

probably, at this point, a bigger number of people who we think would be a percentage of people who would have really negative consequences—even death—from this disease, rather than all the people who had it and didn't know they had it.

We have learned in the past, through outbreaks of a flu strain that we didn't have a vaccine for, of Ebola, of Zika, that what we do to protect people in other countries winds up protecting people here. We have to be sure that we understand that a lot of our fate in this has been determined and will continue to be determined by what we do to first try to contain this virus and, secondly, to provide the money to be sure that, when we do have an outbreak, which has already begun in our country, it is an outbreak that is really held at the lowest possible level of people impacted and, if you are infected by this disease, that you have the ability to work from home, to do other things. The hospital is not always the place to go.

We are working with State and local health officials right now to see that that happens. The money that has been used, I think, has been used effectively. Clearly, we are trying to agree—between the House and the Senate and the administration—to exactly the right number. I would say that, at this point, the administration has been the most agreeable to whatever money we want to provide but, obviously, would like to have that money provided quickly.

I feel confident we are going to have the resources to deal with this. I feel confident that this will be a problem that will not impact more people than would usually be impacted by something like the flu. Again, we need to prepare for the very worst and hope for the very best, but our job right now is to prepare for the worst things that could happen and have the funding available so that we don't have to go through a couple of weeks again where an easy determination should have been reached.

One thing we could have done is to have given the administration exactly the amount of money they asked for—we could have decided to spend it differently—2 weeks ago and then get into a discussion of what we need next. That is not the course we decided to go down.

We are trying to come up with an amount of money, it appears, that would get us through this entire incident with this virus, but it is time to get that done. Hopefully, we will see a bill filed later today and the House able to vote on that bill before they leave this week. Once that number is done, I think it will be seen as almost certain that the Senate will be able to deal with that bill and approve that number.

We are going to move forward. I think, again, we are going to move forward in a way that minimizes, as much as possible, the impact that this has on families and on individuals.

Mr. President, I look forward to you and I both having a chance to learn more about this even today and to learn more as we move forward. The big thing we need to learn now is the amount of money we need to have to spend and how we allocate that money for a vaccine and other things.

RECESS

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:28 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

ADVANCED GEOTHERMAL INNOVATION LEADERSHIP ACT OF 2019— Motion to Proceed—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the bill before us supports clean energy and emerging technologies, so this is the perfect opportunity to update an outdated aspect related to a legacy energy source.

Senator UDALL of New Mexico and I have an amendment that will close a loophole in Federal energy policy. I want my colleagues to know—and I think they do—of my long support for renewable and alternative sources of energy, and so I agree with the aims of the Murkowski-Manchin Energy bill.

The amendment Senator UDALL and I have introduced is the same as the bipartisan bill we introduced last week. The title of that bill is the Fair Return for Public Lands Act. This bill was introduced 100 years to the date of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920.

This amendment would increase the royalty rates on Federal lands from 12.5 percent to 18.75 percent. Everybody here knows that a royalty is what the oil company will pay to a mineral owner—in this case, the mineral owner is the American taxpayer—and that royalty is paid for the right to extract oil and natural gas from the lands of the United States. The legislation modernizes the public lands leasing system, and it does this for the first time since royalty rates were set in 1920.

The legislation increases both the share of royalties taxpayers receive from public lands leasing as well as the rental rates. The new rental rate we are offering in this amendment reflects the current fair market value, while the bill also establishes minimum bidding standards to lease public lands that will stay in line with inflation. This bill is a simple fix by making Federal leasing rates the same whether you are on land or offshore.

The royalty rate the bill offers is very comparable to what current leases are for oil-producing States on their State-owned land. We use the State of

Texas as an example. Texas charges a 25-percent royalty on its State lands, while States in the Rocky Mountain West charge royalties that are somewhere between 16–²/₃ percent and 18³/₄ percent. The royalty rate on Federal public lands is more than one-third lower, at 12¹/₂ percent; hence our amendment—the same as our bill—updating this and bringing more parity between State rates and Federal rates and, of course, absolute parity with offshore drilling.

The current regulatory system allows companies to get a sweetheart deal on Federal public lands. Senator UDALL and I are asking our colleagues to fix this for the American people.

According to studies done by the Congressional Budget Office and the Government Accountability Office, modernizing public lands royalty rates for oil and gas could increase Federal revenues by as much as \$200 million over the next decade and do it with little to no impact on production.

It is time—hence our amendment—for my colleagues in Congress to end this oil company loophole and bring oil leasing into the 21st century.

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

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today as a Senator as well as a physician. I want to do this to reassure the American people that we are doing everything possible to combat and contain the coronavirus. According to Johns Hopkins University, a well-known medical institution, we here in the United States are the most prepared Nation on the face of the Earth to protect ourselves in terms of preparation for an infectious disease like the coronavirus.

Nevertheless, this virus is a global concern and is a problem with pandemic potential. We know the outbreak started in China. It goes without saying that we are deeply saddened by the loss of life there, as well as here and around the world. We are concerned about those currently suffering from the virus. Our focus continues to be on protecting the health and the well-being and the safety of the American people. That is where we need to focus.

Notably, President Trump's early travel restrictions on China have actually helped slow the spread of the virus. He has since expanded these restrictions. The President, I believe, has acted swiftly, boldly, and decisively to contain the virus and to keep Americans safe. Still, this country is not a hermetically sealed bubble. It will never be—can't be. We are likely to see more cases here in the days and weeks ahead.

We all must be prepared, and we must stay vigilant. Be assured, the Trump administration is fully engaged in responding to this virus. The United States has the best public health system in the world, and we have a plan in place to combat the coronavirus. Our public health experts are working to identify and isolate the virus, as well as to produce a vaccine.

The fastest you can ever produce a vaccine is several years. We seem to be moving faster than that with regard to coronavirus. We have seen development, but even though it is moving faster than ever, it will still take a minimum of a year and 6 months to have a vaccine available and produced at a level that could actually impact the population of the country. Since it is a new virus, a new vaccine needs to be developed. The Vice President said over the weekend that we expect to have a vaccine available sometime next year, and I agree.

Meanwhile, our strategy for testing, for isolation, and for quarantines right now is helping to lower the risks. Years ago, we created an infectious disease rapid response team. The goal was to make sure that we were ready if the time would come, and the time has now come. Test kits are becoming more widely available for States and communities. We heard today over the noon hour that they are expecting to have enough test kits available around the country so that, over the next week, we can test a million people. We are going to continue to use every available tool we can in this fight.

The White House has created a Coronavirus Task Force led by Vice President PENCE. The effort is headed by top officials at the Centers for Disease Control and the National Institutes of Health. I had a chance to visit with a number of them today, specifically the infectious disease group through the NIH. We have had a number of briefings through the Centers for Disease Control. We recently had a briefing by Dr. Anne Schuchat, the head of the Centers for Disease Control in the area helping with our efforts on coronavirus. As she has said, "Our aggressive containment strategy here in the United States has been working and is responsible for the low level of cases that we have so far." Officials at the CDC and the National Institutes of Health are coordinating with other Federal officials, and they tend to be working around the clock.

The administration is making sure that State and local officials have all of the resources they need to respond. Dr. Schuchat said that our healthcare system, our businesses, our communities, and our schools all have action plans.

Senators have had a number of briefings from officials at the Centers for Disease Control and the National Institutes of Health. They are working on ways to identify the virus and test for the virus and ways to treat people who are infected by the virus. They are

working on quarantines and on a vaccine. That is what they should be doing. This is a massive, nationwide undertaking.

At every meeting—and I have been going to meetings on this since it was first noted around the beginning of the year. We know about the issue in China. People now know about the doctor who tried to get the word out to the world—who was the first to notice this specific new virus, the coronavirus. He was reprimanded by the Chinese for trying to do what he learned to do as a doctor, which was to share medical knowledge and information to try to get ahead of a disease that is progressing. He was reprimanded by the Chinese Government, and he has subsequently died of the disease.

There are a number of us—and it is bipartisan—who would go as Senators to briefings. We have been going to briefings since the time of the impeachment. We would have impeachment in the afternoon and discussions about coronavirus in the morning. There has been a focus on this probably longer than most members around the country had been focused on it. At every meeting, we would ask the members of the Centers for Disease Control and National Institutes of Health: Do you have the funds you need for the things you need to do right now? At all of those meetings, they said: Yes, we have all we need.

Now things have changed. They say they need additional funds, and they are right. We agree they need more funds for testing, treatment, and vaccine development. It is appropriate that Congress appropriate that money. Congress must act quickly and decisively in passing a bipartisan emergency funding bill. Both parties agree this effort has to be fully funded. We know the initial numbers discussed were only a starting point. We don't know what the total number is going to be, but the team is going to continue to have all the funds they need to deal with this disease.

I find it very disturbing to see Democrats, especially those running for President, politicizing the issue. This is a headline in yesterday's *New York Times*: "Democrats Hit Trump On Virus." They are talking about the Presidential candidates running for President, attacking President Trump on the virus.

The coronavirus is a deadly disease. It is not a political tool to try to tar and feather President Trump. We need to be working on this together. This should not be about Democratic candidates trying to defeat President Trump but about defeating the coronavirus. That is what we ought to be focusing on.

As a doctor, my focus is on the health of the American people. My advice for those who may be watching is the same commonsense advice you would take if you were saying "I want to avoid getting the flu during flu season," and it is flu season as well. Cover

your mouth when you cough. Wash your hands frequently. If you are sick, stay home. Those are the kinds of commonsense things people can do at home, not just to prevent the flu but also to protect themselves against the coronavirus.

There is no reason for lots of anxiety or for panic. As a nation, we are in the right position to deal with the challenge we face. This administration will continue to do everything in its power to keep America and Americans safe. Now it is time for Congress to do its part—to pass the emergency legislation and get it to the President's desk.

