

about our ability as legislators to remunerate communities struggling during a transition, to ameliorate certain economic challenges, we may agree that legislating provides us the tools to achieve greater pollution reductions at a much lower social and economic cost. So once the Clean Power Plan is established, once it is litigated, and once it is full-on reality, I believe there may be room for compromise.

One more point on the issue of price. We have to do our calculations on an all-in basis. That includes tax expenditures, environmental damage, health impacts, and other so-called externalities. There is plenty of good research which indicates that clean energy technology is already competitive with fossil fuel technology when all costs are added in. Additionally, the cost of solar, wind, and energy efficiency is dropping precipitously and in many places is competing successfully in the free market, even before we consider the costs of pollution.

We will have a couple of battles that are unavoidable—on the Clean Power Plan and likely another run at Keystone—but there are a couple of areas that in my view don't have to be a battle. They are energy efficiency and energy research.

We ought to start with the Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency legislation. I have little doubt that Democrats would support this as a stand-alone bill. Energy efficiency is just common sense, and the energy experts remind us of an idea our mothers and fathers taught us growing up: waste not, want not. In other words, the straightest line toward saving money for people, businesses, and institutions is to help them adopt the latest energy efficiency practices and technologies.

Even this has unfortunately become a partisan issue in the last several Congresses with people worried that light bulb efficiency standards were part of some Orwellian plot. But that is not what these Department of Energy standards do, and it is not what Shaheen-Portman does.

At its core, energy efficiency is simply this: Use less but get the same result. Using less means paying less. Getting the same result means not having to sacrifice our way of life. The idea is not to ask people to do without, the idea is to just get more for our money. It is an old-school, conservative idea. Of course the Shaheen-Portman bill doesn't cost the taxpayers a dime, and projections are that it will create nearly 200,000 jobs.

I also think there is a lot of room for good bipartisan work in advanced technology research in the energy space—the kind the Department of Energy did for the State of Hawaii in developing a grid system that can accommodate unprecedented levels of intermittent renewable energy, the kind that made major advances in hydraulic fracturing, the kind that has helped the price of solar panels drop 80 percent since 2008, the kind that is making

breakthroughs in battery storage, which has fallen in price by 40 percent since 2010, and the kind that is working on carbon capture and sequestration.

America must lead on energy, and that requires us to do the kind of basic research that private companies can eventually use. A relatively small increase in research funding—both on the fossil and renewable side—has been shown to make an enormous impact on our economy. Investments in renewable and fossil fuel electricity generation, distribution, and transmission systems, grid stability and security, and fuel systems will enable America to lead in energy for decades to come.

These are the kinds of investments we would see in a comprehensive energy bill. I was so encouraged last week that the chairwoman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, the Senator from Alaska, has indicated her desire to pursue comprehensive legislation this Congress. The Senator from Alaska is a very skilled bipartisan legislator, and I am looking forward to working with her on these issues. I am especially encouraged by her openness to climate provisions as part of that bill, something she mentioned as recently as last week. Just as she has listened to the concerns I and others have raised about climate change during the Keystone debate, so should we listen to her call for reliable, affordable, clean, and diverse energy supplies.

Several energy proposals contained within the President's fiscal year budget could become a part of a bipartisan bill, including ideas to more fully promote carbon capture and sequestration technologies and protect coal workers and their communities as we transition. The concerns of communities that have coal-based economies are real and legitimate and I believe any true climate solution must prioritize solutions for every American. The President recognized that and proposed \$55 million next year to help affected communities diversify their economies, offer job training, and ensure a good transition.

This will require compromise. It will require those of us on the left to concede that fossil fuels aren't going to disappear instantaneously, and it will require those on the right to recognize that investing in clean energy technologies doesn't necessarily mean picking winners and losers. We have wind energy in nearly all States—in fact, more in Republican than in Democratic States—and we have tea party members everywhere who love the freedom and liberty that distributed generation—rooftop solar—offers. We also have clean energy progressives, including myself, who understand that we have to deal with the energy system we have, not the one we wish we had.

