

DONALD TRUMP

Mr. REID. Mr. President, last night the Republican nominee for President failed to give any assurance as any kind or a coherent explanation as to why he refuses to release his tax returns—because there is no coherent reason. It is hard to give one when there isn't one.

He said he couldn't release his tax information because the Internal Revenue Service hasn't certified it. Everyone debunks that—everyone, except Donald Trump. But even as Trump tried to say nothing about his tax returns, he revealed at least one shocking truth: Donald Trump thinks that paying taxes is a fool's errand. People shouldn't pay taxes. He said—and it was reported at least five times in three decades—that he paid nothing in Federal income taxes, and Secretary Clinton alluded to that fact in last night's debate. Donald Trump's response was this: "That makes me smart." So what does that make the rest of us—suckers, unintelligent, dumb? He is smart; so does that make us dumb because we pay our taxes? He knows that refusing to pay taxes makes him, as we have come to learn, a scam artist. He is good at that. Every day that he refuses to release his tax returns is another slap in the face to the American people. People running for office for scores of decades have released their income taxes. That may be a little bit of an exaggeration, but let's say that for the last 70 years, they have released their income tax returns. So why won't he release his? Why doesn't he do this? Because the tax returns would show that he is not the rich guy he thinks he is. Tax returns would show he is a spoiled, rich brat who inherited his daddy's money and hasn't done so well with it. After \$14 million, he hasn't done that well with how much his dad gave him. Trump's tax returns would show he isn't as generous as he claims to be and that he uses charities as his personal slush fund. Did you see this morning's news? He had an appearance on a TV show, and they owed him money. They paid that into his charity so he can then say that he gave this away. Trump's tax returns would show that, in spite of getting over \$1 billion of assistance from New York, in New York City alone Donald Trump is a failed businessman who is buried under a mountain of debt. They would show that he refuses to pay his Federal income taxes.

So I would hope that Donald Trump would release those tax returns the way Hillary Clinton has released 40 years of hers and her husband's.

Mr. President, 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.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 5325, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5325) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell (for Cochran) amendment No. 5082, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell amendment No. 5083 (to amendment No. 5082), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 5084 (to amendment No. 5083), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 5085 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 5082), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 5086 (to amendment No. 5085), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 5087, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 5088 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 5087), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 5089 (to amendment No. 5088), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assisting majority leader.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I came to the floor to talk about the pending business, but I have to just comment based on what the Democratic leader has said. Apparently, he has so little confidence in his party's nominee for President that he insists on coming to the floor every day that we are in session, trying to assist her by making arguments either she cannot make or that she has not made. We do have pending business that is very important and which I know he would agree is important, and that is to keep the government running past the end of this fiscal year, which ends on Friday.

That actually is the subject that I came here to talk about. We are continuing to work on a continuing resolution to fund the government through the end of the fiscal year. The fact of the matter is that we would not find ourselves in this distasteful position were it not for the filibusters of our Democratic colleagues who try to use the leverage and have effectively used the leverage to shut down the normal functioning of the appropriations process in order to gain some leverage to spend more money, notwithstanding the fact that we are \$19 trillion in debt. They simply shifted from one excuse to another in order to refuse to do their job, which is actually to work in a bipartisan way through the appropriations process to fund the functioning of the government at agreed-to spending levels.

So we are now staring at a Friday deadline to keep the government open. Of course, this was their design all along—to drag their feet, delay, and turn from one excuse to another in order to keep from actually working in

a bipartisan way to appropriate the money to fund the government so the government would continue to function. We could have finished this job a long time ago, but our Democratic colleagues simply made it clear that they wouldn't lose any sleep even as we get closer and closer to the funding deadline.

This is actually the narrative they hoped for all along. They want to talk about shutdowns or potential shutdowns that they, in fact, could cause, not because of anything that we have done on this side of the aisle.

The Appropriations Committee, chaired by Senator COCHRAN, and the Appropriations subcommittees have voted out on a bipartisan basis all 12 appropriations bills, and they have done their work. Many of them have passed unanimously. Most of them have passed overwhelmingly with bipartisan support, which is very encouraging. So our Democratic colleagues have had a lot of participation and a lot of influence, as I know they would want, in the priorities of the Federal Government as reflected in the appropriations bill. Of course, that wasn't good enough, and that didn't meet their underlying need, which is to try to gain any advantage they possibly can when it comes to spending levels or in the upcoming November 8 election, which very much appears to be on the Democratic leader's mind as he continues to come to the floor and talk about the Presidential race rather than the pending business.

