

I would note that two Alabama Congresswomen, new, younger Members of the House of Representatives, MARTHA ROBY, a Republican, and TERRI SEWELL, a Democrat, introduced similar bills in the House of Representatives, which passed unanimously, 420 to 0. The Senate bill today that Senator BOOKER and I have moved out of the Senate banking committee, which my colleague from Alabama, Senator SHELBY, chairs—it moved out of that committee unanimously. It now has been passed through the Senate.

It was a very historic day. It marked an alteration in the history of America. It changed an unacceptable abuse of American rights, the right to vote, and it created a more positive world, country, and region. I grew up not too far from there. I was in high school or junior high school when that happened. I remember reading about it, thinking about it, but I do not think I fully understood the significance of it until time had gone by.

I think this is a very fitting honor. I am pleased it has passed today. I am pleased for those who will receive the honor.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I support S. 527, a bill to honor the foot soldiers of the historic civil rights march that led thousands from Selma to Montgomery in a peaceful protest for their right to vote.

I am proud to cosponsor this bill, which would award the Congressional Gold Medal to those who gave their blood, sweat, and tears in the name of ending unfathomable injustices in our country. In honor of the 50th anniversary of the march, this award will recognize those whose groundbreaking efforts acted as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act and made our Nation a more free and equitable place.

Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, and the final 54-mile march from Selma to the Alabama state capitol in Montgomery were defining moments in the never-ending struggle for equal treatment under the law. On Bloody Sunday, peaceful marchers at the Edmund Pettus Bridge by Selma were met by State troopers and locals, resulting in a brutal conflict. Seventeen members of the march were hospitalized, and shameful images of protesters being beaten with nightsticks focused national and worldwide attention on the event. Following Turnaround Tuesday, in which 2,500 marchers held a silent prayer at the same bridge, and a court battle to stop police interference with the march, a final march took place with over 25,000 people flooding the State capitol.

The Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, and Montgomery marches created undeniable momentum for change, and the events left an indelible mark on our national consciousness. President Johnson presented the Voting Rights Act to Congress shortly after Turnaround Tuesday, and by August of the same year, the bill passed Congress.

This bill would provide the plainly warranted recognition to these brave men and women. It would provide a Congressional Gold Medal to be displayed at the Selma Interpretive Center near the Edmund Pettus Bridge, a fitting tribute to the Foot Soldiers who made that fateful march.

Our country was founded on the precept that the power of government is derived from the people it governs. The primary form of expressing opinions in our democracy is through voting. The marchers who risked everything were committed to ensuring our democracy was truly representative, leaving a lasting and positive effect on our Nation. I salute these Foot Soldiers today, and I urge the Senate to swiftly pass this important legislation.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to speak as in morning business for such time as I shall consume.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to use a visible example of the cold weather during my remarks.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am reminiscent, with the snow on the ground, of 5 years ago. The Presiding Officer was not here at that time. He does not have the advantage of knowing the story of what is behind this. The story that is behind this is that back when they started all the hysteria on global warming, there happened to be another snowstorm that was unprecedented. It set a record that year.

There is a charming family of six, I say to my friend in the chair, who built this. Their picture is here. That happens to be my daughter and her family of six. At that time it got a lot of attention. It actually got a lot of national attention.

In case we have forgotten, because we keep hearing that 2014 has been the warmest year on record, I ask the Chair: Do you know what this is? It is a snowball. That is just from outside here. So it is very cold out, very unseasonable. So, Mr. President, catch this.

We hear the perpetual headline that 2014 has been the warmest year on record. Now the script has flipped. I think it is important, since we hear it over and over and over again on the floor of this Senate. Some outlets are referring to the recent cold temperatures as the "Siberian Express," as we can see with the snowball out there. This is today. This is reality.

Others are printing pictures of a frozen Niagara Falls. And 4,700 square

miles of ice have formed on the Great Lakes in 1 night. That has never happened before.

Let's talk more about the warmest year claim. On January 16, NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, concluded that 2014 was the warmest year in modern record, which starts in 1880.

NASA relied on readings from over 3,000 measuring stations worldwide, and only found an increase of just two one-hundredths of a degree over the previous record. Now an important point that was left out of the NASA press release was that the margin of error, which on average is 0.1 degree Celsius, was several times greater than the amount of warming. So, in reality, it is so far within the margin of error that it is not really recordable. This discrepancy was questioned at a press conference, and NASA's GISS Director backtracked.

This is the Goddard Institute for Space Studies. He backtracked on the warmest year headline saying there was only a 38-percent chance that 2014 was the warmest year on the record. Another recent report issued by the Berkeley Earth surface temperature project, using data from more than 30,000 temperature stations, concluded that if 2014 was the warmest year on record, it was by less than 0.01 degrees Celsius—again, below the margin of error ultimately making it possible to conclude that 2014 was the warmest record on year.

Additional climate experts, including University of Oklahoma geophysicist David Deming, have stated that the warmest year on record statement is only as relevant as when the record actually began. Others state that record-setting conclusions issued in January require the use of incomplete data because the preponderance of the data arrives much later from underdeveloped and developing nations.

The media was quick to ditch the warmest year on record claim as cold weather has left most of the country experiencing record low temperatures.

Tuesday's Washington Post highlighted all of the longstanding records that were broken in the Northeast and Midwest.

My State is Oklahoma and that is not even included in this article. But we set 146 records—alltime records—in my State of Oklahoma just during that time.

According to the National Weather Service, 67 record lows were broken on Monday and Tuesday of this week.

Whether news cycles or climate cycles, variations in hot and cold are really nothing new. Recent climate change discussions like to focus on climate trends post-1880, but the reality is that climate change has been occurring since the beginning of time.

The chart behind me is very interesting because it shows two things that everyone agrees with. The first is that we had the medieval warm period. This

is a period of time starting about 1000 A.D. and going to about 1400 A.D. This is a major warming period that led into what they call the little ice age, which was about 1500 A.D. to about 1900 A.D.

The interesting thing is that many of us in this room remember that when they first started talking about global warming, a scientist named Michael Mann developed what they call the hockey stick theory, and that had a hockey stick showing that for a long period of time we had temperatures that were level, and then all of a sudden they started going up like the blade of a hockey stick.

The problem was they neglected to note that the two periods were, in reality, in his sketch of a hockey stick. So in his opinion then, as portrayed by the hockey stick, there was no medieval warm period or little ice age.

By the way, this Michael Mann is the same one who was featured as the main person who was guilty of violations that created this term called the climate change, which was characterized as the most outrageous. I don't have it in my notes, but one of the publications in England talked about the worst scientific disgrace in national history.

Time magazine had a chart, and this is interesting because people who look at the weather and get concerned about all the warming periods and the cold, to them the world is coming to an end. This one shows that in 1974 another ice age was coming. That is the actual cover of the magazine. So everyone is concerned that the world is coming to an end, and at the same time they were talking about the fact that there is going to be another ice age.

In the past 2000 years there was the medieval warm period followed immediately by the little ice age. These two climate events are widely recognized in scientific literature. No one has refuted these. These are incontrovertible.

In 2006 the National Academy of Sciences released its study "Surface Temperature Reconstructions for the Last 2000 Years," and that acknowledged that there were relatively warm conditions during that period of time.

So that is history, and that is behind us.

While that is still up, I will go on and fast forward. That same magazine, Time magazine, had as its cover a short time after that this poor, typical, polar bear that is standing on the last piece of ice—and we are all going to die because global warming is coming.

This is something that has been happening over long periods of time. Every time it does, everyone tries to say that the world is coming to an end and that somehow man is so important and so powerful that he can change that.

In 1975 Newsweek published an article titled "The Cooling World," which argued that global temperatures were falling and terrible consequences for food production were on the horizon—and all of that. Well, we know about that.

This highlights that the climate is changing, and it always has been changing.

In fact, our recent vote during the Keystone XL Pipeline debate showed that 97 of us in this Chamber—Democrats and Republicans—agreed that climate has always been changing. I made a little talk on the floor at that time and I said: You know, I think this is something on which we can all agree. If we look at archaeological diggings, history, the Scriptures, climate has always been in changing.

Despite a long list of unsubstantiated global warming claims, climate activists and environmental groups will cling to any extreme weather-related headline to their case for global warming and to instill the fear of global warming in the American people. People sometimes ask me why. Why do you suppose they are doing this, spending all this time?

They tried it through legislation. We defeated it. Now it is through regulations that would cost between \$300 billion and \$400 billion a year. Yet it wouldn't have any effect on what they perceive to be global warming. So that is the question. Why is it?

There is a scientist by the name of Richard Lindzen. Richard Lindzen is with MIT. Some of us have argued he is the most knowledgeable of all the climate scientists. He answered that question. He said: You know, regulating carbon is like regulating life. If you regulate carbon, it is a bureaucrat's dream, because regulating carbon regulates life. So it is a power struggle.

I think that is probably the best answer. I am not a scientist. I don't claim to be. But I quote scientists, and they have the answers to these questions.

TERRORISM

Now, President Obama is using a similar tactic in order to scare Americans into supporting his extreme climate change agenda. In a recent interview, President Obama agreed that the media overstates the dangers of terrorism while downplaying the risks of climate change. His Press Secretary, Josh Earnest, later reiterated that President Obama believes climate change affects far more Americans than terrorists.

