedom is inalienable leads to another aspect of its status. In his 1785 "Memorial and Remonstrance against Religious Assessments," Madison explained that religious exercise "is precedent, both in order of time and in degree of obligation, to the claims of civil society." Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg once wrote that to America's Founders, religious freedom was preeminent among fundamental rights.

Presidents and Congress have similarly identified the status of religious freedom as preeminent among rights. In his 1941 State of the Union Address, for example, President Franklin Roosevelt included religious freedom as one of four essential human freedoms. Just 4 years later, the United States signed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which asserts that religious freedom is an inalienable right universal to all members of the human family.

The last several Presidents have issued annual proclamations declaring January 16 to be Religious Freedom Day. Those proclamations, by Presidents of both parties, have said that religious freedom is a core value of our democracy, that it is essential to our dignity as human beings, and that no freedom is more fundamental than the right to practice one's religious beliefs.

Turning to Congress, the House Foreign Affairs Committee in 1955 approved a resolution "reaffirming the rights of the people of the world to freedom of religion." The committee said that this resolution "recognizes that the basic strength of the United States is spiritual and that all races, people, and nations of the world share with us a dependence on such strength."

I mentioned earlier that Congress in 1998 unanimously enacted the International Religious Freedom Act. This body passed it by a vote of 98 to 0. Twenty-one Senators serving today—12 Republicans and 9 Democrats—voted for this legislation. So did Vice President JOE BIDEN and Secretary of State John Kerry when they served here. That law declares religious freedom to

be a universal human right, a pillar of our Nation, and a fundamental freedom.

In subsequent speeches, I will explore the responsibility of government regarding an inalienable and preeminent right such as religious freedom, but I want to note two things at this point. First, as the Declaration of Independence asserts, government exists to secure inalienable rights. Second, if a right is preeminent, it must be properly accommodated when government takes actions such as enacting legislation and issuing regulations.

The status of religious freedom is that it is inalienable and preeminent. Let me turn now to exploring the substance of religious freedom in terms of both its depth, or what religion freedom is, and its breadth, or those to whom religious freedom belongs.

First, depth. Starting in the early 17th century, religious freedom in America has been understood to be grounded in the individual right of conscience. Roger Williams established a settlement in 1636 for those he described as the distressed of conscience, and subsequent town agreements and ordinances restricted government to civil things and protected the liberty of conscience.

This liberty of conscience encompasses not only what an individual believes but also how an individual acts on that belief. The Maryland Toleration Act of 1649, for example, provided that no person shall be troubled "in respect of his or her religion nor in the free exercise thereof."

The Virginia Declaration of Rights was the model for the Bill of Rights in the U.S. Constitution. The free exercise of religion is the first individual right listed in the First Amendment. That phrase, the "free exercise of religion," is very important—extremely important. The First Amendment protects not simply certain exercises of religion or the exercise of religion by certain parties but the free exercise of religion itself.

Religious freedom is more than religious speech, which would be otherwise protected by the First Amendment, or attending a worship service on the Sabbath. It is, as Madison put it, the freely chosen manner of discharging the duty an individual believes he or she owes to God.

This robust substance of religious freedom is described in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which the United States signed in 1948. Article 18 states: "Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance."

That is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The United States signed the Helsinki Accords in 1975. Section VII declares the signatories "will recognize

and respect the right of the individual to profess and practice, alone or in community with others, religion or belief in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience." Such rights derive from "the inherent dignity of the human person and are essential for his full and free development."

In 1992, the United States ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Article 18 echoes the same robust definition of religious freedom as the right, individually or in community with others, in public or in private, to believe and to practice one's religion. This robust description expresses the depth of religious freedom.

The second dimension to the substance of religious freedom is its breadth or its application across society. Earlier I mentioned the Maryland Toleration Act of 1649, which protected the free exercise of religion. It did so, however, only for Trinitarian Christians. The Puritans of Massachusetts Bay Colony outlawed the Quakers and punished heretics. In fact, Roger Williams went to what would become Rhode Island after being banished from Massachusetts because of his religious beliefs.