Of course, now we know that we are running out of time. So the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, has now proposed to call their bluff. They said they wanted a clean continuing resolution. As a matter of fact, the Democratic leader said last week that if a clean continuing resolution were brought to a vote, we could "leave in 10 minutes." That is what the Democratic leader said last week. But as of yesterday, we know he changed his tune. He said a clean CR wasn't near enough. He said: "We want more."

We will soon have a chance to vote on that clean continuing resolution after lunch. This is the continuing resolution that the Democratic leader said we could pass and leave in 10 minutes. This continuing resolution funds the government at levels this Chamber has already agreed to. There are no riders or anything that the Democrats can claim as controversial. It is a simple continuation of funding at current levels under the same terms that the President has already signed into law last December. It also includes resources for bipartisan priorities like veterans programs, flood control, fighting the opioid epidemic that is devastating communities across our country, and dealing with prevention of the Zika virus—something the Democrats said they wanted money for since last May. Well, this is it. This is the \$1.1 billion agreed to on a bipartisan basis. But this is when they shift their argument to something else.

We remember that during the summer, our Democratic colleagues were quick to call for action on Zika funding. Ironically, they filibustered a bill that would have provided that funding, but when push came to shove, they flat out refused to act to give communities the funding they need to fight this real health crisis.

We know from what has happened in Florida, where they have had domestic infections of people from the mosquitoes carrying the Zika virus in Florida, that it is just a matter of time before this will spread to other parts of the United States, including warmer weather States like mine, in Texas.

I have spent some time in Houston, TX, with the mosquito and vector control folks at the Harris County Health Department, where they are monitoring these mosquitoes on a daily basis to see whether there are signs of the Zika virus in those mosquitoes. Thankfully, there is none yet, but they are identifying West Nile virus and other mosquito-borne diseases, and thank goodness for the work and leadership they are showing at the local level. It would be nice if the Nation's congressional leaders would demonstrate similar leadership getting our job done, getting the money to the people who need it and can put it to good use.

I have shown the picture of the devastating birth defects caused by the Zika virus in women of childbearing age. It is devastating. How our colleagues across the aisle can continue to block this funding in giving the money that could actually help address this potential health crisis is beyond me. We have given them what they wanted, and they refuse to take yes for an answer. They still talk a lot about it and the urgent need to get it done, while dragging their feet the whole way.

The Democratic leader even said at the beginning of this month that we need to handle the Zika threat first and foremost. Well, I guess that is why he continues to delay a vote on the continuing resolution and why they continue to do what they say they are going to do. They are going to block the cloture vote this afternoon, again, because now they have changed the subject.

Well, this is their chance to act, to send resources to fight the virus in communities across the country. I am glad the senior Senator from Florida, a Member of the Democratic caucus, has already said that he will support this clean CR, in light of the public health threat Zika poses to his constituents in Florida. He clearly has his priorities straight. It is not politics first and foremost. It is public health. I hope more of his colleagues follow his lead and vote to get on this continuing resolution so we can get our work done and so the money can go to those communities like those in his State and in my State that need it most.

Some of our Democratic colleagues say they don't like the continuing res-

olution because it doesn't allow for funding for the water problems in Flint, MI. But I have to say that this is just another manufactured excuse. It ignores reality. We just passed overwhelmingly the Water Resources Development Act with more than 90 votes in this Chamber. That bill provides funding for the crisis in Flint, MI. The House is taking up their version of the bill this week. The chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, has made it clear he is committed to sending this Water Resources Development Act, including funding for Flint, to the President for his signature. So that excuse doesn't hold any water either.

Our Democratic friends may say: Well, that is not included in the House bill. That is true. But with the commitment of the chairman and the ranking member of the Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator BOXER, who work so well together, there is no way in the world that a conference report is going to come back to the Senate without that Flint, MI, money in the bill. So that excuse doesn't hold water either.

Once again, I guess because they think it helps them somehow politically, our Democratic friends are marching this country closer and closer to a shutdown. They have been slow-walking the process, starting months ago when they refused to consider and even pass bipartisan appropriations bills. As I said earlier, these were bills passed overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis. Why in the world would they do that, I guess, perhaps is the question before us. Well, a Member of their leadership implied in yesterday's Washington Post that it is purely for political purposes.

