expense of other retirees. The effect this bill has for retirees in Iowa and elsewhere is that they must place their trust in an oversight board to act courageously and make hard decisions, lest they find themselves bailing out Puerto Rico's government.

Second, no matter what the House bill calls it, title III's debt restructuring authority, which allows for the restructuring of debt that is issued or guaranteed by Puerto Rico, is super chapter 9.

Investors and the municipal bond market have treated Puerto Rico like a State. Granting Puerto Rico the authority to restructure ''state-like'' obligations will be viewed as precedent for giving a State similar authority. Of course, no State is going to ask to be covered by the House bill. Rather, they will say if a territory can receive unprecedented authority from Congress, then why shouldn't a State? Illinois is watching this issue very closely.

Moreover, by creating this new authority Congress has invited material litigation risk.

Worst case, should the law be found unconstitutional under the Takings Clause, then the Federal government would be liable for money damages—the very definition of a bailout. And increased litigation will cause uncertainty, which is the last thing needed in Puerto Rico, making it impossible for Puerto Rico to access the capital market for years.

If that occurs, then mark my words, sooner or later we'll be considering whether to provide direct federal financial assistance to Puerto Rico, despite the claims that this bill doesn't result in a taxpayer bailout.

And given that Puerto Rico has failed to provide Congress with accurate financial information regarding their fiscal crisis, this unprecedented and risky authority appears both unnecessary and unjustified.

Given the bill's failure to satisfy the two requirements I have laid out, which unduly harm retirees in my State, and more importantly, while also setting bad precedent, I can't support this bill.

Perhaps my concerns will be proven wrong and the bill will work perfectly. But it's been my experience that bad facts make for bad law.

Unfortunately, I fear we are simply pushing this problem down the road and have failed to address the root cause of Puerto Rico's fiscal crisis at the expense of uncalled for risks and precedent.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess until 4:40 p.m., with the time during the recess being charged to the Republican side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 4:20 p.m., recessed until 4:40 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. GARDNER).

NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

(The remarks of Mr. ALEXANDER and Mr. CORKER are printed in today's RECORD during consideration of S. Res. 516.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

(The remarks of Mr. VITTER pertaining to the introduction of S. 3120 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. VITTER. Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from Texas.

ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, about 24 hours ago our Democratic friends filibustered an appropriations bill for $1.1 billion that they themselves had said was an emergency, denying mothers pregnant with babies potentially like this one depicted here from suffering the devastating birth defects associated with microcephaly. You can see the shrunken skull associated with a shrunken brain—a devastating impact. This is the principal danger of the Zika virus, which heretofore had been limited to South America and Central America, places like Puerto Rico, sadly, and Haiti. The mosquito that carries this virus is native to Texas, Louisiana, Florida, and the southern most parts of the United States. So far the only cases—save one recently in Florida—of infection from the Zika virus have been from people who traveled to those regions and then returned to the United States. As I said, it appears there has been one reported case in Florida that has been contracted on the mainland of the United States.

I simply do not understand how the Democratic leader from Nevada and his colleagues could turn this public health crisis into a political circus. When a pregnant woman contracts Zika, it can cause microcephaly like this. Of course, you can imagine, even if you are just a woman of childbearing age, the possibility that you might contract Zika—not knowing how long that virus remains in your body—would cause tremendous anxiety. You can imagine what this devastating birth defect does not only to the baby involved but to the families who must necessarily support them.

This condition is tragic. It can cause seizures, intellectual disabilities, hearing and vision problems, and developmental delays, and of course a premature death. That is the kind of life that awaits these children and the families of children born with microcephaly if they are fortunate enough to survive. As I mentioned yesterday, it was reported that a child with microcephaly was born in Florida. In this case, I stand corrected. That was not as a result of a mosquito bite in the United States, but rather the mother contracted the virus while in Haiti and traveled back to her home in Florida.

The simple point is, this is playing with fire. It was just a few weeks ago, actually May 23, 2016, when the Democratic leader insisted we immediately fund the President's request of $1.9 billion in emergency funding. He said:

> Instead of gambling with the health and safety of millions of Americans, Republicans should give our Nation the money it needs to fight Zika and they should do it now. Not next month, not in the fall—now.

I think the urgency Senator REID was expressing was felt by all of us, but we know there is a right way and a wrong way to appropriate money in the U.S. Congress. We have to pass legislation in the Senate, we have to pass legislation in the House, and then we have to come together in a conference committee to reconcile those differences. It is the conference report that is the product of a negotiation between the House and the Senate that funded this effort at the level that actually passed the Senate just a few short weeks ago. Every single one of our Democratic friends voted for funding the Zika crisis at $1.1 billion. Yet yesterday, all but I believe one of our Democratic colleagues then voted against the very funding they said was an emergency back at the end of May.

We know given the warmer weather in the southernmost part of the United States and the fact that the mosquito that carries this virus is native to the southern part of the United States—we know this risk is on our doorstep, and it is really shameful our Democratic colleagues put politics ahead of sound public policy.

Here are some of the excuses they gave, and none of them withstand any sort of scrutiny.

First of all, they said: Well, this doesn't provide enough money, even though all of them voted for funding at this level of $1.1 billion. They know that if in fact the public health needs in the country are significant enough that more funding is necessary, there will be an opportunity at some point, after due deliberation and discussion and appreciation for the nature of the problem and what the proper response would be for us to act again—but they already voted for funding at this level.

The next bogus argument is that this is somehow an attack on women's