In those days, religious freedom had depth but not much breadth. Yet seeds were being planted. In 1657, residents of a community known today as Flushing, NY, signed a petition called the "Flushing Remonstrance." This petition protested a ban on certain religious practices that prevented the Quakers from worshipping, and the signers stated they would let everyone decide for themselves how to worship.

America's Founders were the ones who asserted most directly that religious freedom is inalienable and, accordingly, established its breadth in the First Amendment. Rather than being limited to adherents of a particular faith, this protection applies to anyone acting according to the dictates of conscience.

The status and substance of religious freedom became concretely reflected in Supreme Court decisions in the 20th century. In *Sherbert v. Verner*, a woman was fired from a State government job for refusing to work on Saturday as required by her Seventh-Day Adventist faith. The Supreme Court affirmed that the door to government regulation of religious belief was "tightly shut" and set a standard that only barely opened the door to government regulation of religious behavior.

The Court said that government limitations on religiously motivated conduct could be justified only by "the gravest abuses, endangering interests." Therefore, the Court said, Government must have more than a mere rational reason for restricting religious practice. In 1981, the Supreme Court reaffirmed the *Sherbert* standard by holding that government may "justify an inroad on religious liberty by showing that it is the least restrictive means of achieving some compelling state interest."

This holding was consistent with the path of American history regarding religious freedom. The protection of something, after all, goes hand in hand with that thing's value. If religious freedom is inalienable and preeminent, then it must be properly protected by law.

All of that changed in 1990. In a case titled "*Employment Division v. Smith*," two Oregon State employees were fired for using peyote, a controlled substance, in their Native American religious ceremonies. The law did not single out religious use of this drug, but its application to these individuals seriously inhibited the practice of their religion. The Court should have applied the *Sherbert* standard and required the State to show a compelling justification for applying this law against religious adherents.

Instead, the Court turned the *Sherbert* standard on its head. The Court did exactly what it had rejected in *Sherbert* less than 30 years earlier, holding that the government needs nothing more than a rational reason for a general law or regulation that restricts the practice of religion. In other words, so long as the government is not explicitly targeting religion, the First Amendment provides no protection at all for the free exercise of religion, as that case held. The Court effectively demoted religious freedom from a fundamental right to little more than an optional fringe benefit.

In my opening statement at the Senate Judiciary Committee's hearing in September 1992 on a legislative response to this decision, I said the *Smith* standard is "the lowest level of protection the Court could have afforded religious conduct."

In *Smith*, the Court made it sound as if the *Sherbert* decision had spawned an epidemic of people using religious objections to obeying laws. The truth is that Courts had not applied the *Sherbert* standard strictly at all but with what the Congressional Research Service has described as a light hand. In the years between the Court's decision and *Sherbert* establishing the compelling interest standard and its decision in *Smith* abandoning that standard, Federal courts rejected more than 85 percent of religious exercise claims.

Government today compromises, burdens, and even prohibits the exercise of religion not by overt assault but by covert impact. Zoning ordinances can restrict where churches may meet, whether they may expand their meeting places, and what services they may offer; religious institutions may be forced to hire individuals who do not share their faith; and regulations may prohibit individuals from wearing items required by their faith or require employees to work on their Sabbath.

If government exists to secure inalienable rights such as religious freedom, it must properly respect and accommodate that right even as it be-

comes more and more intrusive. In fact, it is the increasing reach of government that makes vigilance about protecting religious freedom more, not less, important. Requiring a compelling reason to restrict religious practice identifies religious practice as important. Requiring only a rational reason to restrict religious practice identifies it as worth very little.

It is hard to overstate the impact of the *Smith* decision. It stopped dead in its tracks the long and steady progress toward real protection for religious freedom. Government has its greatest impact on religion today not by direct suppression but by indirect restriction. If the status of religious freedom as inalienable and preeminent compels its protection, then reducing that status, as the Court did in *Smith*, opens religious freedom to restriction and prohibition.