Thankfully, we are the most prepared Nation to face this challenge. We have harnessed all of the American energy and ingenuity and expertise we need for this fight. The key is for all of us to remain engaged and to remain vigilant. As a doctor, I am confident that we will be able to succeed together.

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

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

S. 2657

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President and fellow colleagues, I come to the floor today to talk about the American Energy Innovation Act, which is here before the Senate and which we are considering this week.

America's energy landscape has changed dramatically since the last major Energy bill was enacted by Congress more than a decade ago. It is time to update our outdated energy policy to reflect today's realities, goals, and challenges in the energy sector.

The American Energy Innovation Act—the business before the Senate today—is the culmination of more than a year of hearings, business meetings, and negotiations in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. I commend Chairman MURKOWSKI and Ranking Member MANCHIN for their leadership and all of us on the committee in bringing this strong, bipartisan, "all of the above" energy package to the floor.

Included in this legislation are a number of provisions I have proposed that will benefit Idaho and the Nation.

First, the bill appropriately recognizes the importance of having a strong domestic nuclear industry. I represent not just one of the Department of Energy's National Laboratories, but I represent the Nation's flagship nuclear energy laboratory, the Idaho National Lab.

Nuclear power is the Nation's largest source of reliable, carbon-free energy. To date, nuclear powerplants have primarily served one purpose—to produce electricity—but we are discovering

through the work at the Idaho National Lab that this is only the tip of the iceberg as far as the work a nuclear reactor could do.

The INL and the Department of Energy are currently working to demonstrate that nuclear reactors can be adapted to produce other products like hydrogen, steam, and, importantly, heat. To accelerate this research, Ranking Member MANCHIN and I introduced the Integrated Energy Systems Act to help improve the long-term competitiveness of our current fleet of nuclear reactors. That bill is included in the larger bill we have before us.

While we must keep our existing fleet of reactors online, we must also usher in the next generation of advanced nuclear reactor designs. This is particularly exciting at this point in time. The bipartisan Nuclear Energy Leadership Act will address key supply chain and other challenges associated with developing small, modular, micro, and other advanced designs. This act is also included in the larger bill before us today. That bill, NELEA, will enable the Federal Government to partner with the private sector to demonstrate and commercialize these technologies, and the INL's National Reactor Innovation Center will play a key role in making these designs a reality.

When looking toward a clean, reliable, and secure energy future, the importance of rare-earth minerals cannot be overstated. In Idaho, we have the Nation's only significant domestic deposit of cobalt—a mineral that is vital for electric vehicles, wind turbines, and military hardware. Yet, instead of mining and processing this mineral in the United States, we import our supply from China.

Cobalt is just one of many minerals the United States relies on imports for. We need to start prioritizing domestic supply and processing our critical minerals for our energy and domestic security future. I appreciate that we have also included this act in the big bill that is in front of us. This is the American Mineral Security Act, and it prioritizes our energy independence.

I am also pleased that the key provisions of my bill, the Enhancing Geothermal Production on Federal Lands Act, were also included. That act is included in the larger bill.

Idaho has long been a world leader in the development of geothermal technologies. In fact, the Idaho State Capitol Building is the only State capital in the United States that is heated solely with geothermal energy.

There is significant potential to expand this renewable energy in Idaho and indeed across the Western United States, and most of this potential exists on federally managed lands. Unfortunately, developers looking to harness this resource on Federal lands must navigate a labyrinth of regulations. The provisions in this bill will unleash our Nation's vast geothermal resources by making the current permitting-review process more efficient, cost-effective,

predictable, and, importantly, take a shorter period of time.

Lastly, I am proud that this legislation contains language from the PROTECT Act that will modernize our electric grid and enhance cyber security efforts. I don't need to spend any time on cyber security. It is important for our electric grid. It is one of the favorite targets of terrorists around the world. They usually go through cyber security.

The worldwide adoption of digital automation technology has created great benefits, but it also introduces significant cyber vulnerabilities to critical energy infrastructure. I am proud that the solutions to many of these challenges are being developed at the Idaho National Laboratory, which is the world leader in critical infrastructure, control systems, and security research in those areas.

Protecting our electric grid is one of the most pressing security challenges, and we must incentivize the energy sector to deploy the most advanced cyber security technologies.

The additional authorities and tools in these bills are critical to both our energy and national security, and I am committed—hopefully along with all of my colleagues here in the Senate—to seeing those matters cross the finish line in this important act, which finally reaches us at this critical time.

With that, I will yield the floor to my distinguished colleague from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, thank you for the recognition.

Let me begin today by commending the efforts of Senators MURKOWSKI and MANCHIN for working across the aisle to bring an energy bill to the floor.

This bill has positive initiatives—promoting energy efficiency, modernizing the electric grid, and research funding for clean energy—but the full Senate deserves a chance to be heard on the important issues at stake with this bill; namely, energy.

Most importantly, we must take real action on climate change and address a problematic provision in this bill to limit environmental reviews of massive and potentially toxic mining projects.

Everywhere we look, we are experiencing the devastating effects of climate change—whether they are hurricanes along the southeastern coasts, flooding in the Midwest, drought in the Southwest, or out-of-control wildfires in California—and we are careening too close to climate change tipping points that scientists warn will doom the planet.

The bill before us does not set targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to the levels required to meet global targets or transition us to a clean energy economy, which is where we need to head, and we need to be heading there fast. A few things would dramatically improve this bill's climate impact.

First, we need to add clean energy tax incentives. Clean energy tax incen-

tives are one of the most effective tools we have in our toolbox to increase renewable power sources like wind and solar and the energy storage technology that enables them to work as a baseload power.

Second, we should put commonsense limits on one of the worst greenhouse gases—methane. The U.S. oil and gas boom means that we are emitting 13 million metric tons of methane every year. That is 60 percent more than EPA estimates. Methane is 84 times more powerful than CO₂ as a greenhouse gas in the short term.

Industry says they want to control methane pollution. They were prepared to live with limits on public lands in a 2016 rule from the Bureau of Land Management. In 2017, the Senate rejected an attempt to repeal that rule on a bipartisan basis. But the Trump administration eliminated the rule due to lobbying by the worst polluters in the industry. We should restore that rule, and I have filed an amendment to do so immediately.

We should also act to phase out HFCs and include a strong energy efficiency program for buildings. Then this bill could make a small but meaningful contribution to the climate change fight.

Within the confines of this bill, there is a problematic and anti-environmental section that deserves serious scrutiny. I am talking about the controversial American Mineral Security Act—a bill that saw significant opposition in the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. Including this bill in this package is problematic because it would “streamline” the Federal permitting process for hard rock mining. Streamlining the approval process means arbitrary deadlines and reducing public input on massive mining projects that could cause further environmental destruction on public lands.

Mining is a messy business. Surface mining ravages the earth. Heap leach mining produces what is called acid mine drainage that spews a mix of acidic water and heavy metals into streams and contaminates groundwater. An astounding 40 percent of western headwaters are contaminated by mine runoff. Those headwaters are where we get our drinking water.

There are two controversial mine proposals in New Mexico right now—the Terrero Mine in the Pecos and the Copper Flat Mine near Hillsboro, NM. Both of these mines are of significant concern to local farmers, ranchers, Tribes, and residents who are worried about water pollution.

Under this provision, almost anything could be labeled a “critical mineral.” Mining permits will get pushed through, while limiting local community input. I am strongly supporting an amendment from Senator STABENOW to strike this provision.

The proponents of this critical minerals bill have some valid points. Of course we need certain metals for our

economy, including a clean energy economy, but we cannot forget that the mining industry has gotten one of the biggest free rides on the back of the taxpayer in American history, all the while leaving the taxpayer holding the bag for their toxic legacy.

Hard rock mining on Federal lands is governed by the General Mining Act of 1872—that is right, 1872—a 148-year-old law. President Ulysses S. Grant signed it to help settle the West and to spur economic development. Still in effect today, the act allows mining companies to mine gold, silver, copper, uranium, and other precious metals on Federal lands without paying one dime in royalties—not one dime. That is in sharp contrast to coal and oil and gas companies that pay billions in royalties every year for the right to extract resources—resources owned by the public and which are coming off public lands. The current rate paid by coal, oil, and gas is 12.5 percent. These same mining companies often pay royalties of similar payments when they operate overseas but not here in the United States.

Since 1872, mining companies have taken \$300 billion—that is billion with a “b”—from public lands. The U.S. Government Accountability Office estimated that in 2010 alone hardrock mining earned \$6.4 billion from public lands. That would have yielded \$800 million per year for the American taxpayer if mining were treated the same as coal, oil, and gas.

The shocking fact is, foreign-owned companies are often the beneficiaries. For example, 83 percent of the companies that mine or explore for uranium in the United States are foreign owned; 64 percent of the companies that produce gold are foreign owned.

The out-of-date mining law not only shortchanges taxpayers; it shortchanges the environment. The same industry that seeks permitting relief from Congress today does nothing to pay for cleanup at the tens of thousands of abandoned mines scarring our public lands. The GAO estimates that there are 33,000 abandoned mines across the West that are degrading the environment. One study found that 20,000 gallons per day of toxic water from 43 abandoned mine sites are polluting streams, ponds, and groundwater.

What is wrong with these numbers? The American taxpayer is stuck with the bill, and the local and regional communities are stuck with the devastating environmental and public health impacts.

Now, witness this: the Gold King Mine that gushed 3 million gallons—3 million gallons—of this toxic yellow stew into the Animas and San Juan Rivers and across my home State of New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, Arizona, and the Navajo Nation. It has been 4 years since this spill, and the States, Tribes, and local communities have still not been fully reimbursed. This was a normal river in the West that looked clean and pristine. Here it is,

this toxic stew—this yellowish, toxic stew—that ran for a number of days.