I am not naive. I understand politics is part of this process, but clearly the priority of our colleagues across the aisle is not to do their job and to address the funding needs for the Federal Government, including the Zika crisis or even to deal in a bipartisan way with the very issue they have identified, the Flint, MI, issue that is going to get that money to the community.

In the article I mentioned in the Washington Post, the senior Senator from Montana, who heads the Democratic campaign committee, gave us just a momentary glimpse into our Democratic friends' playbook this election cycle. He said that in order to win more seats in the U.S. Senate, Democratic candidates need to show that "Republicans really haven't done anything."

That was the campaign chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, saying in order for them to win seats, they have to show that under Republican leadership nothing has been done. The facts would show otherwise. This reminds me of the story of a propaganda technique where, if you tell a big enough falsehood and you tell it over and over and over,

there are some people who are actually going to believe it.

Facts are a stubborn thing. Democrats are marching us down a path that leads to a shutdown in order to gain some sort of political advantage. What a terrible thing to do to this country, to be brought to the brink purely for some perceived, temporary political game.

The facts are, under the leadership of Senator MCCONNELL as the majority leader and under a Republican majority, the Senate has been brought back to regular order, which means we are actually doing the people's business. Committee chairmen have had the freedom to flesh out legislation on a bipartisan basis and craft good policy solutions for the American people, rather than have bills cooked up in the Democratic leaders' conference room that have never seen the light of day in any committee and certainly were not bipartisan. That was the record when the Democratic leader was majority leader during the last Congress.

We have had more votes on more bills so individual Senators could offer specific ideas on how to make legislation better, and the results speak for themselves. It is a long list, but the Senate has passed much needed overhauls of our education system and our transportation system, both on a bipartisan basis. We have passed bipartisan bills to help root out the dangers to our society from opioid addiction, heroin addiction, and human trafficking. We passed foreign policy measures that have made our country safer, including a bill to impose stronger sanctions on North Korea.

Again, it is a long list. Last week, we passed the Water Resources Development Act I was referring to earlier, thanks to the leadership of a Republican, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, and a Democrat, the senior Senator from California. That is the way this process is supposed to work.

The point is, until very recently, this Congress has been marked by a willingness of folks on both sides of the aisle to work through the issues and to find a path forward that would represent the best solution for the people we represent, the American people.

According to the senior Senator from Montana—in what appears to be an act of desperation—that doesn't make for good campaign strategy in the days leading up to the election, apparently, and now they want to try to sell this propaganda, this gigantic falsehood repeated over and over so people, at some point, at some level, begin to believe it. They want to paint this Congress as ineffective under Republican control.

When our friends on the other side of the aisle put the "d" in dysfunction during the 113th Congress, that is why the Republicans won the majority in the 2014 election, among other things, because Democratic incumbents running for reelection in 2014 had no record of accomplishment they could point to. That strategy backfired on

our Democratic colleagues. You would think they would have learned something from that experience.

For example, they had the incumbent Senator from Alaska go home to Alaska and ask to be returned to the Senate. He could not point to a single amendment on a single bill he actually sponsored that received a rollcall vote in the Senate. That is pretty hard to explain, especially when you are in the majority, but that is what happened. You would think our colleagues would have learned something from that.

What do they gain by edging our country toward a government shutdown this Friday? I don't see how it helps anyone, but that is why we are here today, staring at a deadline and trying to hammer out a stopgap spending bill—and this only gets us to December 9.

Again, the reason we find ourselves having to do this is because they have simply shut down the Senate appropriations process, forcing us into a position that no one who actually has any interest in performing the duties of their job actually likes. This is not the way the Senate is supposed to work, but this is the hand we have been dealt because of their obstruction.

I would hope more Democrats would join the senior Senator from Florida and take yes for an answer when it comes to funding the government, when it comes to dealing with Zika, the potential Zika crisis in our country.

I hope our colleagues on the other side will reconsider their decision to block the vote this afternoon. We are ready to move forward with the solution our Democratic colleagues have called for, a clean continuing resolution, but again it is like Charlie Brown and the football. Do you remember that cartoon? Every time Lucy would put the football out, she would pull it back at the last minute and Charlie Brown would end up on his back.

All we need is a partner who will work with us. I encourage some of our friends across the aisle to reconsider their position.