Congress responded to the *Smith* decision by enacting the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, or RFRA. We were motivated by the very understanding of religious freedom that the Supreme Court had abandoned; namely, that religious freedom is inalienable and preeminent. RFRA does by statute what the First Amendment is supposed to do. Under RFRA, government may substantially burden the exercise of religion only if doing so is the least restrictive means of achieving a compelling governmental purpose.

Congress enacted RFRA for one simple reason. While the First Amendment protected the free exercise of religion itself, by changing what First Amendment means, the Supreme Court in *Smith* put the free exercise of religion itself at risk. The Court made every exercise of religion by everyone vulnerable to governmental restriction, interference, and even prohibition. RFRA restored religious freedom by setting a standard of protection that reflects the true value of what it protects and applies that standard across the board.

This principle is so powerful that RFRA not only passed Congress almost unanimously, but it was supported by a coalition of unprecedented ideological breadth. That consensus existed because we rejected numerous requests to go beyond setting the standard and dictate how it should be applied in certain cases. We refused to do that in RFRA because the First Amendment does not do that. We set the right standard and left its application to the courts in individual cases.

In a 1994 religious exercise case, Justice David Souter urged the Court to reconsider its decision in *Smith* and described what is truly at stake. He wrote: "The extent to which the Free Exercise Clause requires government to refrain from impeding religious exercise defines nothing less than the respective relationships in our constitutional democracy of the individual to government and to God."

Properly understanding the status and substance of religious freedom naturally puts those relationships in

order. Misunderstanding or distorting those principles interferes with these relationships and imperils this fundamental human right.

In 1997, the Supreme Court held that RFRA applies only to the Federal Government because the Congress did not have authority to extend its protection to State and local government. As Smith had done, this decision made every religious practice by everyone vulnerable to government restriction. By these two decisions, the Supreme Court ensured that no one in America had either constitutional or statutory protection to practice their faith.

I introduced the Religious Liberty Protection Act in June 1998 to reestablish the religious freedom that the Supreme Court had again taken away, having been an author of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. Like RFRA did, this legislation set a tough legal standard reflecting the true status and substance of religious freedom and left it to the courts to apply this standard to individual cases. Unfortunately, although it had bipartisan support, consideration of this bill stalled in the 105th Congress.

I next introduced a Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act to protect religious freedom for as many and as completely as possible. It set the same rigorous standard for government interference in the practice of religion, requiring that such actions be the least restrictive means of achieving a compelling government purpose. Within 2 weeks both the Senate and House had passed this legislation without objection. As he had done with RFRA, President Bill Clinton signed this legislation into law.

It is shocking how little it took—just two Supreme Court decisions—to stall America's centuries-long journey of religious freedom. As a result, the law today does not adequately protect religious freedom. You and I can claim the First Amendment's protection only if the Federal Government explicitly targets our religious practice. The First Amendment is not available at all when State and local governments restrict or even prohibit religious practice altogether. Even the legislation passed unanimously by Congress is unavailable when State and local governments restrict religious freedom.

We live in troubled times, and many things we once took for granted are being challenged and even attacked. Today the rhetoric about religious freedom does not match the reality.

In his 1810 State of the Union Address, President James Madison said that a well-instructed people can alone be a free people. The more we understand how religious freedom is inalienable and preeminent, how it is deep in substance and broad in application, the better equipped we are to promote and defend it. Only then will government not only pay lipservice to the fundamental right to religious freedom but will provide for and properly accommodate it so that it will be a reality for all of us.

These remarks are very important because a lot of people don't realize that religious freedom is not as free as the original Founding Fathers expected it to be. Even though we have had some very interesting cases, not the least of which was the Religious Freedom Restoration Act case, we are not there as far as true and noble protection of religious freedom throughout this country.

Fortunately, most States do respect this, and fortunately, hopefully, most governmental people respect this as well. But that is not enough. We need to change these things and get religious freedom the preeminent position it really holds as the first clause of the First Amendment.