The right to mine on Federal lands royalty-free maybe made sense 150 years ago. A free ride makes no sense now. It is a sweetheart deal for the mining companies that can't be justified by today's fiscal or environmental realities. The old joke in the West is that the mining company gets the gold, and the American people get the shaft—and that is literally true.

My amendment to reform the 1872 mining law that Senators HEINRICH and BENNET are cosponsoring ends this free ride by doing two simple things: It sets a royalty rate between 5 and 8 percent on mining on Federal lands, the public lands, and provides for cleanup of abandoned mines paid for by royalties and an abandoned mine reclamation fee of 1 to 3 percent.

The House Committee on Natural Resources approved broad mining reform legislation last year. This bill could be coming to the House floor soon and is probably headed in our direction over here at the Senate. Mining reform is decades and decades overdue. It is only fair to address this injustice before we give mining companies new perks, even if they can be justified, and enacting a royalty and reclamation fee is a healthy start on that process.

I thank, again, Senators MURKOWSKI and MANCHIN for their work. I hope we can return to the regular order, to the idea that we are going to have a bill on the floor and that we can have amendments and have the process work as it normally does and improve the bill on these important points. If we cannot, I think the path for this bill becomes much harder.

Now, on another subject before I conclude, I want to voice my support for the remarks Senator GRASSLEY gave earlier today on the oil and gas royalties. We filed an amendment together, based on our bill, to update those royalties and other leasing items for the first time in 100 years. It is a long overdue topic, and I hope to see increasing bipartisan support in the near future.

We have a historic oil boom in this country, much of which is using public lands, and the public has a right to see a fair value for those resources.

We also have a large and growing budget deficit and a major climate change problem. Bringing oil and gas royalties into the 21st century would be a bipartisan win on all of those fronts.

I yield the floor. I see my good friend, the Senator from Tennessee, is here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

TENNESSEE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I am on the floor to speak about the coronavirus, but first let me express to the families in Tennessee my heartfelt concern for them as the result of a tornado that swept through Middle Tennessee last night while people were sleeping.

The number of deaths is 22 so far in Nashville, and in Wilson, Putnam, and

Benton Counties. I have seen floods, and I have seen fires. The damage they cause is terrible, but there is nothing quite like seeing what a tornado can do. It can arrive in 30 seconds or 1 minute and be gone and leave behind it death and buildings laid flat to the ground. I can't imagine what it must be like for that to happen at 1 in the morning when nobody knows it is coming.

I will be in Tennessee on Friday when the Senate concludes its business this week and will be visiting those areas. Our office has been in touch with mayors in all of the counties and communities affected. Senator BLACKBURN and I are working together, along with the rest of the Tennessee delegation in the House, to make certain that we give full Federal support to Governor Lee. The President talked to Governor Lee today, and, as a result of that call, the White House put out a statement indicating the President may be in Tennessee on Friday. That would be welcomed as well.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. President, let me speak for a moment about the coronavirus. The country was transfixed by the impeachment process for about a month, and now they are transfixed by the coronavirus, but this is different. This is personal. This could affect each of us. When I am home—and I am sure when the Presiding Officer is home—there are lots of questions about the coronavirus.

I want to speak this morning about a hearing that we had in the Senate's Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee that was reassuring to me and, I think, to the Democrats as well as the Republicans there. It was reassuring because we had four respected professionals from the government with broad experience in dealing with public health crises—whether it is anthrax, Ebola, or other coronaviruses. We have had all of that in the United States in the last 25 years, and we have dealt with that.

At the end of the hearing, Senator MURRAY, the ranking Democrat on the committee, and I, and the Democrats on committee who aren't bashful, and the Republicans on committee who aren't bashful, but I think I can speak for them in saying those four professionals, many of whom have worked for 25 or 30 years in terms of helping our country deal with health crises, continue to earn our respect. We believe what they tell us, and they promised to tell us the truth.

When I saw the Vice President earlier today, I said to him: Mr. Vice President, I am glad that you have been placed in charge of this. As a former Governor, I think it makes sense to place a Vice President—that indicates the highest level of attention—and a former Governor, someone who is accustomed to working with States and local governments, in charge of a problem that is going to be solved primarily by our exceptional State and local public health systems. So I think

you are exactly the right person to be in charge.

My advice to him was to let the professionals do the talking because people believe them. If the President and the Vice President give their view, they are entitled to do it, but someone will think they are simply justifying what they are doing. If the Democrats, on the other hand, say something about the coronavirus response, someone will think, well, they are just criticizing President Trump.

But if Dr. Fauci, for example, who for over 35 years—since 1984, which is a long time, working for President Reagan, President H. W. Bush, President Clinton, President George W. Bush, President Obama, and President Trump; working on HIV/AIDS; working on anthrax; working on two Ebola epidemics—if Dr. Fauci answers a question and tells us something, we believe that. What we need is accurate information for the American people about exactly where we stand with this crisis and what we need to do in Congress that we have not already done.

So, in the next few minutes, I would like to talk about what we heard this morning and to compliment those four professionals who were there:

Dr. Anne Schuchat, is the Principal Deputy Director of the Centers for Disease Control. She has had 30 years working with infectious diseases, most of that time with the CDC.

Dr. Fauci I just described, working with six Presidents. I believe he has virtually universal respect here for truth-telling and competence.

Dr. Robert Kadlec. He is the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response at the Department of Health and Human Services. He used to advise the Department of Defense, and then he helped Senator BARR to write the legislation that set up the agency that helps us be better prepared to deal with such health crises as we might experience here.

Then Dr. Stephen Hahn. He is the newest one of the four in terms of coming to the government, but he has been the head of the MD Anderson Cancer Center in Texas, one of the most respected institutions in the world.

So those are the professionals that we heard this morning.

Now, what did we hear? We heard that the coronavirus is alarming in terms of what is happening around the world. There are 90,000 cases or more and 3,000 deaths. All of this has happened in the last 2, 2½ months, so far as we know.

What has happened at home? What has happened at home here in the United States is that we have slightly more than 100 cases that are detected. About half of those are Americans who were traveling and had to be brought home and were repatriated, as we say, and the other half have been detected here. Unfortunately, we have had six deaths.

It is fair to say that citizens in the United States are at low risk for infec-

tion from the coronavirus, but you don't have to take my word for it. Take the word of the professionals who testified this morning before the Senate's Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee or take the words of what the New York Times said a couple of days ago on its front page in the Sunday newspaper in describing the situation in the United States.

Here is what the Times said: "Much about the coronavirus remains unclear, and it is far from certain that the outbreak will reach severe proportions in the United States or affect many regions at once." Continuing, the New York Times: "With its top-notch scientists, modern hospitals and sprawling public health infrastructure, most experts agree, the United States is among the countries best prepared to prevent or manage such an epidemic."

That is the New York Times' front page assessment 2 days ago.

Now, in addition to the possible effect on the lives of Americans, this problem can disrupt our economy. Twenty percent of what we import, according to our Trade Representative, comes from China. So we are not just talking about medicines or masks. We are talking about parts of cars or chemicals, such as those for Eastman Chemical in East Tennessee, which employs thousands of people. It can cause our economy to slow down and economies in the rest of the world to slow down.

The purpose of our hearing this morning was, first, to get an idea of what Americans needed to know about the coronavirus. We learned some things. We learned that, based on the data that we have and that has been received just in the last couple of days from China, we haven't seen many children infected by the coronavirus. They may be, but the average age of the people who seem to be infected by it is 50, and the people who get the sickest are people who are already sick.

The second thing we have learned seems so simple it doesn't seem to be true. What can we do about the coronavirus? How can we keep from getting it? Wash your hands. Wash your hands. I find myself now doing it a few more times a day, and I didn't used to do it as often.

Our hands pick up germs from our cell phones or from the rails we touch or from the hands we shake or from the seats in front of us on the airplane. Then what do we do? We put our hands on our face many more times an hour than most people are aware. That is the single biggest way this spreads.

Wash your hands. That is what Dr. Fauci says—the professional who has been working on these diseases for decades.

Here is something else we learned to put the coronavirus into context. We are just past the peak of the flu season. Most of us know about the flu. We have a vaccine for the flu—not for the coronavirus, but for the flu—and most of us take it. But there are tens of mil-

lions of us who will get the flu this flu season. Fifty thousand Americans, on average, die from the flu each year—50,000 Americans. It might be 30,000 one year and might be 70,000 in a very bad year. But there are a lot of people who die from the flu.

The flu is a respiratory disease, just like the coronavirus is a respiratory disease. It is a different respiratory disease, but the symptoms are similar: fever and a cough.

We also learned this morning from the professionals who told us this: For 80 percent of the people who are infected with the coronavirus, it is a fairly mild experience. Twenty percent—mainly older people—are sicker, and they are the ones who need the attention.

Those are some of the things we learned this morning from the professionals who have been working on epidemics or potential epidemics for a long time.

What should we do about it? Let's start with what we have done about it. I think it is important for the American people to know that. Let's start with Congress. This is not our first rodeo, so to speak. We have faced public health threats for the last 20 years. There are Members of Congress and staff who were here during the anthrax attack in 2001, nearly 20 years ago. In 2003, we saw SARS. That was another type of coronavirus. Then, in 2009, the flu pandemic killed more than 150,000 people around the world. Then there were the Ebola outbreaks in 2014 and 2018.

After every one of those incidents, Congress, working with Democratic and Republican Presidents, tried to prepare the Federal Government to be ready for the next problem.