Now, that is the first time we heard that. But wait until we hear later what the President himself and his Secretary of State said. According to the President, the biggest challenge we face is not the spread of Islamic extremist terrorism in Syria, Iraq, Egypt, Algeria, Libya, Tunisia, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Somalia, Yemen or Nigeria. The greatest threat that we face is not Russian aggression in NATO and the United States, as well as its invasion of Georgia and Ukraine. It is not the expansion of Iranian influence and sponsorship of terrorism throughout the Middle East or its pursuit of a nuclear weapons system to deliver it and to be able to hit the United States of America. The greatest threat is not

North Korea's continued development of its nuclear weapons stockpile and the improving of their delivery systems to include the January 23 launch of a sea-launched ballistic missile that was called the KN-11. I think we are all aware of that. And the greatest threat is not the continued capture and killing of reporters, missionaries, businessmen, Christians, and other non-Muslims in what has clearly been a religious confrontation being pursued. The President's position is that global warming is our greatest threat—greater than all the things I just mentioned. It is underscored by the fact that he won't even publicly state that the 21 Egyptians executed by ISIL in Libya were Christians. He won't recognize that, and he won't recognize that it has anything to do with radical Islam.

He goes out of his way to downplay the actions and dangers of ISIS even though the group continues to terrorize the world. Just this past weekend, ISIS abducted over 70 Syrian Christians, including women and children from villages in eastern Syria. To my knowledge, we don't know what they have done with them yet. But there are 70 of them, and the previous 21 were killed because of their Christianity.

According to the President, our biggest threat is not the continued threats made by extremists against the United States and its citizens. It is not the successful attacks carried out in the United States and other places such as New York, Boston, Fort Hood or potential attacks of lone wolves or sleeper cells against soft targets such as the Mall of America, which is the most recent subject of an ISIL threat. Even as these atrocities are taking place, President Obama is telling the world that climate change is a greater threat to our Nation than terrorists. This is just another illustration that this President and his administration are detached from the realities that we are facing today and into the future.

His repeated failure to understand the real threat to our national security and his inability to develop a coherent national security strategy has put this Nation at a level of risk that has been unknown for decades.

His failure of leadership and his gutting of our military have weakened our ability to influence and respond to crises. This all comes at a tremendous cost to our national security.

The President has accused the media of overstating the problem, heightening the fears of the population. As he downplays the threats, we see photos of young children standing in military-like formation, being brainwashed into ISIS or ISIL extremism. We shouldn't be surprised. It is a natural outgrowth of the President's failed leadership.

In 2012 and 2013 President Obama spoke of helping Libya and Yemen fight terrorism. Yet as he addressed

this Nation, both countries spiraled toward chaos, creating terrorist safe havens. Just days after his speech, Yemen's Prime Minister and his Cabinet resigned amidst a coup by the Iranian-backed Houthi rebels.

The administration aided instability in Afghanistan by releasing the most senior leaders of the Taliban, the Taliban dream team. We all remember that.

We had just passed a law saying that the President cannot release anyone from Gitmo—from Guantanamo Bay—without giving 30 days' notice to Congress. Yet he totally ignored that and let these people go. Some of the terrorists out of Gitmo—I carry this card with me because it is really not believable. Of the five that he turned loose, one was named Mohammed Fazil, and the Taliban commander said that Mohammed Fazil's release "is like pouring 10,000 Taliban fighters into the battle on the side of jihad. Now the Taliban have the right lion to lead them in the final moment before victory against Afghanistan."

Now, I don't know where these are. I suggest that all five have returned to the battle. The record is that of those who have been released, some 29 percent have gone back to the battle.

So that is taking place. Mullah Omar, the Taliban's leader, called the release a great victory.

This action allowed these men to rejoin the fight against our service men and women. This is a big deal.

The President quickly withdrew from Iraq, leaving a vacuum for ISIS to fill, which is now requiring our military to return. The President wants to repeat our errors with a speedy withdrawal from Afghanistan, and that is despite the advice of his commanders on the ground and the request by Afghanistan's newest President, Ashraf Ghani, to reexamine our withdrawal plan.

He has de-Reaganized Europe by drastically cutting our forces, acquiescing to Russian influences by cutting our ballistic missile defense site in Poland and our radar in the Czech Republic. I remember when that happened. I was so concerned about that because we put the radar site and the ballistic missile defense site in Poland and the Czech Republic because—that was for the protection of Western Europe and Eastern United States because we don't have the capacity to offer protection the American people should expect. But the President did that anyway. He failed to provide assistance—apart from the MREs and blankets. Instead of sending weapons to the Ukrainians, he sends blankets.

We had Poroshenko, the President of Ukraine, come in and give a speech to a joint session of Congress. In that speech he said we need to have some defense against what Putin and the Russians are doing with the separatists in his country of Ukraine.

I happened to be over there. I was over there during the parliamentary elections. Not many people in America

realize that in the Ukraine—our very good friends in Ukraine had their parliamentary elections in October, and President Poroshenko looked me in the eyes and said very proudly how good the outcome was. This was the first time in 96 years that the Ukraine had parliamentary elections and didn't elect one Communist to a seat in the Parliament. That was the first time that had ever happened. Yet the President said in his State of the Union message:

We're upholding the principle that bigger nations can't bully the small—by opposing Russian aggression, supporting Ukraine's democracy, and reassuring our NATO allies.

That is what he said, standing in the House Chamber, in his State of the Union speech. Yet, under the President's failed leadership, we have seen two ceasefire failures in the Ukraine, thousands of civilians displaced, and approximately 5,000 people killed.

America's assistance is vital to denying Putin's attempts to destabilize the region. Yet it is not happening. It is not happening under the Obama administration. This administration is overwhelmed by world events and blind to the fact that terrorists are at war with America and our way of life. We now live in a world where our allies don't trust us and our enemies don't fear us. When will the President and his administration take the steps required to minimize the risk to Americans and our allies by providing this country with a national security strategy—one that addresses today's global security environment, grows back our military and its readiness, and deals with our enemies from a position of strength, not weakness and not appeasement?

These are the biggest threats facing our Nation today. It is decidedly not global warming. The threat of war, terrorism, and extremism has plagued the Earth for centuries. The United States is not immune. We must take all threats seriously and take every responsible action to secure our freedom. Threats to our national security are always the most serious threats we face. Issues such as global warming or global cooling 40 years ago are simply not what we need to be worrying about in the same breath when we are talking about national defense.

I say this because I have a deep concern. I was the ranking member on the Senate Armed Services Committee, and I am in a position to see what is happening around the world. The threats we are facing are unprecedented.

Just yesterday we had a hearing, and we had James Clapper, the Director of National Intelligence. This is one of the things he has been quoted as saying:

Looking back over my now more than half a century in intelligence, I've not experienced a time when we've been beset by more crises and threats around the globe.

In the hearing we held yesterday, the Director said:

When the final accounting is done, 2014 will have been the most lethal year for global

terrorism in the 45 years such data has been compiled.

So this goes on and on. This is what the military says. This is the threat we face. Everyone understands it except the White House.

On February 25, just yesterday, Secretary of State Kerry said—and keep in mind he said this with all these threats we are facing:

Today is actually, despite ISIL, despite the visible killings that you see and how horrific they are, we are actually living in a period of less daily threat to Americans and to people in the world than normally—less deaths, less violent deaths today than through the last century.

We all know better than that. We know how threatened we are. Everyone knows it except the White House, and they are going to have to wake up to save our Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 3 minutes notwithstanding the previous order.

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

TRIBUTE TO LOUIS STOKES

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, at a quarter after, I am leading a group of seven or eight Senators to talk about the trade promotion authority and the transpacific partnership, but I would like to take this opportunity while the floor is empty—and I thank my Republican colleagues—to talk about Ohio civil rights pioneer Congressman Louis Stokes. I have known him for 35 years. We celebrated his 90th birthday on Monday, and I had the opportunity to speak to him.

Lou Stokes is a proud son of Cleveland, the city in which I live. He was born in that city nine decades ago and grew up in one of the first Federal housing projects in the country.

Lou rose to prominence as a lawyer and a legislator. His father worked in a laundromat and his mother cleaned houses. Lou himself shined shoes to earn extra money. He served in the Army during World War II and went to college at night on the GI bill. He is the American success story.

Lou was stationed in the Deep South during segregation. He was appalled by the discrimination he witnessed, even for those wearing the uniform and serving our country. That experience compelled him to dedicate his life to fighting injustice.

He handled matters big and small in his legal practice. He argued the landmark case of *Terry v. Ohio* before the U.S. Supreme Court. The Court's ruling

in Terry addressed the police stop-and-frisk policy and defined what constitutes a reasonable search and seizure.

As the first African American to represent Ohio in the U.S. Congress and the first African American to serve on the Committee on Appropriations, his mere presence was groundbreaking. But Lou never rested on his laurels. While serving as a Congressman for 15 terms, he was a fierce advocate for the city he loves and for civil rights. Lou didn't use his success to seek glory for himself; he used his powerful position to expand opportunities for men and women, for people of all colors, and young people and old people.

After retiring from Congress, he didn't retire; he returned home to Cleveland and played a key role in Cleveland's civic life. His role at Squire Sanders was instrumental in the firm's growth. Working alongside his longtime friend and my friend John Lewis—the lawyer John Lewis in Cleveland, not Congressman JOHN LEWIS in Washington—he made a difference in so many ways.

Lou served on the Ohio Task Force on Community-Police Relations. He is known always to fight for his neighborhood, the projects where he and his brother Carl, who was the first Black mayor of a major American city, grew up. Carl was elected as mayor right before Lou was elected to Congress. It has been their labor of love to work to improve schools and opportunities in Cleveland.

The Cleveland VA center is named after Lou Stokes, as are buildings throughout the Nation. They illustrate his hard work and his dedication. It is fitting that as we celebrate his milestone birthday this week, the final week of Black History Month, we renew our commitment to the cause of Lou Stokes's 90 years.

