

programs to counter violent extremism. These programs have strong bipartisan support—and did in the Appropriations Committee—because they are the building blocks for stability where we have critical national security interests that affect all Americans.

A continuing resolution will provide \$162 million less than our bill for global health, including for maternal and child health programs, such as vaccines for children, and to combat malaria and tuberculosis. These programs literally mean life or death for millions of people, which is why they have bipartisan support—or at least they did before the Republican leadership scrapped the appropriations bills that we passed with overwhelming bipartisan support.

In fact, one of the things a continuing resolution will do is provide \$454 million less than Senator GRAHAM's and my bill for security for U.S. diplomatic and consular personnel, for security upgrades to U.S. Embassies and facilities overseas, and for cyber security programs.

I mention that because the Republicans in the other body spent tens of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money decrying the lack of security at our embassies, even after they had already voted to cut money for embassy security, and now they are going to cut another \$454 million. Will they stop using their talking points about how we should spend more to protect our diplomats posted overseas? Of course not, because they hope the American people will not pay attention to the fact that they have cut another half billion dollars. When the Republican leadership blames others for not doing enough on security for our embassies and diplomats, as they have a habit of doing, they need to only look at themselves in the mirror.

At the same time, the continuing resolution provides \$538 million more for U.S. contributions to international financial institutions, than the amount Senator GRAHAM and I put in our bill. That is because the 2016 omnibus provided \$220 million for the Strategic Climate and Clean Technology Funds, which is not needed in fiscal year 2017 because the United States will not be contributing to either of those funds in fiscal year 2017.

The balance of \$318 million is not needed because U.S. contributions to several international financial institutions are lower in fiscal year 2017 than in fiscal year 2016. It boggles the mind. They cut money for the security of our diplomats and embassies, but then they spend half a billion dollars for contributions we don't need to make.

In fact, the continuing resolution provides \$161 million more than Senator GRAHAM's and my bill for contributions to international organizations. We don't need to pay that additional amount because of reductions in assessments in exchange rate costs. It would be nice if, instead of wasting this money on things we don't need, we used it to protect our embassies.

The continuing resolution will provide \$90 million more than our bill for assessed contributions to international peacekeeping. Again, we don't need to pay that additional amount because of reductions in several peacekeeping missions.

These are just examples for State and foreign operations. Every appropriations bill has its own laundry list of reasons why a continuing resolution makes no sense. It wastes taxpayer dollars and wreaks havoc for the agencies that run the government.

Continuing resolutions beyond a few months are illogical, wasteful, and harmful. We end up spending less for things both Republicans and Democrats strongly support, and we waste money on things we don't need and nobody wants. It is bad government 101. It is what the Republican leadership 10 months ago said they wanted to avoid, and we all agreed with them. But that was then and this is now. Now it's forget what we said before. We have changed our mind. Let's just put the government on autopilot and waste the money.

I heard Senator MCCAIN, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, denouncing his colleagues for abandoning the regular appropriations process. He knows the problems it will create for the U.S. military.

Senator MIKULSKI, the vice chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee, has called it "absolutely outrageous." She called it "procrastinating" instead of "legislating." I agree with her.

Another 4-month continuing resolution is completely unnecessary, not to mention outrageous, wasteful, and irresponsible. It can still be avoided. Speaking for State and foreign operations, we can complete our conference agreement in less than 1 week. We are perfectly willing to work into the evenings to do that. I suspect the other subcommittees could do the same or close to it. Certainly, we could finish these bills before Christmas.

So why don't we? That is what the Republican leadership said they wanted. That is what regular order is. That is how the Congress is supposed to work. We should do it. We ought to show the American people, for once, that we will actually do the job we were elected to do. That is what this Vermonter wants. I would hope others would also.

I yield the floor.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:51 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, are we in a parliamentary procedure to pro-

ceed with commentary on the Senate floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business, with 10-minute grants.

Mr. NELSON. May I be recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

#### NIH FUNDING

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to talk about something we all hear about and generally support—that the National Institutes of Health needs help. It was founded in 1887. Its work and investments in the work of others have led to countless discoveries, including in Alzheimer's disease, cancer, and so many other chronic illnesses.

I visited this 300-acre campus in Bethesda, and it is jam-packed with buildings that are teeming with scientists and physicians. Yet that is just the tip of the iceberg because research is being conducted all over the country—indeed, all over the world—by the medical research grants that are given by NIH. This funded research has led to many discoveries and treatments that not only are allowing us to live healthier lives but also contribute to our knowledge and understanding of how diseases and the human body work. Take, for example, the BRAIN Initiative. NIH seeks to unravel the mysteries of the vastly complex human brain, which could allow us to understand an array of conditions affecting the brain.

When I visited yesterday, I met with Dr. Francis Collins, the head of NIH, and a plethora of his brilliant scientists who are working on neurodegenerative diseases—diseases such as concussions, ALS, Parkinson's, and all the many complicated things that come from this complicated organ called the brain. Well, they are on the verge of some real breakthroughs, but that comes at a cost. Dr. Collins stressed the need for consistent, robust funding for NIH.

In 2003, funding for NIH peaked and has since failed to keep up with inflation. In 2009 we came along with a stimulus bill that increased funding for NIH for only 2 years by approximately \$4 or \$5 billion a year over its base funding of \$24 to \$25 billion a year.

I will never forget when Dr. Collins told us—after the effect of that second year of the stimulus bill—that he had to cease 700 medical research grants sent out to the medical schools and research institutions all across the country because he simply did not have the money they had planned for, and thus there is the call for consistent and robust funding. Dr. Collins mentioned that the agency's biggest concern was a loss of young researchers. As the next generation of researchers are increasingly facing being denied research grants, they are leaving the research field. I don't think that is what this Nation wants. We need to ensure that