After anthrax, we created Project BioShield to develop and stockpile new treatments and vaccines. After the 2003 SARS outbreak, in 2006, Congress created the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act. Senator BARR of North Carolina was the principal author. It guides the government on how to respond to public health emergencies, and it created a fund the government can use to respond quickly to problems that come up.

Last year, Congress provided more than \$4 billion for public health and preparedness programs. When a crisis occurs, like this coronavirus—all of which has happened since the first of the year, maybe a little since December, but mostly since the first of the year—money is often needed quickly, so Congress created a couple of funds the agencies can take money from. One of them is the Rapid Response Fund. Secretary Azar has already taken \$105 million from that fund for this healthcare issue. We have given him the authority to take another \$136 million, which he has done.

The President has recommended \$2.5 billion more. Congress, with many different suggestions having been made,

this week is likely to approve additional funding to do whatever our professionals tell us needs to be done to keep us safe and help protect our economy.

In addition to what Congress has done, our various Presidents have done even more. For example, President Obama, if you will remember, sent our military to Africa to deal with the Ebola outbreak before it came here. That was quite an extraordinary action. President George W. Bush sent Centers for Disease Control scientists around the world to help with the SARS epidemic. In the same way, President Trump has done something that hasn't been done in this country for over 50 years. At a time when there were only six confirmed cases of coronavirus in the United States, this administration announced they would quarantine Americans who may have been exposed to the virus while in China and would not allow foreign nationals who traveled to China in the last 14 days to enter the United States, and warned Americans not to travel to China and, more recently, to think more carefully about traveling to parts of Italy or South Korea. The President added Iran to these travel restrictions more recently.

Dr. Fauci, the National Institutes of Health professional whom we heard from this morning, said that without those Executive actions, we would have many more cases right now.

The third thing the administration has done is to develop a test to diagnose whether you have the coronavirus. We didn't have that before because this is a new virus. The administration is rapidly working on that—not as fast as everyone would like, but fast, so far as I can tell.

The FDA is working with 65 private sector test developers in addition to the 46 labs in 38 States who are using the Centers for Disease Control test. The goal is to have in place kits that will allow 1 million tests to be done shortly.

As far as a vaccine, the professionals are working on a vaccine more rapidly than any vaccine ever before, but it still takes more than a year. However, the President met with drug manufacturers to see if existing treatments might be used earlier. Our National Laboratories have gotten involved as well.

As we look at the impact of the coronavirus, we think mostly about our own health, but we also see other issues, such as the effect on our economy. 13 percent of the facilities that make active ingredients for drugs are in China. We need to take a look at that.

I would like to conclude where I started. People ask me: What can we do about the coronavirus? The answer is as simple as wash your hands, drink a lot of water, and isolate yourself if you feel sick. If you have a fever and a cough, call your doctor. Stay home, and don't infect your neighbors.

Are we going to be able to contain the coronavirus in the United States? I go back to what the New York Times said on its front page on Sunday. We have experienced dealing with new diseases in the United States. We have professionals who, for several decades through several administrations, both Democratic and Republican, have been successful in doing that. We have Presidents, both Democratic and Republican, who have taken strong Executive action, including this one, to protect the American people.

In short, while this is an alarming problem around the world—surely, more Americans will become infected—most experts agree that we are fortunate that the United States is the country in the world with the scientists, with the resources, and with the experience to do the best possible job of containing the spread of this virus.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Vermont.

55TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLOODY SUNDAY

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, 55 years ago, a courageous band of civil rights activists, including the fearless JOHN LEWIS, began a march for what many of us considered a sacred right to vote. They marched from Selma to Montgomery, and they marched in the face of unspeakable violence. They shed their blood for access to the ballot. While much has changed in the last 55 years, this struggle for voting equality, and this march for progress, continues.

On Sunday, I was inspired yet again by my hero, my dear friend, now-Congressman JOHN LEWIS, who summoned depthless strength to lead thousands in commemorating the anniversary of Bloody Sunday. This was not merely a commemoration; it was a clarion call to action. Those of us who know the Congressman know he has been seriously ill but has not given up the fight. In fact, Congressman LEWIS's voice booming over the crowd reminded us all to "continue to fight . . . now more than ever."

"I'm not going to give up," he thundered. "I'm not going to give in." I am proud to stand with my dear friend, Congressman JOHN LEWIS.

In the past several years, a number of States have done all they could to disenfranchise tens of thousands of minority voters. Their tactics were often brazen and transparent. While these voter suppression schemes took many forms—from sweeping purges of voter rolls to arbitrary, new identification requirements—they all shared one purpose and one purpose alone: making voting more difficult for minorities and the marginalized. As a Federal judge observed when he struck down one such State's voter ID law, it sought to disenfranchise "African Americans with almost surgical precision."

Today, we are seeing a reprise of these efforts ahead of one of the most consequential elections in the history

of our democracy. Those doing the suppressions don't even pretend to hide their intent.

In November, a senior adviser to President Trump's reelection campaign came right out and said the quiet part, but he said it out loud. He observed that "traditionally . . . Republicans [suppress] votes," and then he predicted that voter suppression is "going to be a much bigger program, a much more aggressive program" in 2020.

In May 2019, Tennessee enacted a draconian law imposing criminal penalties against voter registration groups who submitted so-called deficient registration forms. In October 2019, Florida's State legislature tried to undo a constitutional amendment overwhelmingly approved by Floridians to restore voting rights to former felons. This is something we take for granted in Vermont—that they can vote. These efforts have thankfully been halted, at least temporarily, in the courts. There will be other States that attempt what Florida and Tennessee tried—or even worse. And those who value the sanctity of the vote will be engaged in an endless war of Whac-A-Mole in the courts to stop these un-American efforts to suppress the right to vote.

Why have States been given such free rein to suppress the minority vote? It is because of the disastrous 2013 Supreme Court decision, *Shelby County v. Holder*. That gutted section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, which had been voted on by both Democrats and Republicans. It gutted it. It crippled the Federal Government's ability to proactively prevent discriminatory changes to State voting laws.

In the wake of *Shelby County*, States have unleashed a torrent of voter suppression schemes, some almost immediately after the decision came down, knowing full well that the Federal Government can no longer serve as a shield against disenfranchisement. Our democracy depends on these changes—and changing now. The proliferation, the threats to the right to vote in the wake of *Shelby County*, makes it unmistakably clear that we need the full protections of the Voting Rights Act.

That is exactly why, for years, I have championed, authored, and I have reintroduced the Voting Rights Advancement Act. I reintroduced this legislation again in 2019. I note it is a bipartisan bill. I should repeat this. It is a bipartisan bill. Republicans and Democrats alike support it to restore section 5 of the Voting Rights Act and improve and modernize that landmark legislation, and provide the Federal Government with other critical tools to combat this full-fledged assault on the franchise.

A total of 47 Senators publicly stated they support this commonsense effort to protect the right to vote. Why don't we bring it to a vote? If people want to continue these suppressions, let them vote that way. If they want to allow people to vote, let them vote that way. If the majority leader would simply let

it come to a vote—right now it is being stopped by one person. If the majority leader would simply let it come to a vote, it would pass. The House has already passed its companion version of my legislation.

I find it offensive for those who claim this bipartisan, bicameral legislation is some kind of partisan power grab. In America, it is the governed who possess the power. Restoring their power is not partisan. Restoring their power is what it means to be a democracy.

I say to my friend the majority leader, to Senator MCCONNELL: All eyes are on you. Will he release the Voting Rights Advancement Act from his legislative graveyard and do it before the elections? Will he simply allow an up-or-down vote on this legislation to restore the bipartisan Voting Rights Act of 1965? History is watching.

As my hero and friend JOHN LEWIS powerfully reminded us this past Sunday, “We’ve got to make America better for all of her people. . . . We’re one people, we’re one family.” I agree. The right to vote for all Americans is the beating heart of our form of government. Indeed, it is the very right that gives democracy its name. Let us show the world we are deserving of that name. Let us show the world the conscience of the Senate is that we will go forward and vote it—vote for it or vote against it but vote it. Don’t just keep it from coming to a vote.

Unfortunately, when you keep it from coming to a vote, it looks too much like what we are trying to do to a lot of people, especially minorities in this country, is keep them from voting. We have Republicans and Democrats in this body. Let us vote up or down on this. Most importantly, as we do in my State of Vermont, we fight to make sure every Vermonter gets to vote no matter what their party is, no matter where they live, no matter who they are. Let’s see if we can do that for the rest of the country. We would be a better country for it.

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.

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

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

S. 2657

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the American Energy Innovation Act—a compilation of energy-related measures that has been reported, with bipartisan support, by the Senate’s Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Let me start by recognizing the tremendous efforts of the very committed and dedicated chairman of that committee, LISA MURKOWSKI, and of the ranking member, JOE MANCHIN, and their work in bringing this comprehen-

sive energy package to the Senate floor. Under their leadership, the committee has worked very hard to craft a bipartisan package that seeks to lower energy costs for consumers, to diversify our energy portfolio, and to facilitate and encourage the use of cleaner energy sources.

The American Energy Innovation Act includes several bills that I either authored or cosponsored, including the Better Energy Storage Technology Act, known as the BEST Act, which supports energy storage research and development; the Weatherization Enhancement and Local Energy Efficiency Investment and Accountability Act, which reauthorizes the Weatherization Assistance Program; the Wind Energy Research and Development Act, which supports targeted investments in wind energy; and the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act, as well as the Streamlining Energy Efficiency for Schools Act, which both promote energy efficiency.

I am particularly pleased that this agreement includes legislation I authored with Senator HEINRICH. It is what is known as the BEST Act, the Better Energy Storage Technology Act. This bipartisan bill would support energy storage research and development, which would, in turn, advance the deployment of renewable energy. Federal investments in the research, development, and deployment of energy storage technologies would enable the expansion of renewable energy sources that are essential in combating climate change.