Lou means so much to me personally, he means so much to Cleveland, and he means so much to our country. I know the Presiding Officer, Senator INHOFE, got to serve with him in the House, as I did, and it was an honor to do that and a privilege to call Lou Stokes my friend.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, before we get underway with this colloquy on trade, I wish to respond briefly to what I understand was a presentation made by one of the Republican Senators suggesting that the continued existence of snow disproves climate change.

First, that is not the only measure. We can take a look at sea-level rise, which we can measure from Fort Pulaski in Georgia up to Alaska where LISA MURKOWSKI has acknowledged that climate change is causing sea-level rise, eroding her native villages, to the sea-level rise in my hometown State at the naval station. We can look at the pH changes in the ocean which we actually measure. It is not complicated. Kids measure the pH in their aquarium all the time. We can measure ocean temperature, which is absolutely clear. It involves something called a thermometer. It really isn't all that complicated.

And if we want to understand why the existence of snow might actually be consistent with climate change, I urge people to get their personal device here—their iPad, whatever it is they have—and load up the EarthNow! app. The EarthNow! app is run by a group called NASA. NASA is pretty capable. They are driving a rover around on Mars right now. These are folks who know a little bit about what they are talking about. They map the temperature of the planet, and we can see the cold arctic air drawn down to New England, drawn down to our area, and it is in large part because the ocean is warming offshore that we have this snow.

So not only does the continued existence of snow not disprove global warming—if you actually know what is going on and take the least bit of effort to understand it—you would see it is completely consistent with global warming as it is understood by scientists such as those from NASA.

I will have more later, but let's get on with this other business.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY AND THE TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I know there is a UC order for seven or eight Senators. Senators CASEY, MERKLEY, WHITEHOUSE, MARKEY, WARREN, BALDWIN, and SANDERS we believe will be here for the next 45 minutes under an agreed-to order to talk about our concerns with trade promotion authority and the Trans-Pacific Partnership. I will lead off, then Senator CASEY will speak, and then Senators MERKLEY and WHITEHOUSE.

We know a number of things. We know that American workers are the most competitive and productive in the world. We also know that far too many have been left behind because of wrong-headed trade deals.

In the 20th century, we built the strongest economy in the history of the world by building the strongest middle class in the history of the world. We invested in the health and safety of our workforce, guaranteed workers the right to bargain for fairer pay and reasonable hours. It was a fight to do so and more remains to be done. We expanded opportunity for

women and people of color, which society had never done, to realize their full potential in the labor force.

Americans up and down the income spectrum reaped the awards. Workers got more productive, wages went up, profits were good, communities were strong. We led the world with a booming economy fueled by a skilled and powered workforce.

The talent and tenacity of American workers has not changed, but our leaders—including in this body—commitment to those workers, frankly, and, unfortunately, has.

Nowhere has that abandonment been more clear than the free trade agreements we now approve with little oversight and minimal debate. These binding trade agreements affect all American workers. They cut into small business and industry, and they cut to the heart of the values we hold dear—or say we hold dear—as a sovereign democracy. Too often they are pushed through this body so quickly that the corporations pushing them hope we won't notice these agreements are loaded with corporate handouts that weaken our Nation's ability to chart its own course.

The last thing we need is another NAFTA. We know what the North American Free Trade Agreement did to us 20 years ago when it passed. We know the damage it did to workers in Philadelphia. We know the damage it did to small companies in Oregon. We know what it did to communities in Rhode Island. And I know up close what it has done to far too many communities—from Troy to Piqua to Toledo to Dayton—in my State.

We always talk about American exceptionalism. We give lip service to American exceptionalism. Our Nation is exceptional. We see these same people who always talk about American exceptionalism—and criticize anyone who doesn't talk about it—pushing trade agreements that undermine American laws and bypass our legal system. For what end? To benefit big companies that can't get what they want through our democratic system.

I urge my colleagues and anyone else to read the article today written by Senator WARREN of Massachusetts about something called “investor-state dispute settlement.” This is what I want to talk about for a moment.

Take the issue of tobacco. Tobacco use is the world's leading cause of preventable death. Tobacco companies have been one of the most successful group of companies of any in American history. More trade deals give Big Tobacco a new tool to peddle its poison.

How does that work? Big Tobacco turns to trade deals as the most fertile avenue for defeating international public health efforts. Big Tobacco knows it can't win in this body, even with a conservative majority that too often does the bidding of Wall Street and large companies. Senator MERKLEY and Senator BLUMENTHAL have helped to lead

this charge to make our tobacco law strong.

So what do tobacco companies do if they can't win in a democratic body here? They use a trade provision called investor-state dispute settlement. In the case of Big Tobacco, it uses ISDS to challenge public health measures around the globe. Let me give an example.

Big Tobacco and its supporters are suing Australia for its Tobacco Plain Packaging Act 2011. They are challenging under Australian-Hong Kong bilateral investment. They have good lawyers. They know how to do darned near anything to use these laws—that they helped write under trade policy—to benefit them and sell more cigarettes and poison our young people in far too many cases.

The Tobacco Plain Packaging Act in Australia—passed by a democratically elected legislative body, signed onto by the executive branch in Australia—simply says that tobacco companies can't use their market-tested logos; they have to use plain black-and-white packaging. Also on the tobacco packet they put pictures of diseased lungs or pictures of people who have been sick from tobacco, so when people pick that packet up, they get the message.

Big Tobacco sued Australia under the World Trade Organization despite the fact that the Australian courts had already ruled in favor of the country of the public health law.

Tobacco companies have launched similar cases against Uruguay over its proposed graphic warnings on cigarette packages. Think about this: A big tobacco company is threatening to sue a small, relatively poor country such as Uruguay, saying: If you pass a public health law, we are going to sue you in court—not in one of your courts, but in some international court made up of mostly trade lawyers.

So what does a country the size of Uruguay often do? They give up. They say: We can't afford to defend ourselves in an expensive court proceeding. Fortunately for Uruguay, Michael Bloomberg—one of the richest men in the world—stepped in and helped them fight back.

Togo—one of the ten poorest countries in the world, West Africa—simply gave up when Philip Morris sued them. The people of Togo wanted a law to protect their children from the big marketing of tobacco companies. Philip Morris came in, threatened to sue them, and the Government of Togo backed off. What is good about that? It is appalling. It is antidemocratic. It has been left to a comedy show to expose the practice of Big Tobacco. Watch John Oliver talk about this on HBO.

Trade policy should ensure a level playing field for all companies competing in a global economy, not serve as a tool for the richest corporation to overturn laws enacted by sovereign governments—particularly not when, in this country, we are facing stagnating wages, increased middle-class anxiety and insecurity, and rising inequality at home.

So we are going to pass a trade agreement as CEOs' pay reaches record highs, as average wages stagnate, as profits go up, as unionization goes down, as wages fall as a share of GDP.

Think about this. Productivity has increased in our country 85 percent in the past 30 years. It used to be, as productivity went like that, wages went like that. But now, productivity goes up 85 percent, wages went up 6 percent. The minimum wage in the United States today has 30-percent less buying power than it had 35 years ago. That is why this trade agreement is a bad idea. We know what has happened to manufacturing. We lost 5 million manufacturing jobs between 2000 and 2010.

Just look at the impact of trade on U.S. manufacturing for more than 16 million jobs. It dropped here. We had the auto rescue here, which meant a little bit of an increase, but it increases only back to 12 million manufacturing jobs.

We know bad trade agreements, bad policies on globalization, bad policies on taxes, mean lost jobs—lost manufacturing jobs. That is the ticket to the middle class.

Ever since NAFTA in 1993, taking effect in 1994, we have seen the acceleration of that decline in manufacturing jobs. It is bad for our communities, it is bad for our families, it is bad for our workers, it is bad for the States of Pennsylvania and Oregon and Ohio and Rhode Island, and it is bad for our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the same topic Senator BROWN just spoke to. I appreciate what my colleague from Ohio brought to this Senate floor today when talking about trade. I especially commend him for not just his advocacy and his passion for standing up for workers, but for the persuasive case he makes against some of our trade policies—not just now but over time.

We stand now poised to debate a set of issues which we haven't debated all that much in the 8 years I have been in the Senate—in this case first trade promotion authority, and then of course the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

The people I represent in Pennsylvania know what is at stake here. Each of us, as American people, will have the chance to review the details of these proposals. But based upon past experience with trade agreements in our lifetime, and especially in the last 25 years, that past experience causes me grave concerns about what is in store, first and foremost for our workers, which of course means our economy. Time and again Pennsylvania workers and Pennsylvania businesses of all sizes have ended up with the short end of the stick on trade deals. The question they ask now is, what is in it for them? What is in it for workers? What is in it for companies across Pennsylvania and across the country? And, therefore, what is in it for all of us when it comes to our economic bottom line?

Take the free trade agreement with South Korea just as a recent example. That was passed in 2011. I didn't support it. But here is what we were told before that. In December of 2010, the administration said the agreement would support 70,000 additional American jobs, and it would increase American exports by \$10 billion to \$11 billion.

During the first 2 years that the agreement took effect, exports actually fell by \$3.1 billion and imports grew by \$5.6 billion, contributing to the loss of thousands of jobs. So that is one agreement, one example.

Let's take the impact on a particular industry, the steel industry. By any measure, any review of World War II would indicate very clearly that the American steel industry and steelworkers played a substantial role in our ability to win World War II, to prevail in the most difficult of conflicts. What has happened since then? Well, we know that, for example, import surges from South Korea caused real damage to the steel industry in recent years, which has led directly to job losses in places such as Pennsylvania, for example.

So workers want to know where the benefit is that is promised to them. Over and over again we hear these assertions: "If we pass this agreement, this will be the impact on exports and imports" and "If we pass this agreement, this will be the net benefit to job creation and therefore to workers." Too often the result is otherwise.

