

It is wrong for any Senator, especially the chairman of the Judiciary Committee who deals with these issues day after day, to urge the selective leaking of any Federal investigation. The FBI is not in the business of disclosing information to appease political operatives, but according to press reports, that is just the sort of thing the Republican Judiciary Committee has done.

Remember, there has been a lot of speculation that under Chairman GRASSLEY's leadership the personal information of a Clinton staffer was leaked to the press, including payroll records and a Social Security number, but urging a leak of the FBI investigation for political purposes was not the only thing Senator GRASSLEY said. The Senator from Iowa was asked what he thought was the worst change in Congress during his tenure. He responded that the increasing partisanship was disappointing to him.

The audacity and even the hypocrisy of that statement is staggering. Senator GRASSLEY decries partisanship, while he denies a hearing and a vote to an eminently qualified Supreme Court nominee. For what? No one has a good answer on that. The Senator from Iowa complains of partisanship, even as he uses the Judiciary Committee to wage a political war against Secretary Clinton and her staff.

Under the guise of oversight, Senator GRASSLEY has been wasting taxpayer dollars trying to besmirch Hillary Clinton's good name. This has been going on for years. The Senator's singular focus on Secretary Clinton borders on an obsession. Senator GRASSLEY has written dozens of letters containing hundreds of requests. He has held hearings. He has issued press releases. What have he and his committee achieved? Nothing. All the chairman has done is waste taxpayer dollars.

The Judiciary Committee chairman is so desperate to legitimize his attacks against Hillary Clinton he is willing to encourage a selective leak of a Federal investigation by, of all people, the FBI.

All this in an effort to award the Presidential nomination to Donald Trump. I agree in one respect with Senator GRASSLEY. Partisanship in this Chamber is awful. It is paralyzing the Senate and is preventing us from doing our constitutional duties, but much of this is the handiwork of the Judiciary Committee and Senator GRASSLEY.

I ask the Chair to announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 4

p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CHILD POISONINGS FROM LAUNDRY PODS

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to use articles as examples relevant to the subject of my speech.

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

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I rise today to speak about the rapid rise in child poisonings caused by single-use laundry products. Earlier today, we had an update on the number and severity of these poisonings from the American Academy of Pediatrics. It was in an indepth study just published in their journal, Pediatrics.

The news is not very good, because in 2013 and 2014 that academy reports that there were over 22,000 child exposures to laundry products, resulting in the deaths of at least two children due to the chemicals in these pods, and many others have faced serious injury, with at least 17 children in that time period going into comas because of exposure to these chemicals.

What am I talking about? This is a laundry pod. It is very colorful on the outside, and it smells very good. It is quite soft. Its texture, particularly to the touch of an infant—an infant's hand and face—is very soft and reassuring. The problem is that if it gets into an infant's hand, where is it going to end up? It is going to end up in their mouth, and these packages are soluble. So, naturally, the plastic exterior is going to dissolve, and all of these chemicals are going to end up in the child's digestive system.

As a result of these pods, we have had two children die, and we had 22,000 child exposures in that 2-year period the study covers, with 17 children going into comas. Others have suffered seizures or internal burns to their lips, mouths, and the esophagus. If it gets into their esophagus and burns, then you have a problem.

Now, what we have been advocating, Senator DURBIN and I, in our legislation is to make them as safe as possible and to get the Consumer Product Safety Commission involved in these things. This Senator has met with the industry. Let me show you some of the things in which, indeed, they have made progress.

This is a detergent pod package, and in order to get in it—and this pod came in this packaging—you have to tear it open. That is one good thing. They

have designed this container so that it would be very difficult to get into. Even I am having difficulty getting into it. The pods would be in this container—something that would be child proof.

They designed this container. This has one of those slide bars, such as on a plastic sealant freezer package, where you have to push down on it and apply pressure in order to get the slide that unzips the seal. That is also a good thing.

But let me show you what the industry is resistant to doing. Children are naturally attracted to colorful candy. Here shown on this chart are a variety of candies, such as gummy bears, but among all of these are interspersed some of these pods. This is one. This is another. This is another, and this is another—not unlike the colors on this pod. So if we don't have the packaging preventing the child from getting to this pod, then we are going to have a problem, which is why we lost two children and 17 others went into comas in the last 2 years.

Now, a lot of people like these products, and so does the Nelson family. They serve a very useful purpose. At the same time, we need to make them as safe as possible. So why not just remove the color from the package and make it less attractive to the child.

Last year, Senator DURBIN and I introduced legislation that would require better labeling, more child-resistant packaging and safer chemical formulations for these single-use laundry pod products. The bill has been referred to our Commerce Committee, and as the ranking member of that committee, I am going to talk again to Senator THUNE, who is the chairman of the committee, to see if we can get the committee to take up the bill as soon as possible.

Earlier this year, we were able to get both the House and the Senate to pass legislation requiring childproof packaging for bottles of liquid nicotine, some of which had injured children and, in some cases, resulted in death as well and had poisoned thousands of others. If we could get that done in a bipartisan manner, which we did and that is now law, then there is no reason why we can't, in a bipartisan way, address the issue posed by this problem. Keeping children safe is not a partisan issue. It is just common sense.

In the interim, we want to encourage the manufacturers to keep working on new standards to reduce the poisonings. We appreciate very much the efforts at things such as this and this. That is helpful. Last week, one manufacturer announced plans to put many of the laundry pods they sell into new, more child-resistant packaging. They also announced a public education campaign urging parents to keep laundry pods away from their children. That is certainly helpful. But at the same time, we need to keep working to make these pods less attractive to children and, perhaps more