Energy storage systems actually provide a wide range of benefits. First, these technologies increase the reliability and resiliency of our electric grid by limiting potential disruptions. Energy storage allows for the better management of supply and demand on our Nation’s power grid.

Second, this type of technology can decrease energy costs. In the State of Maine, the price of electricity can rise steeply during the coldest days of the year. In late 2017 and early 2018, very cold temperatures in New England led to higher energy costs that amounted to more than \$1 billion being spent in the wholesale energy market in only 15 days.

The next generation of energy storage technologies could also help to transform our grid, meaning that we would no longer need to generate more expensive power to meet demand during the hottest and coldest days of the year. Instead, we could use more affordable sources of energy that have been stored for later use.

Finally, energy storage systems can allow for more intermittent renewable sources, such as wind or solar power, to be placed on the grid and to be used precisely when they are needed. Think of that. Right now, if the wind is not blowing, obviously we are not producing wind energy. If the Sun is not shining, we are not producing solar-generated energy. Yet, if during those

windy periods and on those sunny days we could figure out how to store the energy that is produced so that it may be released later for electricity on the grid, what a difference it would make.

Off the coast of Maine, offshore wind turbines can produce electricity almost 50 percent of the time due to our relatively persistent offshore winds, but with next-generation energy storage technology, we could utilize this wind power closer to 100 percent of the time by storing the electricity that is produced so that it may be used when the wind is not blowing. That is why I am so excited about the potential for improving our energy storage technologies.

We all think of batteries. Certainly, coming up with better, more efficient batteries with which to store electricity is part of the answer, but there are other technologies that are going to be available if we make a concerted effort to devote resources to research and development and deployment.

For these reasons, I am especially delighted that the BEST Act was included in this package, and I hope it will be enacted swiftly.

Next, I would like to turn to a program that is very important to many low-income families and seniors in the State of Maine, and that is the weatherization program. I thank Senators MURKOWSKI and MANCHIN for including the bill that I authored with Senators COONS, REED, and SHAHEEN that reauthorizes the Weatherization Assistance Program.

Through my position on the Committee on Appropriations, I have worked with my colleagues to secure an increase of \$51 million for weatherization assistance for fiscal year 2020. In fact, virtually every year, this is something on which I and the Senators whom I mentioned work together to achieve. Oftentimes, regrettably, the President’s budget eliminates the funding for the weatherization program, but with bipartisan support, the members of the Committee on Appropriations work hard to include it in the funding bills. One reason we do so is that, whether it is insulating them or replacing windows or installing heat pumps, weatherizing our houses pays off. In fact, on average, weatherization returns a 4 to 1 on the investment.

Since 2010, the State of Maine has received a little more than \$22 million in funding, and it has been able to successfully weatherize nearly 2,500 homes and rental units across the State. What a difference that has made to the families who live in those homes and to the seniors who were once living in drafty homes, for their energy costs were much higher than they needed to be because their homes were not well insulated. It also makes those homes a lot more comfortable for our seniors and low-income families.

Encouraging the adoption of energy efficiency measures is one of the easiest, yet effective mechanisms for reducing energy consumption, lessening

pollution, and ultimately saving money for families, businesses, communities, and governments at all levels.

In addition to weatherization, this comprehensive package supports crucial investments in renewable energy, including the Wind Energy Research and Development Act that I introduced with Senator SMITH. This bill would reauthorize the Department of Energy's Office of Wind Energy. It would support grants in order to improve the efficiency, reliability, and capacity of wind energy generation. The Aqua Ventus program, which aims to be the first floating, deepwater, offshore wind project in the United States, has been under development by the University of Maine and a consortium of both public and private partners for many years now. That consortium and the University of Maine, in particular, could benefit from these targeted investments in offshore wind energy.

Finally, another important component of this comprehensive bill is energy efficiency. I am pleased that the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act is included in this package. As an original cosponsor of this bill, which is also known as the Portman-Shaheen energy efficiency legislation, I recognize that it can kick-start the use of energy efficiency technologies that are commercially available right now and can be deployed by residential, commercial, and industrial energy users. It can also improve the energy efficiency of the Federal Government, which happens to be our Nation's largest consumer of energy.

I congratulate the bill's sponsors, Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN, for crafting this commonsense bill and for their relentless efforts in getting it across the finish line.

Again, I express my appreciation to Chairman MURKOWSKI and Ranking Member MANCHIN.

I would also like to highlight another energy efficiency bill that is included in this package, and that is the Streamlining Energy Efficiency for Schools Act, which I sponsored with Senator MARK WARNER.

In Maine, our schools have made tremendous progress on energy efficiency, but it can be challenging for schools to take full advantage of programs that lower energy costs, in part because school officials may not know where to start. A lot of these programs are scattered in different agencies across the Federal Government.

Our bipartisan bill would create a coordinating structure within the Department of Energy that would streamline available Federal energy efficiency programs, assist school administrators with navigating available Federal financing, and thus reduce school buildings' energy costs.

Again, I want to thank the committee leaders for their excellent work on this package of energy legislation, and I would urge all of my colleagues

to join me in supporting the adoption of the American Energy Innovation Act. This is an area where we can truly make a difference for our constituents, our communities, our States, our levels of government, and for our country.

Let's get on with the adoption of this very worthwhile package of energy bills.

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

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

STEPHEN SCHWARTZ

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the U.S. Senate used to be called the greatest deliberative body in the world. It is the Senate where, at this desk, Hugo Black wrote labor law reform. Essentially, he and another Senator in the U.S. Senate and President Roosevelt created collective bargaining. It is the desk in the Senate Chamber where Senator McGovern from South Dakota passed legislation with Senator Dole across the aisle for feeding programs for hungry people in the United States.

I just met with a number of people from the Cleveland Food Bank, the Middle Ohio Food Bank, and Second Harvest Food Bank. The McGovern-Dole legislation also fed hungry kids around the world.

This is the body that used to do those kinds of things—the greatest deliberative body in the world. But under Leader MCCONNELL, whose office is down the hall, we see something different. The focus of this body has pretty much been one job, and that is confirming young, 38-, 40-, 42-, and 45-year-old judges—extreme judges—who always put their thumbs on the scale to support corporations over workers, to support Wall Street over consumers, and who put their thumbs on the scale to support insurance companies over patients and drug companies over patients. Even by the low standards—and, my gosh, they are low—we have come to expect from Senator MCCONNELL and the majority in always, always supporting the rich, always fighting for the largest corporations, always fighting for the people who have privilege against struggling families, against workers—40 percent of people in this country don't have \$400 to their name if they have an emergency to meet. Instead of dealing with that issue, it is more tax cuts for the rich. It is more cuts to Medicaid or to food stamps or to the SNAP program or any of these things.

Even by the low standards we have come to expect from Leader MCCONNELL and President Trump, this nomination I am going to talk about today, Stephen Schwartz, is appalling. In one sentence, he wants to abolish Social Security—not scale back the cost of

living, not throw a few people off Social Security disability, not eliminate survivors' benefits; he wants to abolish Social Security. You heard that right.

President Trump, on the stump—he came to Ohio many times, my State, and around the country—promised he would protect Social Security, but now he puts Stephen Schwartz on the bench, a judge who wants to abolish it.

Stephen Schwartz wrote that Social Security benefits were intended to prevent "outright starvation." He wasn't sitting at this desk, to be sure, in the 1930s when Social Security was started. Obviously, he didn't understand that Social Security was one of three legs of the stool: Social Security, private pension—we don't have too many of those anymore—and then savings that workers were able to accrue.

He says that Social Security was there to prevent "outright starvation," that Social Security has "become a standard component of most retirement programs." That is kind of the point, to make sure that every single American who works her whole life and pays into the system can have a decent retirement. But for this man, Stephen Schwartz, the man President Trump and Leader MCCONNELL want to put on a Federal court with jurisdiction—this isn't one of those lifetime judges who are in one district that can do a little bit of damage in the Northern District of Ohio or in the Southern District of Alabama—they can do plenty of damage. But this is a man whom President Trump and Leader MCCONNELL want to put on a Federal court with jurisdiction over the whole country. As long as people aren't literally starving to death in retirement, that is enough, he seems to think.

I would like Mr. Schwartz to come to Ohio. I would like him to come to Garfield Heights. My wife and I live in the city of Cleveland. Garfield Heights borders the city of Cleveland. I would like him to come to Garfield Heights and go to Carlo's Barber Shop with me someday and just listen to people talk. Carlo cuts the hair of a whole lot of retired people. I would love to hear him listen to the retired machinist or the retired teacher and say to them that this gentleman wants to serve in the Federal Government, appointed by the President of the United States, and thinks that Social Security should be eliminated. I want him to talk to the nurses and the barbers and the teachers. I want him to talk to Americans who have paid into Social Security for their whole lives.

Social Security is called social insurance. It is like unemployment benefits. It is like Medicare. Social Security—you pay in every paycheck unless you are really rich. Then you only pay in for a few months. But you pay into it every paycheck, understanding that it is insurance, it is social insurance. You pay in, and then when you retire or if you get disabled—or if you die, your children get the survivors' benefits. You pay in, paycheck after paycheck

after paycheck, and then when you need it—that is the whole point of insurance—for disability, when you need it for survivors' benefits, if someone in the family—if the breadwinner in the family dies or you need it for retirement, then you get it.

It is one more broken promise to workers by President Trump, one more betrayal.

Remember, at the beginning of the year, President Trump went to Davos, that sort of hoity-toity place in Switzerland. While he was hobnobbing with the global elite, he let slip his plan. He changed his mind the next day, but it is clear what he wanted. After his tax handouts to billionaires and corporations blew up the deficit, President Trump said he wants to pay for those tax cuts—remember, 70 percent of the Trump tax cuts went to the richest 1 percent.