JUSTICE AGAINST SPONSORS OF TERRORISM ACT

Mr. President, late on Friday afternoon, the President fulfilled his promise to veto the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act.

I have a hard time understanding the President's rationale. This legislation was approved unanimously in the Senate and in the House. That doesn't happen very often, where Democrats and Republicans, where Senators and House Members, unanimously support a piece of legislation, but tomorrow afternoon we will vote on an override of that veto. President Obama made clear in his message that he doesn't understand how limited and narrow in scope this legislation is. As a matter of fact, he misrepresents what this legislation actually does, which is an extension of current law, and it is well within the bounds of historical practice and modern court guidance under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act.

The victims of terrorism in this country need an ability to seek justice in a court of law. That is all this bill is about. It doesn't identify a single country, and it doesn't purport to decide the merits of the case. All it says is, yes, you can present your case to a judge and a jury in a court of law. Why the President would object to that is lost on me.

This legislation will help victims of terrorism on U.S. soil seek compensation. By doing so, it will potentially deter other terrorist acts. If there are consequences associated with sponsoring terrorist attacks on American soil, don't you think this might have some modest deterrence effect, including our counterterrorism measures that our national security forces are engaged in?

This also sends an important message that the United States takes care of its own and that we will never tolerate terrorism and we will never ever shy away from the pursuit of justice for Americans.

I realize there are some of our colleagues who say: Well, Saudi Arabia or some other country might be upset with us.

Frankly, I could care less. We are here to represent the American people, not some foreign country. The fact is, our colleagues—our friends in Saudi Arabia, to the extent that we have aligned interests, we work well together and that will continue despite this veto override. To simply say because some foreign country or some King or some Prince of some other country doesn't like legislation so the President is going to veto it is simply unacceptable, when clearly the American interest here is for these victims of terrorism to find recourse in our courts of law.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, while the Republican whip is still on the floor, I believe there is an agreement, at 10:45, Republicans will have control of the floor.

I have waited patiently while the Senator from Texas has given his speech. I ask unanimous consent to allow me 10 minutes to speak on the floor before the Republicans claim their time.

Mr. CORNYN. Absolutely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you very much.

Mr. President, why are we facing a continuing resolution to fund the government of the United States of America? Because our budget expires on October 1.

It is a new budget. We are supposed to pass spending bills, appropriations bills, budget bills that will cover this next 12 months of the fiscal year, and we have failed. The Senate Appropriations Committee, which I am proud to serve on, has done its job on a bipar-

tisan basis. In fact, we have reported out all 12 spending bills but had very little luck on the floor of the Senate moving those bills forward. The first one we took up was the military construction bill, which passed with good support, and was sent over to the House of Representatives. They loaded it up with every political issue they could think of for this campaign season, and that bill started floundering at that point. That is why, at this moment in time, we need to pass a continuing resolution. This is no way to run a government but, to be honest with you, both political parties have been guilty of finding themselves in this mess before, where we have had to buy a little extra time into the fiscal year in order to agree on the budget for the remainder of that year.

What the President said to the Republican leaders of the House and Senate last week is, if you want to do this continuing resolution bill, just keep the government running until you can agree on all the appropriations bills, give me a continuing resolution bill until December 9, and—if you would—please acknowledge that we are facing a public health crisis with the Zika virus. The President raised that issue because in February of this year, 7 months ago, he notified Congress this was going to happen; that we were going to see these mosquitoes carrying the Zika virus infecting people in Puerto Rico and in the United States and endangering mothers who were carrying babies. In February, the President asked for Congress to give \$1.9 billion to eradicate the mosquitoes, to lessen the danger, and, equally important, to develop a vaccine. This is a vaccine which frankly, when it is developed, all of us will want to take, one that protects all of us from Zika virus infection in the future.

What did the Republican-controlled Congress do with the President's emergency public health crisis request for Zika? Nothing. They ignored it until May of this year, when the Senate finally passed, with 89 votes, Democrats and Republicans together—it was not \$1.9 billion but \$1.1 billion to deal with the Zika virus, this emergency public health crisis. It took 3 months. It should have taken 3 days.

In May, with 89 votes, we sent a bill from the Senate over to the House of Representatives to deal with this crisis. What did they do with it? Instead of passing the bipartisan bill the President requested, they decided to load it up with politically controversial issues that they thought would help them in this election cycle. Listen to some of the things they added to this bill, this emergency public health crisis bill.