I yield the floor.

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

INTERNATIONAL COMMITMENTS ON CARBON EMISSIONS

MR. INHOFE. Mr. President, we are a little more than a month away from the United Nations climate conference in Paris. The countries continue to roll out their international pledges to reduce carbon emissions in an attempt to control global warming. I can't believe it, but this is the 21st year they have done this.

I wrote a book once about this, and the last chapter is the longest chapter. It talks about the motivation and why the United Nations wants to get into this thing and what is in it for them.

I think we all know that every time the United Nations does something, it is contrary to the interest of the United States. We write a letter, which is usually a threat to withhold funding, and that really gets them upset. Of course, what they really want is to have something there that they can draw on so that they don't have to be obligated to any of the countries that are participating.

Anyway, this is not the time to get into that, but I am just saying that this is the 21st year they have had this conference, and every year the same thing happens: The 192 countries get in there and they follow the lead of the United States by saying that they are going to be reducing their emissions, and of course it doesn't happen.

In 2009, Copenhagen hosted such a meeting. I remember going over there, and some of the people who attended at that time were Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, and John Kerry—Clinton and Kerry were in the Senate at that time—BARBARA BOXER, and NANCY PELOSI. They all went over to assure everyone in Copenhagen that the United States was going to pass cap-and-trade legislation.

So I waited until they had all finished their business, and I went over. It was the shortest trip to Europe I had ever taken. I was there 3 hours. I was the one-man truth squad. I said: You have been hearing from all of these leaders, but it is not going to happen. We are not going to pass it. And of course we didn't.

We are going through the same thing now. While the verbal commitments

are creating positive press coverage for a lot of people who want to believe this stuff—and the President is seeking to solidify his legacy—most of these pledges are empty and only place the United States in a position of economic hardship, while other countries continue on their current trajectory with CO₂ emissions.

Let's start with India. On Friday we received a report from India. I didn't see it personally until 2 days ago. It was the most recent country to submit its domestic global warming plan. India's plan will cost—and I am stating what they have in the plan they have presented—\$2.5 trillion over the next 15 years. Do the math. That is approximately \$160 billion a year in costs in order for them to do what is expected of them as a developing country. Their pledge is based on a premise that developed countries—that is us, the United States, always picking up the bills—will pick up these costs by financing the Green Climate Fund.

President Obama has pledged \$3 billion to go to the Green Climate Fund, but the Senate and House appropriators have pledged zero, nothing, no money. If you stop and look at one country, such as India, with an estimated cost of \$2.5 trillion, \$3 billion is such a minuscule fraction, it is not even measurable. That isn't going to happen, and so the President cannot deliver on that promise.

India's approach to addressing its carbon emissions is a continuation of the rich-poor country divide that has plagued the United Nations process in achieving climate agreement from the very start. That is what prompted the Byrd-Hagel resolution of 1997. I remember it so well. I was sitting in this Chamber. I had only been here for 3 years at that time. We all agreed to it. It passed 95 to 0. It was unanimous. Everyone who was in the Chamber at the time voted for it. It said: We are not going to come back. They were really addressing this to Clinton and Gore during their administration. Gore had gone down to see his friends in Central America, I guess it was—I am not sure—to put this thing together. He said: We are going to join you in this commitment to reduce CO₂ emissions.

Well, that sounded good until they came back and they had the Kyoto Convention. They never submitted it to this body because no treaty can be ratified unless it is ratified by the Senate. We never even saw it. What is the reason for that? The reason is they knew it wouldn't pass because the Byrd-Hagel amendment—and several of us were cosponsors of that—said that we won't agree and ratify any convention that comes to us and doesn't treat the developing countries like the developed countries. Unless it does one of two things, we will reject it: one, if it hurts us economically—of course they all do—and two, if China doesn't have to do the same thing we have to do. Well, that is what happened, and of course none of these things have passed.