That is why a year and a half ago you saw the lobbyists going in and out of MITCH MCCONNELL's office, the leader's office, all saying: I want this tax cut for this company and this tax cut for that company. He wants to pay for all that—the President said he wants to pay for it by cutting Social Security and Medicare. Think about that. All these people pay into Social Security and pay into Medicare every day of their working lives—people starting at 16 or 15 or 17—they pay that throughout their working lives, and then the President says he wants to cut Medicare and Social Security in order to pay for tax cuts for rich people.

He sold his giveaway to the wealthy as a tax cut for the working people. It wasn't. He sold his tax cut to the wealthy by saying it would raise wages. It didn't. People see Trump's tax scam for what it really was: a giveaway to corporations and the wealthiest tiny sliver, the 1 percent of this country.

He said over and over that it would mean raises for workers. He promised that somehow these massive corporate tax cuts, these giveaways to companies, would end up in workers' pockets. I heard him pledge to a group of Senators at the White House in the relatively small Cabinet Room—I heard him say that everybody is going to get a \$4,000 raise. Well, not. They obviously didn't.

He told workers last year, the month after he signed the law: You are going to start seeing a lot more money in your paycheck.

One lie after another. He did say, though, after signing the bill, when he went to Mar-a-Lago and hung around with his millionaire and billionaire friends: I made you a lot richer today when I signed that tax cut. He did live up to that promise when he made them richer. It just didn't trickle down, shall we say, to people making \$30,000, \$50,000, and \$80,000 a year.

Instead of investing in workers, these corporations bought back trillions of dollars of their own stock to line investors' pockets. Meanwhile, the deficit

exploded. We know what the corporate crowd's plan always is to deal with deficits. You come into office, you cut taxes on rich people. The deficit goes up to over \$1 trillion. So what do you do? Oh, my gosh, the deficit is up. We have to cut spending. Go after Medicare. Go after Social Security. Go after Medicaid. Go after SNAP. Go after, in my State, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, the MEP, which helps local businesses create jobs. He cut that to zero. He has cut programs and all kinds of things that matter to working-class, middle-class, and small-business Americans, all to pay for that tax cut. So much of what he does now is to pay for that tax cut that blew a hole in the deficit.

It all comes back to whose side you are on. Do you stand with corporations, or do you stand with workers? Do you fight for Wall Street, or do you care about the dignity of work and live the dignity of work? We know for whom Stephen Schwartz fights. He spent his whole career trying to block protections for workers and students. He tried to stop people from voting in North Carolina. He has argued against the retirement securities that workers paid into their whole lives. And this is his reward. He has fought voting rights. He has worked to put Social Security out of business. He has always stood with the most privileged and the richest, and this is his reward from the President of the United States and his reward from Senator MCCONNELL, who sits in the front of this room.

That is why he doesn't belong on the Federal bench. If you love this country, you fight for the people who make it work. President Trump promised to fight for American workers, but this President betrayed American workers again and again and again.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MCSALLY). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

S. 2657

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, as I mentioned yesterday as we were preparing to vote on the motion to proceed to the American Energy Innovation Act, there is much to like and much to support in this energy reform legislation we have proposed.

We are in the early stages here of legislating, and I think it is probably fair to say that perhaps we are a little rusty. As we have told Members, we hope to have a process that allows for amendments from both sides, that gives us an opportunity to debate these important and timely issues.

As we legislate and as we move through each step, it does require a level of cooperation. Again, as I mentioned, we haven't been legislating on a weekly basis, so when it comes to just

the process and the procedure of how this all comes together, maybe we are still in a little bit of a learning curve.

I have had an opportunity in previous Congresses to be that first legislative vehicle that we have really taken on in a period of time. We have worked through some of them successfully before—one, famously unsuccessful. I don't want this to fall into the "famously unsuccessful" category, so I am encouraging Members to look critically at the bill we have introduced, the American Energy Innovation Act, and work with us through this amendment process. We have received a number of what I would put in the "non-controversial bucket" category that I am hoping we will be able to accept, and I am hoping we can work together to incorporate those into our underlying measure.

I wanted to take just a few minutes this afternoon to highlight why the innovation title within the American Energy Innovation Act is so important and what this bill will do to help support and increase innovation in America.

When you think about who we are as Americans, what we are built on, we are built on a foundation of ingenuity and innovation. We pioneered the electric grid system. We pioneered nuclear energy. We pioneered horizontal drilling. These are many of the life-, economy-, and world-changing technologies that you think of in this energy space, and the United States has led in these areas. But the policies underlying Federal energy R&D have not been updated now in more than 12 years—a dozen years since we have last updated, refreshed, modernized. So the question is whether they fully reflect the range of opportunities and challenges that we have, and I would submit to you that they do not. We haven't kept pace with everything that is happening around us. It is important—it is incumbent upon us to look to our policies.

Modernizing our energy laws will support the scientific work undertaken by the Department of Energy, by our National Laboratories, and by our universities. It will also support the men and the women who dedicate their careers to scientific pursuits, individuals who truly form the backbone of American R&D and are a tremendous asset to our country.

As I mentioned yesterday, those of us on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee have spent the last year putting together this innovation package. Throughout that process, what we heard in committee from the experts was that three of the most promising technologies for clean energy are energy storage; advanced nuclear; and carbon capture, utilization, and storage. These three areas, we are told, are where the promise really is if you want to focus on clean energy solutions. Our composite bill prioritizes all three technologies, as well as renewable energy and industrial and vehicle technologies.

CCUS—carbon capture, utilization, and storage—technologies will allow coal and natural gas plants to avoid greenhouse gas emissions and even allow us to make useful products from carbon dioxide. I have had an opportunity and I know some other colleagues have had an opportunity to go to some of these laboratories—not only in this country but overseas—where we are taking that carbon, that waste product, and we are turning it into value—in other words, building materials, whether it is a sheetrock type of a process or whether it is the equivalent of cinder blocks made out of carbon, that waste. When we can change this so we are taking a waste product and converting it to value—talk about technologies that can really change how we operate.

Again, the carbon capture, utilization, and storage technologies will allow us to advance in that direction. The bill also includes demonstration and deployment programs that focus on industrial emissions and direct air capture, which will similarly reduce emissions.

When you think about the prospects and the possibilities for us with direct air capture, it was not too many years ago that it was a dream concept. Now it is no longer a dream concept. We are truly in the process of evaluating and piloting some of these technologies.

I mentioned nuclear energy as one of the three. Nuclear energy is our Nation's largest and most reliable source of zero-emission electricity. Within this subtitle of this bill, we have included the legislation I have been working on, the Nuclear Energy Leadership Act, which would demonstrate advanced reactors to help restore our national leadership and keep our domestic industry competitive with the likes of Russia and China.

You have the CCUS and nuclear energy. The third area—the third really transformative area—is storage. This is, without a doubt, probably the most popular topic within our bill. We have included the BEST Act from Senator COLLINS, which creates a crosscutting energy storage R&D program at the Department of Energy. Its focus is on long-duration energy storage that can smooth out variable renewable energy generation. This is a very significant part of our bill.

With regard to industrial energy, our innovation package includes language that Senator WHITEHOUSE authored to create a crosscutting R&D program to reduce emissions in seven areas, including chemical production, steel and aluminum, high temperature process heat generation, and industrial carbon capture.

I think you will see from that provision that, again, it is making inroads into those areas where we see the highest emissions within our industrial energy sector. As we see consumers demanding cleaner products, know that our bill helps ensure that American industries are going to be prepared to deliver on that.

Another area where we are pushing forward, of course, is renewable energy, which we look at and say has the opportunity to provide nearly limitless power across America. The costs of many of these technologies we have already seen come down significantly. We take reasonable steps within this bill to move wind, solar, geothermal, marine, hydrokinetic, and other renewables to full commercialization.

To give some specifics in this space, in geothermal energy, we provide opportunities to responsibly develop more of the resource with new techniques and to coproduce critical minerals along with it.

In my State of Alaska, we have enormous potential within the geothermal space. Knowing that within this title, we have an opportunity to really help move out some of the new techniques that are out there is significant.

For solar energy, we are working on new applications like solar paint, addressing grid integration challenges, and improving recycling. For marine energy—marine hydrokinetic—we are developing offshore testing centers to scale up new concepts.

I remind colleagues, I come from a State where we have more coastline than the entire United States put together of all the coastal States there. This is an area that I have long looked to and said: Why are we not doing more when it comes to tapping into our marine energy sources?

Our wind energy provisions include offshore and floating wind development and demonstration activities. We are working to push out in the renewable sector some of these areas where we are still pioneering in many of these ways. We have demonstrated wind on land with great efficiency. How are we doing with offshore? What more can we be doing there?

By providing the Department of Energy with new tools and direction, we are helping to ensure the United States remains the world leader in innovative technologies.

One of the challenges we hear about as we discuss these cool things in the Energy Committee is how you get these great cutting-edge ideas from the lab to the market. To address that, our bill reauthorizes the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy. This is ARPA-E. This is the entity that helps these nascent technologies bridge the so-called valley of death and reach commercialization. ARPA-E has already delivered significant results with nearly \$3 billion in follow-on private financing for its projects.

We had the Secretary for the Department of Energy, Secretary Brouillette, before the committee just today on a budget hearing. He heard repeatedly from members on both sides of the aisle the value that comes from ARPA-E. Of course, developing new and cleaner and more affordable technologies doesn't benefit us just here at home; it can also make a meaningful impact around the world.

We shouldn't just develop and deploy new technologies at home. We should also sell them to other countries around the world. This is an incredible opportunity for economic growth. We know that we will simultaneously lower global greenhouse gas emissions and help to cement geopolitical relationships that can span generations.