First, they put in the provision that there was a prohibition of funding any efforts by Planned Parenthood on family planning under this bill. Why? Because mothers, facing the prospect of a pregnancy and the possibility of an infection, would seek family planning help at Planned Parenthood. Two million American mothers did last year.

They put this provision in to defund Planned Parenthood. They knew that was going to be a fight. They put it in anyway. They eliminated \$500 million from the Veterans' Administration funding to process veterans' claims—something we desperately need. They took the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency to monitor the chemicals that would be used to kill the mosquitoes. And then, to add insult to injury, they put in a provision that said you could display Confederate flags in U.S. military cemeteries. What does that have to do with the Zika virus? Nothing. It was political gamesmanship. It was going nowhere. The President would never sign it under those circumstances, and they knew it.

Now the President says: Give me a clean Zika funding bill and we will move forward with this continuing resolution.

Finally, last week the Senate Republican leader gave us that clean bill as part of the CR, and if that were all he did, we would be finished, we would be home, but he kept moving forward in other areas of controversy. You see, there was terrible flooding in Louisiana, and a lot of innocent people were hurt. They lost their homes and businesses. It has been a custom in the Congress to rally to the aid of victims of disasters. I have voted for that over and over again, for maybe every State across the United States, because I knew the day would come—and it has—when Illinois would need a helping hand, and I wanted to be there for my colleagues.

So we said this to the leader on the Republican side: If you want to help Louisiana—and I do—also help the people living in Flint, MI.

Remember when their water supply was contaminated? There were 100,000 people ingesting lead, when there is zero tolerance in our blood streams for that. The damage is obvious. Imagine 9,000 children in Flint poisoned with lead-contaminated water. That happened. In that poor city, they are still drinking water out of bottles every single day.

So we said to the Republican leader: Yes, we care about Louisiana. You should care about Flint, MI. If you are going to help Louisiana, help those poor people in Flint who are facing this kind of contamination.

He refused. He said: There will be money for Louisiana but no money for Michigan.

Why? We think there are victims in both places, and in the past the Senate and Congress have risen to those tragedies and those demands. I have done it on a bipartisan basis. It makes no difference to me that we have two Republican Senators in Louisiana, and it should make no difference to Senator MCCONNELL that we have two Democratic Senators in Michigan. Let's think about the Americans who are hurting in both places instead of playing political games. But no—Senator MCCONNELL said: We will help Lou-

isiana; we will provide no help to Flint, MI. That is unfair, and it complicates the situation.

If that were all he did, it would be bad enough, but Senator MCCONNELL has a pet project that he needs to put into this bill. Listen to what it is. It is a prohibition at the Securities and Exchange Commission that would promulgate a rule to require America's corporations to publicly disclose the campaign contributions they are making. Under Citizens United, in warped thinking at the Supreme Court, it was determined that corporations are persons when it comes to contributing money. Look what has happened—a flood of millions of dollars. Republicans were boasting that they raised \$43 million in their super PAC in August, and they got \$20 million last week from Sheldon Adelson, a rich man who lives out in Nevada. Oh, they are rolling in millions, but Senator MCCONNELL is determined to keep secret the source of these funds, so he wants to prohibit the Securities and Exchange Commission from requiring corporations to simply state publicly that they are making these contributions. We do. If corporations are persons—individual persons, like myself have to make a disclosure of contributions that are made. Why should corporations have the benefit of being treated as a person to make contributions but not the responsibility facing persons to disclose this publicly? Senator MCCONNELL wants to keep that secret, and that is why he included it in this legislation and made it as controversial as it is.

A simple word to the leader on the Republican side and to the wise who want to leave and go home and campaign: There is a way out of here. Treat the people in Flint, MI, with the same respect we are treating the victims in Louisiana. Provide the resources for opioid funding, which we desperately need. Leave out this special interest provision protecting corporations that want to make political contributions but want to keep it secret so nobody knows what they are doing. Make sure that we finally—finally—7 months later, adequately fund the Zika crisis so we can deal with this and develop a vaccine to protect all of America.

