

recognized to deliver his maiden speech.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

#### USA FREEDOM ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the bill we just passed is a historic moment. It is the first major overhaul of government surveillance laws in decades that adds significant privacy protections for the American people. It has been a long and difficult road, but I am proud of what the Congress has achieved today. This is how democracy is supposed to work. Congress is ending the bulk collection of Americans' private phone records once and for all.

To my partners in the Senate on both sides of the aisle, I thank you. Senator LEE, whose name is on our bill here in the Senate, believes strongly in our constitutional system of government. He has worked tirelessly to advance this bill from the day we first introduced the USA FREEDOM Act. Senator FRANKEN has devoted himself to the transparency measures in the bill. Senator BLUMENTHAL shaped the FISA Court amicus provisions. This was hard fought, and they never wavered.

I also want to thank Senators HELLER, CRUZ, MURKOWSKI, DAINES, DURBIN, and SCHUMER, the other original co-sponsors of this bill. They have each worked to help advance this legislation and build the coalition we needed to finally get to our strong bipartisan vote in the Senate for passage. I must also mention Senator FEINSTEIN, who provided invaluable support to get this bill across the finish line. Of course, I also need to thank Minority Leader REID, who has never wavered in his strong support and responsible leadership.

On the House side, Chairman GOODLATTE and Congressmen SENSENBRENNER, CONYERS, and NADLER have been the kind of bipartisan partners on this bill that every legislator wants in their corner.

I also need to thank Senators WYDEN and HEINRICH and former Senator Mark Udall, who used their positions on the Senate Intelligence Committee to ask the hard questions behind closed doors and who have fought to end this program for so long.

While we have much work to do, we have accomplished something momentous today. We are a better nation for it.

I also want to thank the many staffers who have worked long hours on this legislation for nearly two years now. On my own Judiciary Committee staff, I thank Chan Park, Lara Flint, Jessica Brady, Hasan Ali, Patrick Sheahan, Logan Gregoire, Jonathan Hoadley, Joel Park and Kristine Lucius. My personal office staff, including J.P. Dowd, Erica Chabot, David Carle, John Tracy and Diane Derby, also worked hard on this effort, and I am grateful for that. I also want to thank Democratic and

Republican Senate staffers who have toiled countless hours on this effort, including Matt Owen, Mike Lemon, Wendy Baig, James Wallner, Josh Finestone, Scarlet Doyle, Ayesha Khanna, Alvaro Bedoya, Helen Gilbert, Samantha Chaifetz, Sam Simon, John Dickas, Chad Tanner, and Jennifer Barrett.

We not only worked across the aisle on this legislation, but we also worked across the Capitol. The bipartisan group of House staff who helped to craft this compromise bill and generated such an overwhelming vote on this legislation deserve enormous credit for their work: Caroline Lynch (who along with Lara Flint deserves a perfect attendance award for extensive negotiating sessions), Bart Forsyth, Aaron Hiller (whose wife deserves our thanks as she had a baby just weeks before the House considered the bill), Jason Herring, Shelley Husband, Branden Ritchie, and Perry Apelbaum.

I thank those at the White House who devoted countless hours including Josh Pollack, Jeff Ratner, Ryan Gillis, Michael Bosworth, and Chris Fonzzone. I also appreciate the work of so many other executive branch officials at the Justice Department, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, and National Security Agency who work so hard to keep our country safe and answered our questions at all hours of the day and night.

I also need to thank the many public interest groups, on all ends of the political spectrum, who stuck with us despite many challenges. There are too many to name, but without their energy and expertise, this reform effort would never have come to fruition. Likewise, the technology industry provided invaluable input and support for this legislation.

And finally, I would like to thank the dedicated staff in the Office of Senate Legislative Counsel, whose tremendous work in assisting us with legislative drafting often goes unnoticed and unrecognized. In particular, I want to thank John Henderson, Kim Albrecht-Taylor, and James Ollen-Smith for their assistance and technical expertise.

Seeing nobody else seeking recognition, 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. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, today I am here for the 101st time to urge this body to wake up to the threat of climate change. It is real, it

is caused by carbon pollution, and it is dangerous.

There is a legislative answer to this problem that my Republican colleagues should consider, and that is a carbon fee.

The unpleasant fact here in Congress presently, anyway, is that Congress is ruled by the lobbyists and the political enforcers for the fossil fuel industry. But outside this Chamber, where the fossil fuel industry's power is less fierce, there is considerable conservative support for a carbon fee.

Leading right-of-center economists, conservative think tanks, and former Republican officials, both legislative and executive, all say that putting a price on carbon pollution is the right way to deal with climate change. They know that climate denial cannot stand against the facts. As the Washington Post reported last month, prominent thinkers on the right are "increasingly pushing" for a climate policy based on conservative principles and on values such as property rights, market efficiency, and personal liberty. They recommend pricing carbon.

Jerry Taylor, a former vice president at the CATO Institute now leads his own Libertarian think tank, which is making the case for a carbon fee. He recognized that "the scientific evidence became stronger and stronger over time." He knows climate denial is not an option. He says that "because catastrophic climate change is a non-diversifiable risk, we should logically be willing to pay extra to avoid climate risks." Taylor points out that hedging against terrible outcomes is what we expect in our financial markets. Why should we not do the same for climate change?

Conservatives have also long agreed that government should prevent one group harming another. Conservative economist Milton Friedman still tops the reading lists of Republicans in Congress. Republican Presidential hopefuls still invoke his name to show their free market bona fides. Asked whether the government had any role to play in reducing pollution, Friedman said:

There's always a case for the government to do something about it. Because there is always a case for the government to some extent when what two people do affects a third party.

Friedman is describing what he called "neighborhood effects" or what many economists call "negative externalities." A negative externality is when two parties engage in a transaction and the result of that transaction causes damage to a third party—a third party that did not consent to the arrangement. That is an externality, and when the consequence is harmful, it is a negative externality. In a free society, wrote Friedman, government exists, in part, to diminish those negative externalities.

When the costs of such negative externalities don't get factored into the price of a product, even conservative economic doctrine classifies that