Now the President is trying to do with regulations what he failed to be able to do through legislation, and we are seeing that every day in the committee that I am fortunate enough to chair, the Environment and Public Works Committee. All of these rules are coming before us, and these rules are a result of things they tried to do legislatively, but they couldn't do—the WOTUS rule.

If you talk to farmers and ranchers in America, they will say that of all the regulations that come from the EPA that are the most damaging to farmers and ranchers, it is the WOTUS rule, and that is the waters of the United States. The Chair is certainly very familiar with this. That means that while we have had State jurisdiction over our water for many years, it had one exception, and that is for navigable waters.

I think all of us who are conservatives would agree that the Federal Government should have jurisdiction over navigable waters because that affects a lot more than just States. So they tried to do that with legislation. That legislation was offered 6 years ago by Senator Feingold of the Senate, who is from Wisconsin, and Congressman Oberstar, who is from Minnesota. Not only did we overwhelmingly defeat their legislation, but we defeated them at the polls in the next election, so it gives you an idea of the unpopularity of this. Since the President was not able to do it with legislation, he tried to do it with regulation. Well, that is the way it is with CO₂ emissions.

So India sent their plan over. They are the third largest CO₂ emitter, only behind China and the United States. Its demand for coal is expected to surpass U.S. consumption by the end of the decade unless the United States helps front India the cash it needs to execute its trillion-dollar climate plan, but that is not happening. As a Member of this body, we will do everything we can to stop it, and we will be successful. We know for a fact that is not what America wants to do.

Now we have China. It has pledged to peak its carbon emissions around 2030 and increase its renewables to 20 percent of the primary energy use. Subsequent to its commitment, China also announced a nationwide cap-and-trade system alongside a newfound partnership between U.S. cities. While all of these commitments—that is, they have partnership cities that say “We will do it in our State if you do it over there”—they sound good to the media, but the facts don't pan out because it is nothing more than business as usual. At the end of the day, the country gets to increase its emissions for the next 15 years. Here is what they call an agreement that is in the best interest of reducing CO₂ worldwide. Yet they are committing not to reduce but to increase their emissions for the next 15 years, until 2030.

When they first made their commitment—I called it a nonbinding charade

because as China's economy has grown, so has its demand for electricity. China is the largest consumer and importer of coal in the world, accounting for 50 percent of global consumption. Fifty percent of the global consumption of coal is in one country—China.

Over the next decade, China is expected to bring a new coal-fired powerplant online every 10 days to give it the electricity it demands. Unlike the United States, China does not have other inexpensive energy sources. Where we in the United States are benefiting from cheap natural gas, China doesn't have the technology and resources to do it, so they can't do that. Even though we have this huge shale revolution in this country where we are producing oil and natural gas—which brings up the other thing we need to do, and that is to do away with the export ban on natural gas and oil. But China doesn't have the technology to do that, so all they can use is coal. And to continue to support the world's largest economy, which China is, China will have no choice but to break its promise of hitting its emission peak by 2030, and that is not going to happen.

Russia has pledged to reduce its carbon emissions between 25 and 30 percent by 2030. Here is the sticking point. Russia made this projection based on its carbon emissions baseline of 1990. By playing with numbers, Russia's commitment will actually allow it to increase emissions between 700 and 900 tons in 2030.

Then there is Mexico, South Korea, and South Africa. All of them will have made pledges not cut emissions but to slow the growth—not to cut emissions but slow the growth. In other words, these countries are committing to increased emissions through 2030. In the meantime, President Obama is committing the United States to cut—not slow the growth but cut—its emissions from 26 to 28 percent by 2025. Nobody knows how they came to those years. There is no plan that we have seen that would do that. But this promise is also just as hollow as what we have been hearing from these other countries that I previously mentioned.

Not only does the President not have the backing of the Senate and the American people, but outside groups are finding that the President's methods to achieve these reductions through climate regulations—primarily the Clean Power Plan—are faulty. According to a recent analysis by the U.S. Chamber, the President's intended nationally determined contribution is about 33 percent short of meeting its stated target. So that is not going to work.