We will be discussing more of the component pieces within the American Energy Innovation Act. You are going to continue to hear me say that this is good legislation, this is important legislation, this is timely legislation—after 12 years. But you don't necessarily have to take my word for it. Consider the work of the American Energy Innovation Council, which is led by noted individuals, luminaries, like Norm Augustine and Bill Gates. They have found that at least 50 percent of the U.S. annual GDP growth can be traced to increases in innovation and that innovation has been the predominant driver of U.S. economic growth over the last century.

When we say that this Energy bill focuses on that innovation, recognize the value that innovation brings to us in the energy sector. The council's members have also observed that advances in energy technology deserve particular attention since energy underlies virtually every facet of modern life. Without a sufficient, reliable, and affordable source of energy, the U.S. economy would grind to a halt.

They are exactly right in their words. Yet the United States continues to allocate less than 0.1 percent of its annual Federal outlays to energy R&D. Put that into context. This is an afterthought in our budget and, unfortunately, in real life for too many Americans. We take for granted that when you pull up to the gas station, they are going to have fuel there. We take for granted that when you flip the light switch, the lights are going to come on. The reality is, it takes a tremendous amount of work to make that happen. It is innovation that brings this all to us.

Innovation is worth it. The proof is literally around us with everything we do. Given our history, given our people, given our institutions, I know this country can continue to lead the way on new technologies. What we need to do is make sure we have policies that help further incent them, that do not drag down that opportunity to meet those challenges.

I am confident that we have a good bill in front of us, a strong bill in front of us. I appreciate the support that the Senate has shown for our bill thus far. I look forward to working on amendments as the week continues. I urge colleagues to provide us with those matters that you have been working on. We want to try to accommodate, but we also recognize that we haven't been in this process before where we have had the opportunity for open amendments. We want to try do it right. We want to try to be efficient, as

we do in the Energy Committee, and we want to be fair to our colleagues.

With that, I look forward to the input and the cooperation from fellow Senators as we proceed with the discussion about the American Energy Innovation Act.

With that, I yield the floor.

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I am here today for the 267th time to call this Chamber to wake up to the threat of climate change. My chart here is getting a little dog-eared with use.

Let me dive right in with a report from over 30 years ago that was presented to a major conference here in Washington, DC. On the very first page of this report it says:

Increases in atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and other key gases . . . that are opaque to portions of the infrared spectrum result in the "greenhouse effect" or global warming. When short wavelength infrared radiation from the sun warms the earth's surface, and this heat is later radiated from the earth, some gases in the atmosphere are not transparent to the longer wavelength re-radiation, the heat does not escape, and the atmosphere becomes warmer, much as does the interior of a greenhouse.

That is a flawless description of climate change. I wonder who wrote it. Well, let me continue.

After some hedging about the state of the science and the uncertainty surrounding how much climate change could be attributed to humans at that point in time, this same report delves into the expected effects of climate change on our planet. It reads:

There is qualitative agreement among prognosticators that sea levels will rise, wetlands will flood, salt water will infuse fresh water supplies, and there will be changes in the distribution of tree and crop species and agricultural productivity.

Wow. That is really accurate. That is all the stuff we are actually seeing happen right now. Gosh, I wonder who wrote that. Let's continue on through the report.

A significant rise in sea levels will flood now habitable land in some countries. . . . Developed countries may be able to protect their cities, at least for some years, by building levees and dikes at a considerable cost to avoid major displacements of people and their economic bases.

We are also seeing that. Impressive—whoever wrote this report really got this quite accurately 30 years ago.

Let me go on with the report:

These same actions will affect wetlands and it may not be possible to protect both coastal and wetland areas.

Once you have built your dike, it pushes water out into wetland areas.

The report says:

Flooding will intrude into water supplies, such as coastal cities (e.g. Miami and New Orleans)

Wow. Who wrote this? This is good.

It continues:

Changes in temperature patterns will affect natural ecosystems by altering the distributions of species, and affecting forestry and silviculture. Under various scenarios, commonly harvested species will move north and try to grow in different soil types. Ranges of particular species are likely to change because trees in the southern part of the present range may die off much more quickly than they can propagate further north

This is all stuff we are seeing now—all predicted 30 years ago in this report. Wow. I wonder who wrote it.

I will continue quoting the report:

Similarly, crop lands will change. In present farm areas, there will be greater reliance on irrigation. The stress will depend on changes in precipitation patterns, which is now difficult (at best) to predict. Grain production will move north and productivity may fall because of differing soil types. Global warming could expand the northern range of livestock disease and pests

Still quoting from this report:

Global warming will affect snowfall patterns, hence melt, and affect water supplies. Most of California's water supplies are from snow melt and if snow is reduced to rain, or melts quickly during the winter, water supplies in the summer will be less than now.

Wow. Thirty years ago they predicted all of that. That is really impressive. Fast forward to today, and that is exactly what we are seeing. All of it is underway already. Sea level rise is already happening. The tide gauge in Naval Station Newport, in my home State of Rhode Island, shows over 10 inches of sea level rise over the last century. Temperatures are up globally, with some areas measuring increases well above 2 degrees Celsius. Wildlife and plants are indeed shifting away from the equator, like the maple trees whose range is creeping out of the United States toward Canada. And, of course, we have seen water tables continue to drop as temperatures rise and snowpack dwindles.

Wow. This report was so accurate. Who wrote it?

Well, let's look for a minute at the prescriptions that the report lays out. What should we do about this problem it describes so accurately? Those prescriptions are pretty good for 30 years ago, too. Here is what its authors reckon on typical, sensible governments would do in response to climate change:

(1) Reduce the emissions of CO₂ by reducing the use or mix of fossil fuels; (2) Reduce the emissions of potential pollutants; (3) Improve energy efficiency; (4) Ban or restrict the manufacture of certain chemicals; and (5) Seek to affect the natural emissions of key chemical compounds.

Wow. Indeed, governments around the world have adopted these policies. There are dozens of carbon pricing regimes in place, including in some of our biggest global competitors, like the program China is rolling out this year. There are comprehensive energy

efficiency programs and bans on climate-damaging chemicals like HFCs and global efforts to harness natural processes like growing trees to sequester carbon.

That is really good prescription, whoever wrote it. This rigorous analysis was so good that its authors eagerly thrust it into the hands of political leaders here in the United States. Not only did the authors present it to the Symposium on Industrial Development and Climate Change in May 1989, but they submitted it to the U.S. House of Representatives at a hearing on the same day. In the hearing, the authors condemned the House committee on climate-related legislation and expressed support for "coordinat[ing] federal research and national global climate change policy efforts."

So who was it? Who was this sensible, forward-thinking group that lauded a smart bill 30 years ago that was designed to prepare us for climate change? Who was it over 30 years ago who presented all of these sound findings and recommendations to international business leaders and to Members of Congress? Who was it? Hold your breath. It was the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—the biggest, most powerful trade group in Washington and one of the biggest obstructors of climate action in Washington today, according to the nonpartisan watchdog Influence Map.

Here is a chart showing the big corporate players in Washington on climate. The good guys are over here on the green side, and the bad guys are over here on the red side. The worst is that climate miscreant, Marathon Petroleum, that is busy messing around with electronic vehicle taxes and messing around with vehicle fuel efficiency standards. Yet, right here, lined up with Phillips 66, the Southern Company, and Marathon Petroleum, is—boom—the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. It is way over on the far side of climate obstruction and denial.

As Influence Map's Dylan Tanner testified last fall, "The U.S. Chamber of Commerce . . . is likely the most authoritative voice of American business," and it has been one of the most ardent opponents of climate action.

It is just gross. The chamber knew about this problem early on. It took its own sound climate report to business leaders and to the U.S. Congress in the 1980s. It described then what we are seeing now. It described then what it has denied since then. It made recommendations that we are still pushing for now. It was poised back then, in the 1980s, to be a part of the solution to climate change—to get onto this problem early before it metastasized into the climate crisis we experience today.

Instead, here is what the chamber did: It opposed one comprehensive climate bill after another in Congress. It opposed them all—the bipartisan cap and trade bill in 2005, the Energy Policy Act. The chamber sent out a Key Vote Alert signal that whoever voted

in favor of the bill could face an onslaught of political attacks in the next election. That is another feature of the chamber's climate obstruction.

It runs TV ads against candidates who might do something about the climate. Here are some hot moments from some of its climate attack ads: If we were to do anything about climate change, obviously, you would be freezing in your bed, wearing your coat while in a sleeping bag with your covers. Clearly, you would have to cook your breakfast over candles, in a tin can, and you would have to walk to work.

That is its crooked, political electioneering image of what doing something about climate change would mean for Americans. There is its logo, proudly, on that whole pack of lies.

In 2007, the chamber ran political TV ads against climate legislation, making all of those threats: People would be prevented from heating their homes. People wouldn't be able to drive to work. People would cook over candles.

Then, in 2009, the chamber led the charge against the Waxman-Markey bill. The chamber tanked Waxman-Markey, and since then, the Republicans in Congress have refused to hold hearings on, to mark up, to debate, or to vote on any legislation that proposes a policy framework for economy-wide reductions in carbon pollution. We have a lost decade, in significant respects, thanks to the misbehavior of the chamber of commerce—the largest, most powerful lobbying force in our country.

The chamber doesn't just try to beat climate action in Congress; the chamber also has fought climate action in the courts, and it has fought climate action in the agencies of the executive branch. Here are some lowlights of chamber mischief:

In 2010, the chamber sued the EPA and sought to overturn the finding that greenhouse gas emissions endanger public health and welfare. Disabling the endangerment finding would cripple the EPA's ability to regulate carbon under the Clean Air Act. When the courts rejected the chamber's lawsuit, the chamber became central command for corporate lawyers, coal lobbyists, and Republican political strategists who devised the legal schemes to fight climate regulations. This produced another chamber lawsuit to block the Clean Power Plan to reduce carbon pollution from powerplants.

