

something else or the Presiding Officer. That is because Republicans in the Senate have no plan at all as it relates to climate change.

We have trillions of dollars in infrastructure that needs to be addressed over the next couple of decades. We could make those investments in ways that also address climate. We could offer tax breaks for clean energy. We should reenter the Paris accord, but they are pulling the same play they always do, to make this so partisan, to mock the issue itself so they can continue to do nothing. They are whistling past the graveyard.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, how do we make our communities, our States, our Nation, and our planet better for our children? How do we make it better for our children's children and their children? Isn't that the task we have in the U.S. Senate, to make things work better, not worse?

We have this question before us: Do we have a carbon pollution problem? What is the answer, yes or no? I ask each of my colleagues, yes or no?

Presiding today is a new Member of the Senate from Florida. I have been down to Florida. I will tell you that I heard about the rising seawater polluting the aquifers and creating freshwater supply problems for communities in Florida. I heard about coastal erosion. I heard about coral reefs being damaged and the fish offshore. I heard about the toxic red algae on the gulf side—so toxic it is killing fish and dolphins and turtles and manatees, and they are washing up on the shore of Florida on the gulf side.

The people have two problems. The toxic algae is creating breathing problems, and then there is a stench arising from the dying sea life. People on the gulf side of Florida say: We have to take inland vacations.

I know my colleague presiding today knows about these issues in his State because we see the impacts of carbon pollution and climate chaos in every single State. We certainly see it in my State. We see it through the more powerful forest fires—hotter, more acreage, and more destruction. We see it in the smoke affecting the communities and the economies throughout Oregon. Of course, we saw the devastating forest fires in California, wiping out the town of Paradise and afflicting so many other communities.

It is not just the impact on the natural world; it is the impact on the people. When you affect the fisheries, you affect the fishermen. When you affect the forests, you affect the timber industry. When you proceed to produce conditions of more floods and more droughts, you affect the farmers and ranchers of America. It is the people of America.

How about the Panhandle of Florida. It was wiped out by a more powerful hurricane, driven by those warmer

ocean temperatures. What does one say to them—that there is not an issue; that we don't have a problem?

The entire scientific community of the world has said you can see the facts on the ground, but we don't need them to see the facts on the ground. We see it through the everyday impacts on Americans, on our farmers, our ranchers, and on our communities plagued by smoke or wiped out by hurricanes.

So we do have a problem. The answer is, yes, we do have a problem. If you say there is no problem, then your head is stuck in the tar sands, and you are failing your responsibility not just as a U.S. Senator, you are failing your responsibility as a human being. You are failing your constituents if you think there is no problem, while their lives and their economy are being so dramatically impacted by this issue.

I ask my colleagues, did you come here to fail your constituents, to fail as a Senator, to fail as a human being to address this issue? Did you come to fail, or did you come to take on the issues that face us and build a better world for your children?

If you believe there is a significant challenge, what are you doing about it? What actions are you planning? Because if you believe there is a problem and you are not putting forward a plan to address it, then your leadership is a failure.

So we have a choice on the Republican side of the aisle. Is it that you are too obsessed with the power of the Koch Brothers to address the needs of the citizens of the United States of America, that you have your heads stuck in the tar sands? Is that the issue, or is it that you want to sit on the sidelines? You know there is a problem, but you want to sit on the sidelines and do nothing, in which case you are a failed leader.

So how about reject ignorance, and how about reject failed leadership and come together to make a better world for our children. That is what we need to do, all of us, together, because the impacts we see from carbon pollution and climate chaos—those are not impacts affecting blue America or red America; they touch the lives of every citizen, no matter which political party they belong to. It is going to affect every child we have now and every child born in the future, whether they register as a Democrat or a Republican. We have already wasted decades in getting at this issue. Let's waste no more time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Pursuant to the order of February 13 with respect to the Barr nomination, I ask the Chair to put the question on the nomination of William Barr to be Attorney General at 12:30 p.m. today.