On July 8, David Bookbinder, former Sierra Club chief climate counsel, testified before the committee that I chair about his own analysis that has found an even greater gap. It was in this same hearing where it was stated that to close the gap in the President's climate commitment, the United States would likely have to consider

regulating other industrial sectors, including agriculture. So it is not just oil and gas and some of these emitters. It is everybody, and it is not going to happen because it can't happen. It doesn't work.

After that committee hearing, I led a letter with 10 other Senators to the President requesting a detailed response for just how the United States intends to meet the pledge of 26- to 28-percent emissions reduction by 2025. It has been 3 months, and we still haven't received a response. So they have been saying this. We are saying: How are you going to do it? Three months have gone by, and we still don't know how he plans to do it.

When we go to these other countries, they assume that America is like they are; if the President says it, he means it, and he is going to try to make it happen. With his pledge to the international community, the President is setting up the American economy to suffer great pain for no gain.

Now, his Clean Power Plan lacks credibility. The EPA does not even bother to assess the minuscule environmental benefits associated with the Clean Power Plan and with the cost of the plan. We are talking about something that would be upwards of \$400 billion a year. That is very similar to when they tried to do this with cap-and-trade legislation.

I had the occasion and I do this: Every time I hear a big number, I go back to my State of Oklahoma and I do a calculation. I find out how many families in my State of Oklahoma filed a Federal tax return, and then I do the math. As it turned out, that would cost about \$3,000 per family. Now, to some people who believe the world is coming to an end and global warming is causing it, that might sound like: Well, \$3,000 a family is not that big a deal. But let's remember—and I would remind the Chair—that it was just a short while ago when Lisa Jackson, who was the President's nominee and eventually became the Director of the EPA, was asked by me on live TV in our committee: If we do pass any of these things, either by regulation or by legislation, will that have the effect of reducing CO₂ emissions worldwide? She said: No, because this isn't where the problem is. It is in China. It is in India and in these other countries that I mentioned before. So we would be doing that. Even if you are a believer in the doom philosophy, we would be doing it in a way that is not going to work.

So despite all the costs they have, the President's climate regulations would only reduce CO₂ concentrations by 0.2 percent. Global average temperature rise would be—would be, I say, not will be but would be—reduced only by .0016 degrees Fahrenheit. It could not even be measurable. And the sea level rise would be reduced by 0.2 millimeters, which is the thickness of two human hairs.

So it is no wonder the President is working so hard to circumvent

Congress's role in committing the United States to the agreement.

I only say this because we are now getting close to December and we have been through this so many times before, and this isn't going to be any different. There is going to be a difference, and that is that they are not going to attempt to do it by passing legislation. They want to circumvent Congress because they know Congress reports to the people and the people don't want this.

I can remember when global warming—when they had their annual Gallup poll every March. It used to be that when asked what were the critical concerns about America, global warming was always—in 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005—between first and second place of the greatest concern. Do we know what it is today? Out of 15, it is number 15. So the people have caught on. They know it will be the largest tax increase in history and that it will not accomplish anything.

Mr. President, what is our timing situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are no time limitations.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I wish to make some other comments because something very good happened, and it is not normally the case. We passed the Defense authorization bill. Here we are in the midst of over two decades of wars and we are being challenged on all fronts—from national states to terrorist organizations and extremists to cyber and lone-wolf attacks. Our military is directly engaged in Asia, Africa, Eastern Europe, Syria, Afghanistan, and Iraq, and the demands that this country is placing on them continues to increase. It is greater than anything I have ever seen in the years I have been here and probably the greatest in history in terms of the numbers of threats to America from different countries.

Yesterday we voted to pass the National Defense Authorization Act, or the NDAA, for the 54th consecutive year. I have been worried. The last few years we ended up passing it not this early but passing it in December. If we had gone to December 31 in those years or even in this year, all of a sudden our people wouldn't get hazard pay and they wouldn't get reenlistment bonuses and we couldn't let that happen. So I am glad we did it earlier this year. I think it is the most important bill we pass every year.