If you look at the numbers—if you look at the agreement, the industry, and then look at the numbers, in the United States we had a \$66.5 billion deficit with free trade agreement partners in 2013. Our trade balance with our largest free trade agreement partners—Canada, Mexico, and Korea—is decidedly negative, not positive. So how is this time going to be different?

I am concerned and a lot of Americans are concerned that past experience suggests broadly negative impacts on jobs, especially—as Senator BROWN made reference to by way of the chart and in other ways—especially as it relates to manufacturing jobs, the ones on which you can support a family, the jobs that lead to the kind of innovation that allows us to be one step ahead of the world.

The Economic Policy Institute, for example, estimates that 26,300 jobs were lost due to the trade deficit with Mexico between 1994 and 2011 in the aftermath of NAFTA, as Senator BROWN referred to, and 122,600 jobs were lost to China in the 12 years since China joined the World Trade Organization. Between these two countries alone, the average impact on Pennsylvania was some 148,900 jobs lost in Pennsylvania. So we have lost almost 150,000 jobs in Pennsylvania directly attributable to two factors: the impact

of China joining the World Trade Organization and the impact of the trade deficit with Mexico.

When we look at the big picture, we have two possible areas of concern with the so-called TPP—the Trans-Pacific Partnership—and by proxy the trade promotion authority as a part of that. There are labor and human rights concerns as well as currency manipulation.

Members of Congress and labor groups across the country have expressed concerns about the so-called TPP and the countries we are negotiating with, in particular Malaysia, Vietnam, Brunei, and Mexico. Vietnam, as an example, does not offer the establishment of independent labor unions and has opposed the inclusion of any provision that would change this aspect of domestic law. The State Department has noted that basic labor freedoms are often restricted in both Mexico and Malaysia. Brunei has recently implemented a harsh form of sharia law that violates basic human rights standards.

How about currency manipulation? American manufacturers feel the pain from undervalued foreign currencies all the time, and they time and again have demanded action from both parties and both Houses of Congress. Currency manipulation concerns are urgent not just because of Japan's policies and the potential future inclusion of China in TPP down the road but also because virtually every negotiating partner has a currency that is undervalued relative to the U.S. dollar—every partner in the proposed TPP.

As of January of this year, according to the Economist, 10 of the 11 negotiating partners of the United States had undervalued currency. Seven of those countries, including Japan, had currencies that were at least 25 percent undervalued relative to the U.S. dollar.

For far too long this administration has allowed foreign countries to stack the deck against U.S. workers when it comes to currency policies by manipulating their currencies. We have a chance in the TPP negotiations to do something about this. All of us believe our workers could out-compete any workers in the world if they were given the chance, if they were given basic fairness and a level playing field.

Pennsylvanians want Congress and the administration to focus on policies that lead to both good jobs and good wages. So let's give our workers the kind of support we gave past generations. Give our workers a level playing field so that they can out-compete and therefore out-produce any workers in the world. I am afraid these agreements are not a step in that direction.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

I appreciate the points that have been made by my colleagues from Ohio and Pennsylvania and the remarks yet

to be made by my colleague from Rhode Island.

We are here on the floor together to raise fundamental issues that should be part of the discussion about a proposed trade deal or a fast track to a trade deal.

I love the concept of trade, the idea that our particular economy, based on our natural resources and based on our skills, can do certain things very well, and we would like to be able to sell those products to the world. Other nations do other things very well, and we can benefit from their expertise and their products. That is a win-win on a level playing field between nations that have roughly the same structure of environmental laws, roughly the same structure of labor laws, and roughly the same level of wages. That is a win-win for nations involved in agreements.

Indeed, our trade agreements after World War II were very much along those lines as we expanded to the economies of Europe. We saw substantial prosperity that affected people throughout our economy.

My parents couldn't believe the difference between their experience as children and their experience during the 1950s and 1960s as they started to raise children in terms of going from extraordinarily humble means—lack of electricity, running water, insulation, and all the things that became a part of the basic housing structure in post-World War II when they were raising their children. That prosperity came from a nation producing things and sharing the wealth throughout its economy. My father was a working man, a blue-collar mechanic. He brought those mechanical skills to the mill and became a millwright. He loved that job keeping the machinery in the mill running and loved other jobs. He was able to live the American dream.

Our recent trade deals have created something quite different. They have been based on an unequal relationship. They have been based on a relationship between our Nation with strong environmental and labor laws and good wages and high enforcement and countries with the exact opposite—such as China, for example. Indeed, the result in the period since NAFTA—and my colleagues spoke to it, but let me re-emphasize it—there has been a loss of 50,000 factories, a loss of 5 million manufacturing jobs. That is logical. If you are a manufacturing company making products, you will move that manufacturing to the places where it is cheapest to make them.

This is how the vision works out. There is a conversation about reducing barriers, and companies say: Look at all the additional products we can sell to that emerging economy in China. We can make a lot more in the United States and sell to China.

That is stage one.

Stage two: Hey, now we can move our manufacturing overseas and produce things at a much lower price and not

only sell them to the foreign nation but also sell them back to the customers in the United States.

That is exactly what we have seen, and that is why we have lost these 5 million jobs.

So the initial publicity campaign is all about creating jobs through increasing American manufacturing, but the reality in an unequal relationship is the opposite.

Let's make sure we create a standard for the consideration of future trade deals, a standard that will evaluate whether this deal will create good-paying jobs here in America, will expand prosperity to the middle class in America or will do the opposite. This is the standard we should apply. I would like to evaluate the provisions of the proposed deal in that light, but I can't because the negotiations are secret. The draft text is secret. We need to demand that there not be secrecy about something as important as creating jobs or destroying jobs in America—my standard for evaluating what is to come.

Let's talk for a minute about these eroding promises of enforcement. A couple of years ago a group of 10 U.S. Senators took a trip to China to meet with the Ambassador. We asked how the Ambassador felt about enforcement against China and their currency manipulation. He basically said: Here is the deal. We have broad strategic concerns that involve China, and we don't want to put ripples in the water.

So can you really have a level playing field in a situation where you are not willing to enforce even the provisions that are on the books? Can you really have a fair deal for America?

During the conversations a couple years ago, I proposed legislation that would require China to actually honor what it was responsible for doing under the WTO. Under the WTO, it was to notify Americans about all the subsidies it provided for items of export, deductions and credits. But China had not honored that responsibility. So I proposed that we exercise another part of WTO, which was counter-notifications by our Trade Representative. Within 2 weeks of putting this idea forward, guess what. Our Trade Representative put forward a list of 200 subsidies through the counter-notification process.

Looking at those notifications carefully revealed a vast strategy in renewable energy to subsidize exports—not allowed under the WTO; to subsidize paper—not allowed to subsidize exports of paper under the WTO. The result is that paper plants are going out of business in the United States of America. The Blue Heron plant most recently has gone out of business on the Willamette River at a place where paper has been made for a very long period of time. In fact, the energy from the water wheel that was first there provided some of the first electricity in America. Longtime industrial production, but those jobs are gone. So that is a real concern.

My colleague mentioned the interstate dispute settlement and the fact that it gives a foreign investor rights that a domestic investor does not have. It puts constraints on consumer protections that can be overrun—consumer protections done by a State can be overrun by an investor from a foreign nation.

For example, you have a bill in America to stop producing toxic flame retardants and putting them into our carpet. Well, the foreign investor says: We built a plant to produce that chemical. Sorry, you can't have that consumer protection even though the result would be a lot more cancer for American citizens. That is an example of the concerns about handing over the sovereignty of our Nation, of our consumer law, our environmental law, to an independent board that operates outside of our constitutional framework. That is a legitimate concern which needs to be addressed in this conversation.

So on issues of enforcement and issues of secrecy, issues of whether we are creating jobs or destroying jobs, I encourage Americans to become as familiar as possible with the provisions that have been leaked about the Trans-Pacific Partnership and to think carefully and give concerns to us here in Congress that we will work to address. When we have the legitimate text before us, then we can engage in a more detailed debate. But right now we need to push to end this secrecy on an issue that is so important to the future prosperity of our Nation and of our families.

Thank you, Mr. President. It is my pleasure to yield the floor in anticipation of remarks from my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

I wish to start by sharing the experience I had when I first started running for the Senate and asking people around Rhode Island to give me the chance to represent them here.

One unforgettable day was when I was walking along a factory floor and, as I was walking along, I looked down and I noticed there were holes in the concrete pad of the factory floor, and I asked: Why are the holes there?

They explained: Oh, well, we used to have manufacturing machinery here. Those are the bolt holes, and we unbolted the machinery and shipped it overseas to a Central American country where the same product is made for the same buyers on the same machine, but it is made by foreign workers.

That is the memory I have when I think about these trade agreements, and it is not just that one machine that went overseas. Rhode Island, not a big State, has lost more than 50,000 good-paying manufacturing jobs since 1990. Our State has been on the losing end of these trade deals.

People say they are going to enforce the environmental and human rights

and labor and safety requirements of these agreements. I have not seen it. I am at the stage where I don't believe it. You will have to prove it to me. You will have to establish a record of enforcing these things before I will believe it. I have been told that for too long. I don't believe the enforcement any longer.

I have to say I don't like the process very much either. It is secret. We are kept out of it. Who is in it are a lot of big corporations, and they are up to, I think, no good in a lot of these deals. Look at these private deals in private forums where they can litigate against a government. They secure that right through these treaty agreements. It is outrageous.

First of all, a lot of it is done for the sake of pollution. It is the big folks, such as Chevron, ExxonMobil, Dow Chemical, and Cargill, that brought nearly 600 disputes, pursuing billions of dollars in damages against governments.