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

The Senator from West Virginia.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, before I begin with my remarks, I would like to take a moment, as I think everybody here in the country should, to remember and honor all the lives lost 1 year ago today during the shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, FL. It was a horrible act, as the Presiding Officer of the Senate is well aware, and its reverberations are still felt deeply today, especially among those who lost friends and loved ones, many of whom work day in and day out to keep their memory alive.

We have before us on the floor today a bipartisan government funding measure, and as the chairman of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee, I rise in support of the conference agreement to secure our border and fund our government and end any possibility of a shutdown at the same time. This agreement is a compromise between Republicans and Democrats, between the House and the Senate, and because it is a compromise, none of us really got everything we wanted.

When you are working to reach an agreement, whether you are in government or in a family, it is important to understand the difference between compromising on details and compromising on your principles. While this agreement may compromise on some of the specifics, it does not compromise on our commitment to our Nation and to secure our Nation. That commitment is also shared by our President, who has been unwavering in his promise to strengthen our border. It is a goal we must achieve in a smart and informed way to address the real and ever-changing challenges we face as a nation.

On the border itself, I have been very clear that our agreement had to include three critical elements, three legs of the stool: physical barriers, technology, and personnel.

There were a few sticking points with our Democratic colleagues. We did hear from the Speaker of the House that there would be no wall or there would not be \$1 for the wall. Instead, this agreement provides almost triple the money for new wall construction that we appropriated last year. In fact, we will pay for 55 new miles of wall in the Rio Grande Valley where Customs and Border Protection has told us it is desperately needed. This agreement will build twice as many miles of new wall as last year's appropriations, despite the fact that we were negotiating with those who didn't want to have any wall.

Would I have preferred more money for the wall? Of course. But this bill provides the most money ever in a single appropriations bill for a barrier. I drafted legislation—passed by the Senate Appropriations Committee last June—that would have fully funded the President's budget request for the wall. I would have voted for higher amounts—and did, actually, in committee—of funding for the wall. That is

because I believe strongly that physical barriers are a vital part of securing our border. I saw it myself when I toured the borders in California and Texas. I saw the need. I saw how the walls work. And I will stand side by side with the President as he works to secure additional money to construct a border wall in the future.

We got \$1.375 billion, and that is a long way from \$1. It is a critical downpayment on the President's ultimate border security goal. The best path forward to secure our border today is to pass this agreement.

The bill also stands with the men and women of ICE, Immigration and Customs Enforcement. A statutory cap on the number of ICE detention beds would have required dangerous criminals to be released from ICE custody. It would have posed a threat to families and communities across the country, and it would have compromised an important principle. This agreement rejects that anti-ICE proposal.

I have said many times that I support the men and women of ICE and their important work to secure our Nation, and that is why the agreement before us gives ICE the operational flexibility it needs to accomplish its goals. Taking advantage of the flexibility this bill provides, ICE can utilize 18 percent more detention beds than they are currently using. That means ICE can continue interior enforcement efforts and be ready to respond to any surges on the border, so it gives ICE the flexibility they need.

I say to my friends who, like me, want more money for the wall: This agreement is better for the wall and better for ICE than any other alternative. Rejecting this agreement will cost dozens of miles of new wall and jeopardize ICE's ability to detain dangerous criminals.

Another government shutdown cannot and should not be allowed to happen. We need to provide certainty to our Federal workers and the American people whom we serve. I also think we need to restore trust in our ability to work across the aisle, to work across party lines to reach settlement, negotiated settlement that moves us forward, because if we are in a stalemate, we are standing still. In my opinion, if you are standing still, you are actually going backward, and we don't want to do that as a nation.

The work done by the men and women in our Federal workforce during the shutdown should continue to be applauded. Without pay and in a period of great uncertainty, thousands of men and women did their jobs at the highest level. We should be thankful for their service, and we are.

One of the things I am proud of in this bill is a 1.9-percent pay increase for the men and women of the Department of Homeland Security. This is ICE. This is Border Patrol. To the Coast Guard, Secret Service, FEMA, we salute you.