Mr. President, to reiterate, after weeks of bipartisan negotiations and significant progress made in settling our differences on a bill to keep the government open through December 9, Republican leadership has given up on negotiations and instead filed a bill that completely ignores the ongoing emergency in Flint, MI. For over a year, the good people of Flint have waited for Congress to do our job and address the public health emergency that has poisoned 9,000 children and left 100,000 residents without access to clean and safe water. But once again, they are being told to wait. They are being told that the emergency their community is facing is somehow less important than emergencies other

communities around the country are facing.

Republicans continue to argue that the ongoing crisis in Flint and other cities is better addressed through the Water Resources Development bill or WRDA. But while the Senate WRDA bill, which we passed earlier this month, includes vital funding for Flint, the House has made no commitment to help Flint in their bill. We cannot afford to wait any longer. The people of Flint have waited far too long already. We need to address the emergency in Flint now—in this bill—just as we are addressing the emergency in Louisiana.

It is unbelievable that Congress continues to hold up federal funds to help aid these Americans in their time of need. Almost 100,000 people are currently living without reliable access to clean water in their homes and 9,000 children are suffering from lead poisoning. Just like those suffering from flooding and tornados, these families did nothing to deserve this. And just as the federal government always helps when Americans are hit by disasters, it should do so now.

There were no complaints last May when the Federal government declared an emergency and reached out to residents of Texas to help them rebuild their lives after a tornado hit. So I see no reason why Senators should hesitate to provide funding to Flint, Michigan, to help deal with this public health emergency. The crisis in Flint is a tragedy that demands Senate action.

Instead of turning on the tap to make breakfast or take a shower, like all of us did this morning, these residents start their day by waiting in long lines for bottled water to feed and bathe their children, take showers, and stay healthy. And for those elderly or disabled residents that cannot make it to the pick-up location, they are left with the option of continuing to use water that they know is poisoning their bodies with lead and causing numerous health issues.

The lead contamination levels in the City mean that an entire generation of children are in danger of suffering from irreversible brain damage, lower IQ scores, developmental delays, and behavior issues for the rest of their lives.

This truly is a tragedy that requires federal support.

And what is frightening, is that Flint is not the only city battling with lead issues, nor is it an isolated incident. Elevated lead contamination levels have been reported in cities nationwide—including in Ohio, South Carolina, New Jersey, Mississippi, and Washington, DC. In my own home state of Illinois, Chicagoans have been battling with lead contamination in their homes for years.

Recent articles in the Chicago Tribune have highlighted this struggle. In 2012, an EPA study found high levels of lead in the drinking water of several Chicago homes—despite the City's use of anticorrosive chemicals to treat the water. And since then, at least 179

young children in federally-subsidized homes in Chicago have suffered lead poisoning stemming from exposure to lead-based paint.

These issues have led to Illinois having some of the country's highest rates of children with elevated blood lead blood levels, which, unfortunately, have hit low-income and minority communities the hardest.

Thankfully, however, lead levels in Illinois and across the nation have not risen to the severity of those in Flint.

But the widespread nature of these issues does show that we need to get serious about investing in infrastructure programs that address the housing, environmental, and public health aspects of preventing lead contamination in American homes. That is why I was proud to join Senators from both sides of the aisle in supporting a bipartisan deal to address the ongoing lead crisis in Flint and other communities across the country and ensure all Americans have access to safe drinking water.

The Senate's bipartisan WRDA bill provides \$220 million in direct emergency assistance to Flint and other communities facing similar drinking water emergencies. It provides \$1.4 billion over five years to help small and disadvantaged communities comply with the Safe Drinking Water Act. The bill modernizes our State Revolving Loan Fund program and provides \$300 million in grants for communities to replace lead service lines. And because we are also seeing high levels of lead in our schools' water, the bill authorizes \$100 million for additional lead testing in schools.

This bill also addresses many of the issues that I raised in the Lead-Safe Housing for Kids Act that I introduced with Senator MENENDEZ and the CLEAR Act that I introduced with Senator CARDIN, two bills that would ensure our children are protected from the dangerous effects of lead in our water and our housing.

While we still haven't figured out our differences over aid for communities affected by lead contamination, Democrats and Republicans have finally agreed to address the Zika public health emergency in this bill.

In February, the President requested \$1.9 billion to fight the Zika virus. In May, the Senate overwhelmingly passed a bipartisan bill to provide \$1.1 billion in emergency funding to combat this virus, but then partisan politics took over. Republicans insisted on attaching a variety of controversial policy riders to the Zika bill, from attempting to overturn provisions of the Clean Water Act to trying to block money from going to Planned Parenthood health centers.