A former member of the WTO's appellate body said in 2005 the WTO agreements "allow Member Nations to challenge almost any measure to reduce greenhouse gas emissions enacted by any other Member." So the war on the environment continues through this mechanism.

In March 2013, more than one-third of the disputes pending before the World Bank's investment dispute settlement tribunal were related to oil, mining, or gas. Guess what they want. The public health around the world is suffering because of this.

In Africa, the tobacco industry has brought these types of claims against the Governments of Gabon, Namibia, Togo, and Uganda. They probably add up to about \$100 billion in total GDP—all 4 countries—which is probably about a quarter of the revenues of Big Tobacco worldwide. So this is a question of pure, raw economic power by massive corporate interests being used to make governments knuckle under on public health issues such as tobacco. That is just wrong. And it can displace the regular governing systems of courts.

Chevron was asked to clean up contamination it left behind. It lost in the courts in Ecuador, it lost in the courts in America, and so it went and got a third bite at the apple in front of three private lawyers in one of these forums.

Where do you think the motivation is of private lawyers? Who are their clients going to be next? Another government? I don't think so. It will be the big corporate companies.

After many States in the United States created a ban on something called MMT, a gasoline additive, as a probable carcinogen, U.S. Ethyl Corporation filed a NAFTA investor-state case against Canada which then reversed its national ban on the potentially carcinogenic chemical.

They pick on themselves as well. Under NAFTA provisions, a Canadian company sued the Quebec government

over a decision to put a moratorium on fracking. I guess Quebec can't make a decision about fracking any longer because some company can sue it under these agreements which involve private lawyers and were cooked up in the dark in these trade agreements. It is preposterous.

Mr. BROWN. Think about what Senator WHITEHOUSE just said. A U.S. company that made an additive to gasoline filed suit against a public health law that the Canadian legislative body passed because they believed in clean air, and under NAFTA that company in the United States sued the Canadians. The Canadian taxpayers had to pay the company and repeal their public health law.

I thought this was a democracy. Think about that multiplied by how many times—about what Senator WARREN talked about her in piece in the Washington Post today.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. How long is it until they sue the State of Louisiana or the State of Rhode Island or the State of Massachusetts or the State of Ohio? It is up for grabs. This is just a private remedy.

Since I am on Senator WARREN's subject, and since her piece in the Washington Post is something we have all read today, I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, the United States is in the final stages of negotiating the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a massive free-trade agreement with Mexico, Canada, Japan, Singapore, and seven other countries.

I come to the floor today to ask a fundamental question: Who will benefit from the TPP? American workers, consumers, small businesses, taxpayers, or the biggest national corporations in the world?

One strong hint is buried down in the fine print of the closely guarded draft. The provision, an increasingly common feature of international trade agreements, is called investor-state dispute settlement, or ISDS. The name may sound mild, but this provision fundamentally tilts the playing field further in favor of big multinational corporations. Worse yet, it undermines U.S. sovereignty.

ISDS allows foreign companies to challenge American laws and potentially pick up huge payouts from taxpayers without ever stepping foot in an American court.

Here is how it works. Imagine that the United States bans a toxic chemical that is often added to gasoline. We ban it because we believe it is dangerous for people's health or harmful to the environment. If a foreign company that makes this toxic chemical wants to sell it in the United States, it would normally have to challenge that in a U.S. court. But with ISDS, the company could skip the U.S. court and go before an international panel of arbitrators. If the company wins, the ruling cannot be challenged in U.S.

courts, and the arbitration panel could require the American taxpayers to cough up millions, even billions, of dollars in damages.

ISDS has the power to impose gigantic fines, but it doesn't have independent judges. Instead, highly paid corporate lawyers go back and forth between representing corporations one day and sitting in judgment of corporations the next day.

Now I don't know, maybe that makes sense in an arbitration between two corporations, but not in cases between corporations and governments. We should have real doubts about how likely it is that a lawyer looking to attract high-paying corporate clients will rule against those corporations when it is his or her turn to sit in the judge's seat.

It is also a real problem that only international investors—only international investors—get to use these courts, investors that are, by and large, large corporations.

If a Vietnamese company with American operations wants to challenge an increase in the U.S. minimum wage, it can use ISDS, but if an American labor union believes the Vietnamese companies are paying slave labor wages in violation of trade commitments, the union has to try to wind itself through the Vietnamese courts. Good luck with that.

These rigged pseudocourts were created after World War II because investors worried about putting money into developing countries where the legal systems were not as dependable. They were concerned that a corporation might build a plant today only to watch a dictator confiscate it tomorrow. ISDS was born to encourage foreign investment in countries with weak legal systems.

Now, look, I don't know if these justifications made sense back then, but they sure don't make sense now. Countries in the TPP are hardly emerging economies with weak legal systems. Australia and Japan have well-developed and well-respected legal systems, and multinational corporations navigate those legal systems every single day, but ISDS would preempt their courts too. And to the extent there are countries that are riskier politically, market competition can solve that problem.

Countries that respect property rights and the rule of law, such as the United States, should be more competitive. If a company wants to invest in a country with a weak legal system, then it should buy political risk insurance, which is available.

The use of ISDS is on the rise. From 1959 to 2002, there were fewer than 100 ISDS claims worldwide, but by 2012 alone, there were 58 cases. That was in 1 year.

Here are some examples of recent cases under various treaties with ISDS provisions:

A French company sued Egypt because Egypt raised its minimum wage.

A Swedish company sued Germany because Germany decided to phase out nuclear power after the Fukushima disaster.

A Dutch company sued the Czech Republic because the Czech Republic didn't bail out a bank the Dutch company partially owned.

American corporations are getting in on the action too. Philip Morris is trying to use ISDS to stop Uruguay from implementing new tobacco regulations aimed at cutting domestic smoking rates.

ISDS advocates point out that so far this process has not hurt the United States. Our negotiators, who refuse to make the text of this trade agreement public, claim it will include a bigger, better version of ISDS that will protect our ability to regulate in the public interest.

But with ISDS cases exploding in the last several years and more and more multinational corporations headquartered abroad, it is only a matter of time before such a challenge does serious damage here. Letting a panel of arbitrators replace the U.S. legal system with a complex and unnecessary alternative on the assumption that nothing could possibly go wrong seems like a really bad idea.

This is not a partisan issue. I don't often agree with the conservative Cato Institute, and I suspect they don't often agree with me, but this morning the head of Cato's trade policy program said that ISDS "raises serious questions about democratic accountability, sovereignty, checks and balances, and the separation of power." He went on to say that these concerns about ISDS are "one[s] that libertarians and other free market advocates should share." I think that is right.

Conservatives who believe in American sovereignty are outraged that ISDS shifts power from American courts as envisioned by our Constitution to unaccountable international tribunals. Libertarians are offended that ISDS effectively offers a free taxpayer subsidy to countries with weaker legal systems, and progressives should oppose ISDS because it allows big multinationals to weaken labor and environmental rules.

Giving foreign corporations special rights to challenge our laws outside of our legal system is a bad deal. So long as TPP includes investor-state dispute settlement, the only winners will be international corporations.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I thank Senator BROWN for putting this group together to discuss the important trade issues facing our Nation.

In Massachusetts, we know what a good trade deal looks like and what a bad trade deal looks like. Remember, we are the ones that traded Babe Ruth, so we know a bad trade deal when we see one. Right now in Massachusetts,

we are seeing the United States negotiate two significant agreements—the Trans-Pacific Partnership in Asia and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership in Europe.

Both of these agreements would establish binding rules on a wide range of issues, such as labor rights, energy, the environment, medicine pricing, patents, Internet freedom, and innovation. The scope goes far beyond the previous trade deals that focused on tariffs or access to markets.

These trade deals need to meet several criteria in order to be acceptable:

No. 1, workers rights. It is critically important that both trade deals protect workers rights. When we put goods on a ship, we can't do it by casting off workers rights. These deals need to benefit the middle class in our country and protect the rights of workers of our trading partners. They must also have robust and fully enforceable labor provisions that ensure compliance with international core labor standards.

No. 2, protect our environment. If companies want to make more green, great, but they have to be green, too, and follow the environmental laws to protect our resources and our planet. Both trade deals must include new and robust commitments from member countries to protect and conserve forests, oceans, wildlife, and obligate member companies to comply with both domestic environmental laws and meet their commitments under multilateral environmental agreements. These commitments must be strong and binding and enforceable.

No. 3, don't export our oil. Long-standing U.S. law prohibits the export of crude oil except in instances in which the President determines that exports are consistent with the national interests. There should not be any language in the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement requiring the United States to automatically approve exports of oil without such a determination. We shouldn't be sending oil abroad even as we send young men and women in the military to dangerous regions of the world to protect oil shipments coming into our country. We still import 5 million barrels of oil a day. We are the largest importer in the world. We should not be exporting oil.

No. 4, no fishy stuff. The Trans-Pacific Partnership should eliminate harmful fishery subsidies. It should maintain the ability of governments to support conservation of ocean resources, promote sustainable development and viable fishing industries and the coastal communities that depend on them, and the Trans-Pacific Partnership should include strong measures that address illegal fishing.

No. 5, don't try to sneak through bad sneaker deals. It is my understanding that the current Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement includes a provision that eliminates all trade barriers for sneakers and shoes. This provision would endanger more than 1,350 critical

manufacturing jobs at the New Balance facilities in Massachusetts and Maine. New Balance has decided to keep its manufacturing in the United States, despite economic pressures and additional costs. As the last remaining U.S. manufacturer of running shoes, New Balance already has smaller profit margins on the U.S.-made shoes than most of its competitors have on their imported shoes. They should be congratulated for making a commitment to American workers, but if the TPP agreement is passed by the Congress in its current form, we will not be making that same commitment and that is because New Balance will be forced to immediately compete with Vietnam running shoe companies which have a dramatic advantage with low hourly wages and subsidized businesses. Those 1,350 jobs might be lost. That is wrong, and we must do better for our manufacturers.