Of course, once President Trump took office, the chamber switched from defense and obstruction to offense and began attacking Obama administration rules that limited carbon pollution. The chamber even funded the phony report that President Trump used as his justification for leaving the Paris accord. That is the contribution to this of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. It authored 30 years ago the report that I read from. It made the recommendations 30 years ago about fixing this problem. Then it turned into this climate obstruction, political monster.

Worst of all, the chamber has been fighting science itself. It actually proposed putting the evidence of climate change on trial in what its own officials branded as the "Scopes monkey trial of the 21st century." The chamber said the trial "would be evolution versus creationism." Of course, the chamber has been the 800-pound gorilla in elections that every Member of Congress and candidate for Congress knows all too well.

The 2010 Citizens United decision allowed what we call outside groups, anonymous groups, to spend unlimited sums on electioneering activities. In the wake of that decision, the chamber has funneled, roughly, \$150 million into congressional races—\$150 million. This makes the U.S. Chamber of Commerce the largest spender of undisclosed donations on congressional races—the largest spender of what we call dark money on congressional races.

If you dare cross the chamber or don't subscribe to its climate denial-climate obstruction point of view, you risk its running an ad against you like this ad, which was run against a U.S. Senate candidate in Pennsylvania in 2016. This is toward the end of the ad, and the theory of the ad is that the candidate is so determined to tax energy that she is going to tax the energy of these women's children who are running around on a playground.

Here are two moms on a playground who are watching their children run around, and the setup is: Oh, wow. How energetic Johnny and Billy are. Oh, but don't you know? The Senate campaign is going to tax their energy.

"Run, Jimmy. Run" is the punch line.

Classy.

So what gives? How did the chamber go from being the sensible climate realist to the hardened climate obstructionist?

The answer is pretty simple—fossil fuel money.

As Influence Map's Dylan Tanner told us at our hearing, big trade groups like the chamber tend to adopt the lowest common denominator positions on climate of their most oppositional members. For the chamber, that lowest common denominator is Big Oil and other fossil fuel giants.

Fossil fuel uses the chamber as its tool to defend—at all costs—what the International Monetary Fund estimates as being a \$650 billion subsidy in the United States. That was the number estimated by the IMF for 2015—a \$650 billion subsidy to fossil fuel for getting away with what economists call negative externalities—shoving their costs on other people. If you believe in market economics, those negative externalities should be baked into the cost of the product, but they don't want that. They want the public to bear the cost so they can sell their products cheaper. That is a subsidy, and it is a \$650 billion subsidy every year. So giving the chamber, let's say, \$150 million to spend is chump change

against \$650 billion. That is exactly what the chamber does. It lets itself be used by fossil fuel interests to deliver this message.

What about the rest of the chamber's members? Not everybody in the chamber is a fossil fuel company.

Big tech, what about you guys? You have companies in your ranks who claim to care a lot about the climate.

Google, for instance, has the company motto: "Don't Be Evil." Google warns its investors that climate change threatens its operations, that its "systems are vulnerable to damage or interruption from natural disasters [and] the effects of climate change (such as sea-level rise, drought, flooding, wildfires, and increased storm severity)."

Google also tells investors that "[c]limate change is one of the most significant global challenges of our time" and that it has a goal to reach 100-percent renewable energy for its operations. Google even signed the Corporate Renewable Energy Buyers' Principles and the American Business Act on Climate Pledge. Yet Google also funds the chamber's anti-climate crusade.

I don't know about my colleagues, but Google does not come to my office and say: Hey, you need to do something good on climate. Google has a million issues it lobbies us on, but they are not on climate change. On climate change, it supports the chamber of commerce, and the chamber of commerce is our adversary.

Look at the big food and beverage companies. They have crops—a supply chain of grain and fruit and vegetables. They have crops that the chamber's report of 30 years ago told us would be affected by climate change. Those crops are the bread and butter—the supply chain—of these big food and beverage companies. Where are they?

Many food and beverage companies say they understand the threat of climate change. Pepsi signed the Ceres BICEP Climate Declaration and the Prince of Wales's Corporate Leaders Group Trillion Tonne Communique. Those were both important commitments to climate action. There is Pepsi's rival, Coca-Cola. Coke says it plans to reduce CO₂ emissions by 25 percent and that to do so will work to reduce greenhouse gas emissions across its value chain and make comprehensive carbon footprint reductions across its manufacturing processes, packaging formats, delivery fleet, refrigeration equipment, and ingredient sourcing. Yet both Coke and Pepsi fund the chamber of commerce's denial and obstruction operation, and they fund the American Beverage Association—their little beverage trade association—which, in turn, runs more money to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

What is the net result here in Congress of all of that?

You have two companies that actively reduce their carbon emissions and enthusiastically, publicly, support

good climate policy, but in Congress, through their funding of the chamber, they take the position of opposing climate action here in Washington—the place where it really, really counts.

Decades ago, one of most powerful political forces in Washington, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, knew climate change was coming. It wrote that report. It described how global warming happened. It described what the consequences were going to be in the oceans, in the agricultural sector, across our country. It made regulations as to how to head it off. It understood the risks. It knew. It knew what we needed to do to head off the worst consequences and, even back then, supported legislation to help us prepare.

Then, in came the fossil fuel industry. The chamber will not tell us how they are funded. I could tell you right now how this all worked except that the chamber will not disclose how it is funded. But it sure looks as though floods of fossil fuel money came in and bought the chamber, caused it to change its position on the facts of climate change, caused it to change its position on the consequences of climate change, caused it to change its position on what we needed to do to head off climate change.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce let itself be bought by the fossil fuel industry. And thanks to the greed of that one-member industry, the fossil fuel folks, and thanks to the indifference of the others—thanks to the indifference of the tech sector, the indifference of the ag sector—we still have yet to act, 30 years later.

At the close of the chamber's report is a really telling quote from the satirical comic strip "Pogo." "Pogo," in a legendary cartoon from when I was about as young as the pages here, says: We have met the enemy, and it is us.

The chamber quotes that at the end of its report: "We have met the enemy, and it is us."

Well, that was an observation about what was going wrong with the planet and how it was our emissions that were causing it. We have met the enemy; we see this danger; we understand it; and we are the cause of it. It is us.

But at the same time, it is also like a preconfession by the chamber: "We have met the enemy, and it is us." For 30 years, the chamber has been the enemy. Since Citizens United, it has been an implacable enemy. They have been wrong on climate. They knew it 30 years ago; they know it now.

We need to fix this, and we need corporate America to extract itself from the thrall of the evildoers in its midst, and we need to solve, at last, this problem.

So time to wake up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sen-

ate 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.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 20-12 concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Israel for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$2.40 billion. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,

Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 20-12

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Israel.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment * \$2.25 billion.

Other \$0.15 billion.

Total \$2.40 billion.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Up to eight (8) KC-46 Aircraft

Up to seventeen (17) PW4062 Turbofan Engines (16 installed, 1 spare).

Up to eighteen (18) MAGR 2K-GPS SAASM Receivers (16 installed, 2 spares).

Non-MDE: Also included are AN/ARC-210 U/VHF radios, APX-119 Identification Friend or Foe transponders, initial spares and repair parts, consumables, support equipment, technical data, engineering change proposals, publications, Field Service Representatives (FSRs), repair and return, depot maintenance, training and training equipment, contractor technical and logistics per-

sonnel services, U.S. Government and contractor representative support, Group A and B installation for subsystems, flight test and certification, other related elements of logistics support and training.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (IS-D-YAG).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: March 3, 2020.

* As defined in Section 47

(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Israel—KC-46A Aerial Refueling Aircraft

The Government of Israel has requested to buy up to eight (8) KC-46 aircraft; up to seventeen (17) PW4062 turbofan engines (16 installed, 1 spare); and up to eighteen (18) MAGR 2K-GPS SAASM receivers (16 installed, 2 spares). Also included are AN/ARC-210 U/VHF radios, APX-119 Identification Friend or Foe transponders, initial spares and repair parts, consumables, support equipment, technical data, engineering change proposals, publications, Field Service Representatives (FSRs), repair and return, depot maintenance, training and training equipment, contractor technical and logistics personnel services, U.S. Government and contractor representative support, Group A and B installation for subsystems, flight test and certification, other related elements of logistics support and training. The total estimated program cost is \$2.4 billion.

The United States is committed to the security of Israel, and it is vital to U.S. national interests to assist Israel to develop and maintain a strong and ready self-defense capability. This proposed sale is consistent with those objectives.

The proposed sale further supports the foreign policy and national security of the United States by allowing Israel to provide a redundant capability to U.S. assets within the region, potentially freeing U.S. assets for use elsewhere during times of war. Aerial refueling and strategic airlift are consistently cited as significant shortfalls for our allies. In addition, the sale improves Israel's national security posture as a key U.S. ally. Israel will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractors will be Boeing Corporation, Everett, WA, for the aircraft; and Raytheon Company, Waltham, MA, for the MAGR 2K. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require the assignment of two U.S. field service/contractor representatives to Israel.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 20-12

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The Boeing KC-46 is an aerial refueling aircraft with two (2) Pratt & Whitney Model 4062 (PW4062) Turbofan engines. The KC-46 evolved from the Boeing 767-200ER passenger aircraft and the 767-2C provision freighter. Refueling systems and military avionics have been added to the aircraft.

2. The Miniature Airborne Global Positioning System Receiver 2000 (MAGR 2K)