Thankfully, 7 months after the President first made his request, commonsense is prevailing and Republicans have finally dropped their outrageous demands to load this bill up with contentious and extraneous items. I wish it had happened sooner. The bill before

us today includes \$1.1 billion in funding to help States and our Federal health agencies properly respond to the ongoing Zika epidemic. This money will be used for vaccine development, mosquito control, and the delivery of needed health care.

What the bill before us today does NOT include are ill-conceived partisan poison pills. As of last week, there were more than 23,000 reported cases of Zika in the United States and its territories, including more than 2,000 pregnant women. We are 7 months overdue in passing this emergency funding. It is my hope that pregnant women and children won't have to wait much longer.

While this bill is missing vital funding for Flint, Leader MCCONNELL had no problem including controversial language that limits the Security and Exchange Commission's ability to require disclosure of corporate political spending.

In 2010, the Supreme Court issued a far-reaching decision in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*. On a divided 5-4 vote, the Court struck down years of precedent and held that the First Amendment permitted corporations to spend freely from their treasuries to influence elections. As a result of *Citizens United* and the series of decisions that followed in its wake, special interests and wealthy, well-connected campaign donors have so far poured more than \$2 billion dollars of outside spending into recent Federal elections, including 2016 races.

In the years since *Citizens United*, several of my colleagues and I have called for the SEC to initiate a rulemaking requiring public companies to disclose their political spending to shareholders. More than 1.2 million securities experts, institutional and individual investors, and members of the public have asked the SEC for a disclosure rule.

Such a rulemaking would bring much needed transparency to the U.S. political process. Shareholders deserve to know when outside spending in political campaigns comes from the coffers of a company they have invested in.

Unfortunately, last year, this provision limiting the SEC's rulemaking authority was slipped into the omnibus appropriations bill, which we had to pass in order to fund the government for the 2016 fiscal year. We should not allow this rider to continue to strangle the SEC's authority.

Despite weeks of bipartisan progress on a deal to fund the government, the Republicans have decided to move forward on a bill that continues to ignore the ongoing crisis in Flint and other cities like Chicago. Congress and the Federal government's primary responsibility is to protect the American people. And just as the Federal government always helps when Americans are hit by disasters, it should do so now.

Like the communities in Louisiana suffering from devastating flooding,

the people of Flint deserve our help in responding to this public health emergency. A deal to provide funding for Flint has already passed the Senate with overwhelming bipartisan support. We need to address the emergency in Flint NOW, in this bill. The people of Flint have waited long enough.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11:30 a.m. will be controlled by the majority.

The Senator from Wyoming.

OBAMACARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, the Senate minority leader, Senator REID, came to the floor a couple of days ago and talked about health care. He said: If people would just look at the newspaper, they would see that ObamaCare has changed America—in his words—for the better.

Well, millions of Americans do pick up the newspaper. I hope many of them saw the Presiding Officer's article in today's Wall Street Journal about some of the travel and things he has seen regarding our Nation's security. But I would like to point out to Senator REID that there have been headlines in the papers repeatedly, including one in the Reno Gazette-Journal this month, that said his home State—"Nevada ranked 48th in healthcare by finance website." This from a finance Web site. They are talking about just how bad the health care law has been for the people of his home State of Nevada. It was about a new survey that looked at things such as health care costs and access to care and how it impacts people at home. So if ObamaCare is so great—at least as great as Senator REID says it is—then why is his home State ranked almost dead last?

Look, Americans are seeing headlines like the one that appeared on the front page of the Washington Times the day the Senator came to the floor. Had he picked it up and looked at it on the way to the floor, he would have seen the headline on the front page saying "Failures of Obamacare. . . ." This was on the front page the day he came to the floor and said: Check out the headlines. The article says: "Democrats see need for fallback plan." They need a fallback plan because this health care law has been so devastating to people all across this country. If ObamaCare is so great, why do the Democrats need a fallback plan?

Look, people across the country are seeing headlines like this every day.

A Washington Post headline: "Health-care exchange sign-ups fall short of forecasts."

The New York Times: "ObamaCare Options? In Many Parts of Country, Only One Insurer Will Remain."

Another New York Times article: "Cost of health law's plans set to rise more sharply."

This is from the paper The Hill: "Dems to GOP: Help us fix ObamaCare."