No. 6, don't go around the U.S. courts. Both the Trans-Pacific Partnership and Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership have provisions to allow other countries to take legal action if they do not like the decisions made by our government and do it outside of our own courts. These separate panels could subject American taxpayers to billions in taxes, and when they have a problem with decisions in other countries, we will have to argue in an independent court or even in their home country courts. This double standard is wrong and it should not be included. We need trade deals that don't ship workers' rights overseas along with their jobs. We need trade deals that don't cloud our skies with more pollution or plunder our seas with illegal fishing. We need trade deals that keep our oil and manufacturing jobs here at home. We need trade deals that don't outsource justice or jobs overseas.

That is why we need to make sure, just as when Babe Ruth was traded, that we don't put a curse on our own economy by passing trade bills that do not protect the American worker.

Finally, I understand my good friend from Oklahoma Senator INHOFE came to the floor to argue that the existence of winter disproves global warming. I know some in my home State of Massachusetts might be thinking the same thought right now, because after the first snowstorm people look for a good place to sled. After the second snowstorm, people look for a place to pile the snow. After the third and fourth snowstorms, people stop looking for things to do and just start asking, Why? Why so much snow? Why such intense storms? Why won't it stop?

What if I told my colleagues that it was all part of climate change; that the winters we have known have now been supercharged by warmer waters and stronger storms; that the carbon pollution that is making our summers hotter is also making our winters more unpredictable.

Here are three facts I want my colleagues to know.

No. 1, the waters off Massachusetts—and indeed up and down the Atlantic coast—have been at record warm levels; in one case, off Cape Cod, 21 degrees warmer than normal. Warmer water gives storms more moisture. That moisture has to drop at some point, and when it does, it means more snow. That is what is going on.

No. 2, cold air is part of winter. We are New England, after all. But new research is suggesting that the melting of the Arctic icecap is causing more of those polar vortex situations that send frigid air rushing down to Canada and then down to us. That is global warming.

No. 3, more intense precipitation events have increased by 71 percent in New England since 1958—71 percent more intense precipitation. Supercharged storms from climate change are a little like Rob Gronkowski. They are bigger, they are stronger, and whether they spike the ball or drop their snow, it is going to come down harder—a lot harder.

Across the globe temperatures are going up. It is called global warming. This last year was the warmest on record across the globe. A few weeks of cold in one place does not mean global warming isn't happening. That is the difference between weather and climate. Global warming does not cancel the seasons. We will still have winter. Sometimes it will be still very cold, but overall it is going to be warmer—a lot warmer. When warmer water makes more moisture and it goes into the clouds, it has to come down, and when it does and it is cold, it should be no surprise that we will get more snow. If there is one issue we can all agree on regarding the climate, it is that every person in Massachusetts would rather be in Florida at Red Sox spring training camp right now because this snow is still coming down. But it is not just weather, it is climate change as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me congratulate and applaud Senator BROWN of Ohio for organizing this colloquy on trade. In my view, if we look at why the middle class of this country has been in decline for the last 40 years, why millions of Americans are working longer hours with lower wages, why we have seen a huge shift in the economy from a manufacturing economy where people earn good wages to a Walmart economy where people are working for very low wages and minimal benefits, one—not the only one, but one of the significant factors has been our disastrous trade policies for a number of decades.

If people are watching this discussion, there may be some people who will say, Trans-Pacific Partnership, what is that? What is that trade agreement? What are they talking about? One of the reasons they may ask that question is that a study came out recently which looked at how the major

networks are covering the TPP—the Trans-Pacific Partnership. It turns out the major television networks are not covering the TPP. Incredible as it may sound, this trade agreement—the largest trade agreement in the history of the United States of America—has received virtually no coverage—no coverage—on the major networks. That, to me, is very amazing.

I think it was Albert Einstein who made the point that doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results is sometimes called insanity. If we think a new trade agreement, based on the same principles of the old trade agreements, is going to bring different results, I think we are very wrong.

I remember, because I have been in Congress for many of the major debates on trade, that way back when we had a discussion about unfettered free trade with China and the argument was, well, look at the huge market in China, look at all the jobs we will create in America selling to China. In fact, we were told that permanent normal trade relations with China would create hundreds of thousands of American jobs. Well, not quite. It turns out, as everybody who goes into a department store knows, most of the products we buy are made in China, and it turns out the permanent normal trade relations trade agreement with China has led to the loss of more than 3 million good-paying American jobs. The reason for that is obvious. Why is a major corporation going to pay an American worker \$15, \$20 an hour, provide decent benefits, and obey environmental laws when that corporation can shut down here, go to China, pay people very low wages, and bring their products back to America? That is why, when we go shopping, most of what we buy is made in China.

We were told that the North American Free Trade Agreement—NAFTA—would create at least 200,000 American jobs in just a few years. Well, not quite. It turns out that NAFTA has led to the loss of about 1 million American jobs.

We were told that the Korean Free Trade Agreement would increase American jobs. Well, it turns out that it has led to the loss of over 60,000 American jobs.

Since we signed NAFTA, the United States has a cumulative trade deficit of \$8.8 trillion—\$8.8 trillion. That is wealth that has left the United States and gone overseas.

While the full text of the Trans-Pacific Partnership has not been made public, there have been some leaks of what is included in it, and what these leaks tell us is in fact very disturbing. I think it is obvious to anyone who has taken a look at this issue that the TPP is just a new, easy way for corporations to shut down in America and to send jobs abroad. It is estimated the United States would lose more than 130,000 jobs to Vietnam and Japan alone if the Trans-Pacific Partnership goes into effect. The reason for that is, when we

are dealing with a country such as Vietnam, my understanding is the minimum wage there is 56 cents an hour—56 cents an hour. Maybe I am old-fashioned, but I don't think American workers should be forced to compete against people who are working for 56 cents an hour.

At a time when corporations have already outsourced over 3 million service sector jobs in the United States, the Trans-Pacific Partnership includes rules that will make it easier for corporate America to outsource call centers, computer programming, engineering, accounting, and medical diagnostic drugs. Under the TPP, Vietnamese companies will be able to compete with American companies for Federal contracts funded by U.S. taxpayers, undermining "Buy American" laws.

If the United States is to remain a major industrial power, producing real products and creating good-paying jobs, we must develop a new set of trade policies which work for the ordinary American worker and not for large corporations and big campaign donors.

Let me be very frank as an Independent. This is not just the Republicans who have been supporting these unfettered free-trade agreements; there have been Democratic Presidents as well. Corporate America has said we want these trade policies, and the leaders of both political parties have said, yes, that is what we will do. But I think it is time to stand up and say enough is enough.

This country now is in a major race to the bottom. Workers are working longer hours for lower wages. No American worker should be forced to compete against desperate people around the world who are making pennies an hour. Corporate America, every night on television in every ad we see, tells us buy this product, buy that product. Well, you know what. If they want us to buy these products, maybe it is high time they started manufacturing those products in the United States of America.

I am opposed to the TPP, Trans-Pacific Partnership trade agreement. That is my view, but I would hope every Member is opposed to the fast-track process which gives the authority to negotiate these agreements in the final terms. That is because nobody has had the opportunity to even see what is in the proposed agreement right now. Transparency has been minimal, absolutely minimal.

I think if we are serious about creating decent-paying jobs in this country, if we are serious about raising wages, if we are serious about dealing with the other issues that have surfaced in terms of sovereignty, the idea we would make it easier for tobacco companies to sell their deadly products to children around the world and make it harder for governments to protect the health of their citizens is an absolute outrage. It is an outrage.

I again thank Senator BROWN for helping to organize this event. I hope the American people stand and tell the Congress enough is enough. We need to create decent-paying jobs in this country for a change and not just in other countries around the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, as President Obama has noted in his State of the Union, the American economy is growing again. We are creating jobs at the fastest pace since 1999, and unemployment is lower than before the financial crisis. American businesses are posting large profits and boosting the stock market along with them.

Yet for many working Americans, this good news is only that, news—something they see in the paper or on TV, not in their paychecks or at the kitchen table. Many of the Wisconsin workers I hear from every day are struggling to make ends meet. They are working more, taking home less, and worried that for the first time in American history their kids will have fewer opportunities than they did.

For the last 5 years the Obama administration has been negotiating with 11 nations in the Asia-Pacific region on a free-trade agreement known as the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Some of these countries have values similar to ours and some do not. I fear this agreement could allow some nations to take advantage of the values we as Americans place on our environment, on labor laws, on human rights, and on free enterprise rules. These nations would be competing against American workers on an uneven playing field. This unfair game would continue the downward pressure on wages that has plagued American workers since before NAFTA.

The interests of Wisconsin workers are being represented in these negotiations by unelected officials in the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative. I am here to let these negotiators know that Wisconsinites don't want more of the same failed promises from free-trade deals.

Wisconsin workers make things. We have been one of the top manufacturing States for generations. If we hope to continue making things, we think we should continue to have our own government as a customer. That is why I have been a big and strong supporter of "Buy American" provisions that require Federal agencies that use taxpayer dollars to purchase American-made products.

Free-trade agreements have historically allowed foreign nations too much leeway when bidding for our government projects and contracts, while not affording American companies that fair access, that same access. I have asked the GAO to study this and report back to Congress so we can know the effect skirting "Buy American" laws have and the cost it has to American manufacturers.