The areas I have mentioned are not the only opportunities for bipartisan compromise, but we do need to start a dialogue, either on the floor, in committees or in informal discussions, about what we can actually do. As we consider a policy solution, let's ask the

following questions: Can it be enacted into law? Will it advance American energy security? Will it strengthen the economy and provide economic growth? Will it reduce pollution?

There are a few areas where we are going to fight—there is no avoiding it—and that is OK. But there is, for the first time since I arrived, a glimmer of hope that we may be able to find common ground on some of these issues and begin a serious discussion about tackling American energy policy and climate change.

I yield the floor.

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

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

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, this is the first time I have come to the floor to speak on this issue while the Senator from Iowa has been presiding. Over the last 2 years, since the mass tragedy in my State, in Sandy Hook, CT, I have come to the floor once every week or so to give voice to victims of gun violence all across this country. I have told the story of the beautiful 6- and 7-year-olds as well as the teachers and professionals who were killed that day.

The fact is that every day across this country there are two to three Sandy Hooks that happen. There are 86 people killed by guns every day in this country, 2,600 a month, and over 30,000 a year. The statistics, unfortunately, have not compelled this body to action. We have done nothing—zero—about this national tragedy since Sandy Hook. That is a stain upon the conscience of this body that is impossible to erase. My hope is that by coming to the floor and speaking about who these people actually are, maybe it will prompt us to have a conversation about how we can make sure these numbers aren't eliminated; they are never going to go away but to make sure they are lower, that they are less than these numbers, the highest in the developed world.

Let me speak first about an extraordinary young man, 44 years old, who was killed on January 20—just about 2 weeks ago—in Boston, MA. His name was Dr. Michael Davidson. He was shot by a gunman who walked into Brigham and Women's Hospital. The gunman was the relative of someone who had been under the care of Dr. Davidson who clearly had some major illness that prompted him to think he could solve his grief by shooting the doctor who had cared for his loved one. Dr. Davidson was known at Brigham and Women's Hospital for his gentle way

with patients and their families and his willingness to operate on the most delicate hearts. He used to lie awake at night worrying about his patients. He was always receiving letters about the great care he provided. He wanted to be a cardiovascular surgeon from the time he was a little boy, which is a pretty exceptional thing. As renowned as he was as a physician, what he truly will be remembered for was for being a father to three children, and he and his wife were waiting for their fourth to arrive, due this April.

At his funeral nearly 1,000 people were there to hear his wife say:

By now, you've all heard that my husband, Michael Davidson, was a superb physician. Perhaps, most importantly, he cared immensely for his patients and their families. That is why the fact that a patient's family member would take Michael away from us makes it all the more devastating.

A brilliant surgeon and a wonderful father taken away from us at age 44 in Boston, MA.

Everyone by now has heard the story from December 20, where two New York City police officers were killed by a mentally ill man who drove to New York with the intention of killing police officers. Wenjian Liu had been in this country almost 20 years to the day—an American dream story personified. His family came to this country from China to seek a better life. He came here on Christmas Eve, 1994. He wanted to be a police officer because he wanted to give back to his community. Liu once said:

I know that being a cop is dangerous but I must do it. If I don't do it and you don't do it, then who is going to do it?

It is that kind of commitment that was shown by him that day by the very fact that he was in the car. He wasn't scheduled to work, but he volunteered to work a fill-in shift when a fellow officer was late. That is just how he was.

Rafael Ramos, otherwise known as Ralph Ramos, was in that car as well. He wanted to be a police officer so badly that when he was preparing to join the police academy, he took a petition door to door throughout his whole neighborhood asking for his neighbors to testify to his character. He is remembered as a good police officer but also as someone who shoveled all the sidewalks in his neighborhood, took his two boys to a nearby park over and over to play basketball, always with a smile on his face. He was hours away from becoming a lay chaplain. One of his dreams was to go into the ministry. He is remembered by friends and family as someone committed to his family, committed to his job, but also committed to his faith.

These two police officers were killed by a man named Ismaaiyl Brinsley. He was a deeply mentally ill man, someone who had tried to commit suicide and who had become completely isolated from his family and from his peers. When I read his story, it struck me as not completely dissimilar from the story in Newtown, CT, Adam

Lanza. Adam Lanza was a deeply troubled, deeply mentally ill young man who became isolated from his peers and from his family. We can't completely understand what caused him to do what he did that day, nor what Mr. Brinsley was thinking in his head when he drove to New York to carry out those heinous murders.