Under this agreement, we will also hire 200 new Border Patrol agents over

the fiscal year 2018 funded level to defend and police our border, and we will add \$600 million for nonintrusive inspection technology.

As I have said before, border wall, personnel, and technology are all vital parts of securing our border. They are very critical in addressing the drug epidemic that has plagued my State of West Virginia and many other parts of this country.

This bill includes the highest level of funding ever in a homeland security appropriations bill to combat the opioid epidemic—more than \$700 million—and it has funds for investigations when it comes to human trafficking, looking into the dark web, and other crimes.

The homeland security portion of this agreement also takes a major step forward in advancing our Nation's Coast Guard by building a new polar security cutter to help address operational needs in the Arctic. This is critical to our homeland security. We also address the needs of the TSA, the Secret Service, and FEMA—to name just a few of the other entities within this title.

This bill is not the bill I would have written alone. I don't get to do that. It is the product of give-and-take that is necessary to forge a bipartisan consensus. It is a strong compromise that will help secure our border and make America safer.

Senator JON TESTER, the ranking member of our subcommittee and the Senator from Montana, has been an excellent partner as we have worked to deliver a bill worthy of the men and women of the Department of Homeland Security. So I thank him for his efforts throughout this process. We have worked very well together.

I also want to thank Chairman SHELBY and Vice Chairman LEAHY for their work in guiding the Appropriations Committee to a deal. These are seasoned appropriators who know how to get the job done. Their leadership has demonstrated that the Appropriations Committee can come together and forge bipartisan consensus in the national interest.

The leaders of the House Appropriations Committee, Chairman NITA LOWEY, whom I know very well; and Ranking Member KAY GRANGER, who is a good friend of mine from my service in the House; as well as my counterpart in the House and chairman of Homeland Security, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD; and Ranking Member CHUCK FLEISCHMANN, of the Homeland Security Subcommittee. They deserve our gratitude for forging ahead with a willingness to negotiate.

I also appreciate the contributions of all the members of our conference committee, and I would like to thank a group of individuals who have dedicated a lot of nights, weekends, and family time to this effort. Their knowledge of the facts and their commitment to the cause never waned, even though their time to sleep did wane. Shannon

Hines, who is Chairman SHELBY's right-hand woman on the committee, was fantastic. Thank you to Adam Telle, Peter Babb, Christian Lee, Chris Cook, and Thompson Moore of the Homeland Security Subcommittee staff, which I chair, as well as to my own appropriations staffer, J.T. Jezierski. I say thank you—a big thank you.

I have spent the majority of my time today and the last several weeks on my bill—our bill. My thanks and congratulations also go to my fellow chairmen who have titles in this package. They have produced legislation that will help West Virginia expand access to broadband, combat the opioid epidemic, enhance our transportation, foster economic development, and advance scientific research and discovery. They, too, faced similar challenges to draft bipartisan legislation, and they too got it done.

In closing, although conferees compromised on details, we did not compromise our principles. Passing this conference agreement is in our national security interest. It will provide the resources, the direction, and the support that the President has said many times he needs to protect our Nation.

I am very proud to have been a part of this process, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in a bipartisan fashion in passing this bill later this afternoon.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF LYNCHING ACT OF 2019

Ms. HARRIS. James Baldwin once said:

Not everything that is faced can be changed. But nothing can be changed until it is faced.

That is why we are here again today, to face the history of lynching in this country. From 1882 to 1986, the U.S. Congress failed to pass anti-lynching legislation when it had the opportunity more than 200 times.

We have an opportunity, once again, to right this wrong and face the ugly history of lynching in America. Let's recall this stain on America's history. Lynching is an act of terror. It is murder.

These were summary executions. Victims of lynching were dragged out of their homes. They had ropes wrapped around their necks. They were hanged on trees. In many cases, they were castrated and burned as crowds of people watched and applauded. The premise underlying all of these acts was that Black people were not full human beings.

According to the Equal Justice Initiative, lynching was used as an instrument of terror and intimidation 4,084 times during the late 19th and 20th centuries.

In 1955, Emmett Till, a 14-year-old African-American boy, was lynched in