Currencies that reflect their true value are also vital to the conduct of global trade. When foreign countries cheat by manipulating their currencies to price their goods cheaper, Wisconsin workers—in fact all American workers—lose.

Seven years ago, then-Senator Obama, speaking about the Bush administration's inaction on currency manipulation said it best:

Refusing to acknowledge this problem will not make it go away. . . . The Administration's refusal to take strong action against China's currency manipulation will also make it more difficult to obtain congressional approval for renewed Trade Promotion Authority, as well as additional trade agreements.

That statement is as true today with the Obama administration as it was with the Bush administration. Currency manipulation is essentially cheating. That is why I support including strong and enforceable currency manipulation provisions in any trade agreement. Without these rules, we will allow countries to engage in a race to the bottom that leaves everybody worse off.

One of the things that has made America great is our entrepreneurial spirit. This spirit has attracted immigrant entrepreneurs from all over the world, but all too often I hear from Wisconsin businesses whose patented ideas are being stolen and replicated in Asia.

I believe any agreement must include high standards for protecting intellectual property to encourage risk-taking investments that turn into profitable companies and jobs in the United States. In the same way, I believe our ideas should be protected. I also believe that what we call our foods should be protected from foreign interference.

Let me explain what I mean by that. In fact, the European Union has sought to restrict the use of cheese, meat, and alcohol names that American producers have used for generations. For instance, cheese producers in Wisconsin would not be able to call their cheese "feta" because it is not made in Greece, while a brewer in Wisconsin couldn't label his dark beer a "Bavarian Black" because it isn't made in Bavaria, in Germany.

I have worked hard to urge the U.S. Trade Representative to reject any attempt by the European Union or any foreign nation to restrict the use of common food names in order to protect our food manufacturers and processors across this country—and especially as Wisconsin is a major producer of beer and brats and cheese, this is an issue that is very close to home.

Finally, I have concerns about the value systems of some of the nations that are party to the TPP. By way of example, Brunei recently adopted new sharia laws that include death by stoning for acts of adultery, homosexuality, and forced amputations for other offenses, including consuming alcohol. These laws go so far as to outlaw

public Christmas celebrations. In fact, the act of wearing a Santa Claus hat in public could lead to a fine of more than \$15,000, a 5-year imprisonment sentence or both.

Amnesty International has called the new rules in Brunei “shocking.” They have been declared illegal by the U.N. High Commissioner For Human Rights. We should not be affording our highest trading privileges to nations that do not value basic human rights.

I have heard from so many constituents who are rightly skeptical of the promises this new generation of trade agreements offer. I appreciate having this opportunity to express my concerns about free-trade agreements that are currently under negotiation. After seeing decades of jobs going overseas while the ones that are left pay less, who can blame the critics? Until it is clear to me that the gains from these agreements will go to the middle class and not just multinational corporations, millionaires or billionaires, I will continue to oppose them.

I thank my colleagues for organizing this opportunity to speak on trade.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the historic vote the FCC took today to preserve Net neutrality and maintain a free and open Internet. But before I turn to that exciting news, I want to take just a moment to talk about the urgent need to pass funding for the Department of Homeland Security.

The Republican leadership has wasted a lot of time over the past month politicizing this issue, and now we find ourselves on the brink of a completely preventable shutdown of DHS. I think every American agrees that funding for Homeland Security is too important to play politics with. Last year Democrats and Republicans came together and passed a clean bill to fund the Department for a full year, and we should do the same this year. I am pleased the Senate Republicans have agreed to take up a clean funding bill, and I hope the House Republicans will quickly do the same.

NET NEUTRALITY

Turning to today's good news, I am thrilled to report that this morning the Federal Communications Commission voted to adopt new rules to preserve a free and open Internet. This is a big win for the 280 million Americans who use the Internet. I want to congratulate FCC Chairman Tom Wheeler and thank him for his leadership on Net neutrality.

The FCC has taken a crucial step to ensure that the Internet remains the platform for free expression, innovation, investment, and economic growth that it has always been. The new rules will offer meaningful protections for all Internet users. They promise to preserve the Internet's status as an open marketplace, a place where everyone can participate on equal footing, free

from discrimination by broadband providers—the companies such as Comcast, Verizon, and AT&T that provide consumers with access to the Internet.

That is what Net neutrality is all about. Net neutrality isn't some radical new idea. It is the simple and longstanding principle that all lawful content on the Internet should receive equal treatment from broadband Internet service providers, regardless of who owns the content or how much money he or she has in the bank. It means broadband providers can't pick and choose which Internet traffic reaches consumers and which doesn't. This idea has been part of the architecture of the Internet from its very start.

Because of Net neutrality, an email from my constituent in rural Minnesota reaches me as quickly as an email from my bank. Because of Net neutrality, the Web site for my local pizzeria loads as quickly as the Web site for a national chain. Because of Net neutrality I can stream videos of my amazingly cute grandson just as easily I can stream a hit TV show, and he is amazingly cute. It is because of Net neutrality that companies such as Amazon, Facebook, and YouTube are household names. Once startups, these are now billion-dollar companies employing thousands. Net neutrality gave them the chance to compete on a level playing field. Their success is a testament to both American innovation and the power of a free and open Internet.

For me, the bottom line is this. The Internet is a vital part of our daily lives. Net neutrality is at the core of how the Internet operates. It is critical to our democracy and to our economy that it continue to operate in this manner. All of the amazing innovation and growth on the Internet did not just happen while we had Net neutrality; it happened because of Net neutrality.

This is not the first time the FCC has sought to protect Net neutrality. Twice before they have tried to implement rules which were then challenged by the big broadband providers and basically struck down by the DC Circuit. It was not that the Court thought that the rules were bad policy, but rather that the FCC had not invoked the proper legal basis.

Since the second court decision last year, we have seen a lot of debate about what the FCC should do. Many of us have called for stronger rules. We have argued that those rules must be grounded in the FCC's authority under title II of the Communications Act if they are going to survive judicial scrutiny and withstand the test of time.

Of course, the big broadband providers pushed for the FCC to move in the opposite direction, to take a weaker approach. Why? Well, without Net neutrality they stood to make a ton of extra money. These guys wanted the FCC to allow them to charge Web sites access to fast lanes to reach consumers. Then only those sites that could afford to pay would see their con-

tent delivered at the fastest speed ever. Everyone else would be relegated to a slow lane. Only those with very deep pockets would be able to afford to pay for the fast lanes, and the broadband providers would have profited at the expense of everybody else.

I fiercely opposed this. Millions and millions of my fellow Americans did too. Consumers and business owners spoke out and urged the FCC to adopt rules that would protect—not destroy—Net neutrality.

They made the case for Net neutrality in clear and compelling terms, arguing that strong rules are essential for the future of the Internet. With today's vote, the FCC has provided those much-needed rules. The new rules are strong, clear, and enforceable. They will prevent broadband providers from blocking or throttling lawful online content.

The rules will stop providers from charging Web sites for access to fast lanes. The FCC is implementing these rules within a time-tested legal framework that will allow the agency to respond to challenges to Net neutrality that arise in the future. Following the commonsense path that I and a number of my colleagues have long urged, the FCC has recognized that broadband Internet access is a title II service, a telecommunications service.

Last spring, I could not have predicted that we would be celebrating this victory today. The best principles of our democracy have won out. It is clear that the voices of the American people have been heard. I have often called Net neutrality the free speech issue of our time. I believe that exercising our free speech right has been key to our success and will continue to be the key to our success.

Today does not mark the end of our work—the work of all Net neutrality supporters to safeguard our free and open Internet. Some of my Republican colleagues have decried the very idea of Net neutrality. More recently others have purported to embrace the concept but at the same time have tried to stop the FCC from taking meaningful action.

My friend Senator JOHN THUNE has drafted legislation that would strip the FCC of authority to regulate access to broadband Internet services. Along with many of my colleagues, I made clear that I regard this as a nonstarter. In the weeks and months ahead, I and other Net neutrality supporters will need to continue to speak out, to make sure everyone understands what is at stake, why we stand by the strong rules adopted by the FCC and why we oppose efforts to strip the FCC of its authority or to weaken Net neutrality protections.

This will take a lot of hard work. Some folks really just do not get it. Back in November, my friend Senator TED CRUZ referred to Net neutrality as “ObamaCare for the Internet.” It was a statement that seemed to demonstrate just a basic misunderstanding of what

Net neutrality is and how the Internet works. For that matter, tens of thousands have seen a YouTube video of Senator CRUZ attacking FCC efforts to protect Net neutrality.

I will just pause to note that the video reached many viewers, and the reason it did was that it was uploaded to YouTube, a site that would not have flourished were it not for Net neutrality. It was because of Net neutrality that YouTube, a company founded by three guys in an office over a pizzeria in San Mateo, CA, was able to compete against and ultimately overtake the well-funded competitor, Google Video.

In his video Senator CRUZ compared an old rotary phone to a modern cell phone. He claimed that the landline was an example of stagnation due to FCC regulation under title II, while cell phone innovation was a product of noninvolvement by the government.

The attempted comparison fails for many reasons, not least because the telephone services on cell phones have long been subject to title II. In fact, the FCC is taking the same kind of approach to applying title II to broadband access services as they have taken in applying it to mobile voice services, where I think we all agree there has been robust investment and innovation under title II.

In the coming months, I expect that we are going to confront a lot of this kind of confusion and misinformation or disinformation. We are going to encounter plenty of people who oppose Net neutrality because they do not understand how the Internet works or do not understand the relevant legal authorities or, frankly, are willing to personally obfuscate to advance their own agenda. I hope the American people will remain engaged on this issue, that they remain willing to speak up, to use the Internet to spread solid information, to organize support, and ultimately to counter the deep-pocketed ISPs and the politicians who may seek to undermine Net neutrality.