What we know is we have largely abandoned the mentally ill in this country. We lock them up in prisons rather than treating their underlying illnesses. Over the course of the last half a decade, 4,000 inpatient psychiatric beds have been closed all across this country, forcing more of the mentally ill out on the streets and into prison and into crisis. You know, the Federal law authorizing the funding we send to mental health work in this country—SAMHSA, that is the agency—has not been reauthorized in a decade. We haven't even debated mental health policy on the floor of this Senate for a decade. No wonder we have a system that is in crisis.

It means in the absence of Federal leadership, private organizations are stepping up to the plate. Sandy Hook promised—the group of parents of many of those children who were killed has taken up a cause called No One Eats Alone. It is a wonderful cause in which students in high school, middle school, and elementary school cafeterias are asked to seek out one or two children who often eat alone, who are socially isolated at school, and to reach out and do small things such as sitting with them during lunch to remove some sense of social isolation that comes often with children who bring mental illness or learning disabilities to school.

That effort is admirable, and it will make a difference. But it speaks to the fact those groups have to step in and do things such as the No One Eats Alone campaign because Congress isn't stepping up to the plate and doing anything about these numbers: 31,000 a year, 2,600 a month, 86 a day. You know what my feelings are on this. I don't think it is just about mental health programming and funding. I think it is ridiculous 90 percent of Americans think you should have to go through a background check in order to buy a gun, yet we still won't move forward with expanded background checks, and the majority of Americans think that dangerous assault weapons should be for the police and for our military and not be able to get into the hands of young, troubled men such as Adam Lanza to be used in mass murder.

In the absence over the next 2 years of our ability to come to an agreement on changing our gun laws so they reflect where the vast majority of the American public is, let's at least take on the mental health crisis in this country. Let's at least decide we are going to plus-up resources for community mental health providers. We are going to rebuild inpatient capacity. We are going to recognize that as angry as

we are at people such as Ismaaiyl Brinsley and of young men such as Adam Lanza, there is a story there of neglect that if we address we can lower these numbers even without changes over the next 2 years in our—I would argue—very backward national background check laws.

I thank you for listening and some of my colleagues for being on the floor today. I know we have a number of people who want to speak. I will continue to come to the floor so my colleagues can hear the stories of people such as Officer Ramos, Officer Liu, and heroes such as Dr. Michael Davidson so that maybe the voices of these victims can prompt us to action.

I yield the floor.

AUTHORIZATION ON USE OF MILITARY FORCE

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, along with Senator HATCH, we have a concern we want to share with this body. One of the reasons I do is because I had planned to go ahead and introduce the bill having to do with the AUMF. In fact, I actually had introduced it a year ago, but I understand now we are coming into an agreement and Senator HATCH and I stand together to speak about the need for the new AUMF, authorization for use of military force, against the terrorist organization known as ISIS or ISIL, or whatever you want to call it, in order to answer any legal question as to the authority the President has to defend the American people and demonstrate our commitment to the global coalition in defeating this radical Islamic organization.

I have always contended the President had this authority anyway. In fact, I can remember a year ago he said he did. I now understand the President will be sending to Congress his own version of the AUMF this week. I will read it with interest.

Over the past 6 months, ISIS, or ISIL, has expanded its control in Iraq and Syria. They continue to recruit followers worldwide. We saw just the other day what happened when we had the King of Jordan here and we had the opportunity to be with him when he got the very sad news of what happened to his F-16 pilot being burned alive. I happened to be with him in Syria just a month before that. I am talking about with the King of Jordan.

We know firsthand what is going on. It is my hope the President's proposed AUMF will include all the authorities needed to execute his strategy to stop ISIS and the President provides Congress with that strategy as part of any approval for an AUMF.

The President's proposed AUMF should not contain restrictions on U.S. forces or time or geographic limitations. An AUMF should authorize the use of all necessary and appropriate force anywhere where ISIS or any successor organization is operating until we accomplish our strategy.