It is our constitutional duty to provide oversight over the President and his administration. There is an old wornout document that nobody reads anymore. It is called the Constitution. If we read article I, section 8 of the Constitution, it tells us what we are supposed to be doing—No. 1, defending America, and No. 2, roads and highways. I am very glad we passed the highway bill. It is over in the House, and I am optimistic they will be able to pass it over there as well.

So the Constitution says the most important thing we do is defending America. It is our constitutional duty to do it.

The NDAA contains provisions that take care of military men and women—the pay, the benefits, the bonuses, the new starts, the reenlistment bonuses, military construction, and all of this stuff. This bill addresses things such as additional protections for victims of sexual assault. It is a good bill, and most of the members of this committee have been to the floor today and have talked about.

I just wanted to mention a couple of things that may have been overlooked by some of the other speakers. They should be focusing on accomplishing their missions instead of wondering if this bill authorizes spending priorities critical to our national security and supports the resources requirement of the Department of Defense. While this bill does not contain every provision that the Senate wanted, that I wanted, that the House wanted, and that the President would like to have, the final language is overall good policy for our national defense. It provides authorizations in a timely manner. This vital piece of legislation sets the course for our national security and provides for our Nation's nearly 2.1 million all-volunteer force.

I was a product of the draft many years ago. I have often said that is one of the things that this country probably ought to go back to. We wouldn't have a lot of the problems today if we had to have kids go through the discipline and the appreciation for our country. But nonetheless, this is an all-volunteer force, and it has worked beautifully.

I make it a point, when I go to Afghanistan or Iraq or Africa and these places where we have troops stationed, to sit down in the mess halls, to go out in the field and eat with them or listen to the problems they have and try to boost them up a little bit because they know that under this administration, which I have called the disarming of America, defending America is not the high priority that it should be. This is a time when each service chief, secretary, and combatant commander has testified that no service will be able to meet the wartime requirements under sequestration.

The President and many people in this body wanted sequestration to take place but only for domestic purposes as well as military, and we are saying this is where the problem is. Let's look at Secretary Carter, our Secretary of Defense. He said recently:

Readiness remains at troubling levels across the force. Even with the fiscal year 2016 budget, the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps won't reach their readiness goals until 2020 and the Air Force until 2023.

At a time when former Secretary Hagel says—listen to this. I don't know why more people in America didn't hear this. This is the Secretary of Defense, Secretary Hagel, who said:

“American dominance in seas, in the skies, and in space can no longer be taken for granted.” This is America, and people are thinking that the President might even veto this bill.

Admiral Winnefeld, who is Vice Chief of Staff, said: “There could be for the first time in my career instances where we may be asked to respond to a crisis and we will have to say that we cannot.”

General Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, says we are putting our military on a path where “the force is so degraded and so unready” that it would be “immoral to use it.”

General Dempsey labels it “unlike any in his lifetime.”

So the passage of this legislation is absolutely necessary. We have passed it. We have done the responsible thing. And I think we need to be sure that we use full pressure to make sure the President does not veto this bill, because he is toying with a veto.

We have never seen anything like this in the history of this country. We have a level of threat to America, and we are going to have to make sure that we pass this bill. I am very proud that it was passed by the majority in the Senate.

I know I am the last speaker tonight. I suggest the absence of a quorum, just to see if there is any last message that has to be given.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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. MCCONNELL. 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.

RECOGNIZING COASTAL RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I wish to commend Coastal Ridge Elementary School in York, ME, on being named a 2015 National Blue Ribbon School of Excellence. This year, Coastal Ridge Elementary was one of only 335 schools across the country and one of only two schools from Maine to receive this prestigious recognition of high accomplishment by the U.S. Department of Education.

Created in 1982, the Blue Ribbon Schools Award honors schools that are either academically superior in their States or that demonstrate significant gains in student achievement. The schools singled out for this national recognition are models of high educational standards and accountability.