I do believe that with the same energy and determination that has gotten us this far, Net neutrality supporters can make today's historic vote a lasting win for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I will yield the floor when the next speaker comes. But while we have a quiet moment, I just want to complete my remarks related to the Senator from Oklahoma and his snowball.

I ask unanimous consent to show the Earth-Now Web site on the iPad device that I have.

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. If you go to Earth-Now, it is actually quite easy to load. You can see how that polar vortex measurably brings the cold air down to New England. If you do not

want—this is produced by NASA. These are pretty serious people. So you can believe NASA and you can believe what their satellites measure on the planet or you can believe the Senator with the snowball.

The U.S. Navy takes this very seriously, to the point where Admiral Locklear, who is the head of the Pacific Command, has said that climate change is the biggest threat that we face in the Pacific. He is a career military officer, and he is deadly serious. You can either believe the U.S. Navy or you can believe the Senator with the snowball.

The religious and faith groups are very clear on this, by and large. I would particularly salute the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, which has made very, very clear strong statements. We are going to hear more from Pope Francis about this when he releases his encyclical and when he speaks to the joint session of Congress on September 24.

I think it will be quite clear that you can either believe the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops and Pope Francis or you can believe the Senator with the snowball.

In corporate America there is an immense array of major, significant, intelligent, and responsible corporations that are very clear that climate change is real. They are companies such as Coke and Pepsi; companies such as Ford, GM, and Caterpillar; companies such as Walmart and Target; companies such as VF Industries, which makes a wide array of clothing products; Nike; companies such as Mars and Nestle.

So, we have our choice. We can believe Coke and Pepsi and Ford and GM and Walmart and Target and VF Industries and Nike and Mars and Nestle; or we can believe the Senator with the snowball.

Every major American scientific society has put itself on record—many of them a decade ago—that climate change is deadly real. They measure it. They see it. They know why it happens. The predictions correlate with what we see, as they increasingly come true. The fundamental principles—that it is derived from carbon pollution, which comes from burning fossil fuels—are beyond legitimate dispute to the point where the leading scientific organizations on the planet calls them “unequivocal.”

So you can believe every single major American scientific society or you can believe the Senator with the snowball.

I would submit the following. I would submit that, if you looked at the American population and you removed the conspiracy theorists—there are always conspiracy theorists in the American population that come out and deny that the moon landing was real. They have their hobgoblins from time to time. If you remove the conspiracy theorists—and there are people who simply do not accept a lot of scientific

truths. They think the Earth is only 6,000 years old. They deny that evolution is real. Fine, they are entitled to that point of view. But it is not one you would want to make much of a bet on. It is not a point of view that is likely to get, for instance, a rover onto the surface of Mars and driven around successfully by scientists. But if people want to have that point of view, they have the right to do it. I just would not put very many bets on how productive that point of view is when you are trying to accomplish something important.

Also, remove the people who have financial ties to the fossil fuel industry. So take out the conspiracy theorists, take out the evolution deniers, take out the people who have a financial tie to the fossil fuel industry, and I would be very surprised if you found virtually anybody left who was not prepared to be responsible about climate change.

Too many of us see it happening right in front of our faces. The science has been too clear for too long. Frankly, what we are seeing is the rollout of the famous tobacco strategy to delay and deny the day of reckoning because they are making money selling tobacco in the meantime while they create false doubt about the damage their product is doing.

Now is an interesting time for that because in Washington, at the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District, we just had oral argument on the enforcement of a decision rendered by a U.S. district judge finding that that tobacco scam—the deliberate pattern of lies by the tobacco industry to convince people tobacco really wasn't responsible for cancer and other ill health effects—that that campaign was a civil racketeering conspiracy. That is the law of the United States of America. I would submit that if we look at the civil racketeering conspiracy that the tobacco industry ran, that has been called out by a court of law, and we compare that to what the polluters are saying about climate change, we will see more similarities than differences.

I yield the floor.

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

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

REMEMBERING MIKE PERRY

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a dear friend whom we have just lost in West Virginia. Mr. Mike Perry. He was a beloved community leader, a dear friend to all of us, and truly an inspiring West Virginian.

Mike was a native of Huntington, WV, which is located in beautiful Cabell County. He was a tireless champion for his community, for Marshall University, and for the entire State of West Virginia.

Upon graduating from Marshall University in 1958, Mike attended WVU School of Law and graduated first in his class. He then spent 20 years as a dedicated lawyer with the firm of Huddleston Bolen in his hometown of Huntington, becoming partner after only 5 short years. In 1981 he entered the banking business and was chairman of the board and CEO of the First Huntington National Bank until his retirement in 2001.

Mike never failed to give back to the Huntington community that he loved, which had rewarded him with so much throughout the years—an education, endless opportunities to make a successful life for himself and his family, and a truly special place he could always call home.

He served as interim president of Marshall University in 1999, donating his entire salary to the university's general scholarship fund. His performance at the university was so highly regarded that the board of trustees voted to remove the word "interim" from his title when listing Marshall's presidents.

Mike woke up every day aspiring to make his community an even better place to work and live and consistently encouraged others to do the same.

Throughout the years he was a great confidant of mine. I enjoyed speaking to Mike on countless occasions on an array of issues, ranging from worldly national and State policies to very localized matters concerning beautiful Cabell County.

Remarkably, despite battling cancer for 1½ years, Mike never stopped working on community projects. He served on countless boards throughout the tri-state area, including those for the Huntington Area Development Council, the Tri-State Airport Authority, and St. Mary's Medical Center, among many others.

Above all, he was a dedicated family man who was truly devoted to his wife Henriella, his three children, and his eight grandchildren. Mike met Henriella in the fifth grade, and he was certain then that he had met the girl of his dreams. He knew even as a youngster that they would spend the rest of their lives together. The two married in 1958, and I think Mike would agree that Henriella always brought out the best in him and made him a better man.

Together, the Perrys moved to Harveysburg in 1973, which was the future Heritage Farm Museum and Village. They transported old log structures and began reassembling buildings and accumulating a unique collection of antiques. Today the farm consists of five houses, a zoo, a church, and several buildings that showcase rich Appalachian heritage.

In 2010 both Mike and Henriella were honored with the Donald R. Myers Humanitarian Award, which recognizes individuals who have enriched Appalachia through their extensive leadership and community service endeavors.

Heritage Farm Museum and Village has become a true mainstay within West Virginia and will forever serve as a reminder of a man who lived to make his community and the Mountain State a better place, a man who was an inspiring leader, a selfless friend, a loving husband, father, grandfather, and so much more. He was a friend to all, and I personally will always value his friendship and his guidance, as will everybody who ever came in contact with Mike Perry.

So I say farewell to my dear friend and God bless to the State of West Virginia and the Perry family.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

WELCOMING THE PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL TO THE UNITED STATES FOR HIS ADDRESS TO A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on Tuesday of next week, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu will make an historic address before the Congress. This is his third address as Prime Minister of Israel. At the invitation of Speaker BOEHNER, he is coming to discuss Iran's nuclear ambitions and the ongoing P5+1 negotiations, as well as the rise of the Islamic State terrorist group and other jihadist groups across the Middle East.

These are obviously serious issues of national security, both for Israel but also for us here in the United States, and Prime Minister Netanyahu and the citizens of Israel have a unique perspective on those issues. In the interest of staying fully informed and aligned with our closest ally in the region, Israel, Congress needs to listen to what Prime Minister Netanyahu has to say, and I look forward to doing so.

I believe the Prime Minister's speech will be both informative and timely, as the Obama administration is reportedly trying to lock down a questionable nuclear deal with the Iranians by the March 24 deadline.

That is why I have introduced S. Res. 76 that welcomes the Prime Minister of Israel to the United States for his address to Congress. This resolution explains just a few of the reasons why the U.S.-Israel alliance is so powerful and so enduring, and it states in part that we welcome the Prime Minister and eagerly await his address before Congress. This resolution reaffirms our commitment to stand with Israel in times of uncertainty, strongly supports Israel's right to self-defense, and finally reaffirms our support and the friendship between our two countries. These sentiments are widely shared in

Congress, but in an increasingly perilous global security environment in which we find ourselves, I think it is important to remind people of how and why the United States stands with Israel.

A majority of Senators have cosponsored this resolution, and I believe today it is time for the Senate to pass it, to reaffirm there will be no daylight between the United States and Israel when it comes to common issues of national security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 76.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 76) welcoming the Prime Minister of Israel to the United States for his address to a joint session of Congress.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Cornyn amendment be agreed to, the resolution, as amended, be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the Cornyn amendment to the title be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 262) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To make a technical correction)

On page 3, line 4, strike "joint session" and insert "joint meeting".

The resolution (S. Res. 76), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

S. RES. 76

Whereas, since its founding in 1948, Israel has been a strong and steadfast ally to the United States in the Middle East, a region characterized by instability and violence;

Whereas the United States-Israel relationship is built on mutual respect for common values, including a commitment to democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, free-market principles, and ethnic and religious diversity;

Whereas the strong cultural, religious, and political ties shared by the United States and Israel help form a bond between our countries that should never be broken;

Whereas Israel continues to serve as a shining model of democratic values by regularly holding free and fair elections, promoting the free exchange of ideas, and vigorously exercising a form of democratic government that is fully representative of its citizens;

Whereas nations such as Iran and Syria, as well as designated foreign terrorist organizations such as Hezbollah and Hamas, refuse to recognize Israel's right to exist, continually call for its destruction, and have repeatedly attacked Israel either directly or through proxies;

Whereas, in particular, the Government of Iran's ongoing pursuit of nuclear weapons poses a tremendous threat both to the United States and Israel;