COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 17, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Michelle A. Bekkering, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and Richard K. Bell, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cote d'Ivoire, Jessica E. Lapenn, of New York, to be Representative of the United States of America to the African Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador, Mary Beth Leonard, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Nigeria, and Lana J. Marks, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Africa, all of the Department of State.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 16, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 17, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 17, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing following nominations: Halil Suleyman Ozerden, of Mississippi, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, David B. Barlow, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah, John Fitzgerald Kness, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, and Eleni Maria Roumel, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 17, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC POLICY

The Subcommittee on Economic Policy of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 17, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AFFAIRS AND FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

The Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 17, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Abigail Brown, an intern in my office, be granted floor privileges through August 2, 2019.

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

DEFENDING THE INTEGRITY OF VOTING SYSTEMS ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 95, S. 1321.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1321) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interference with voting systems under the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 1321) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 1321

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Defending the Integrity of Voting Systems Act''.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON INTERFERENCE WITH VOTING SYSTEMS.

Section 1030(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by adding ''or'' at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) that—

''(i) is part of a voting system; and

''(ii)(I) is used for the management, support, or administration of a Federal election; or

''(II) has moved in or otherwise affects interstate or foreign commerce;'';

(2) in paragraph (11), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(3) in paragraph (12), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(13) the term 'Federal election' means any election (as defined in section 301(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(1))) for Federal office (as defined in section 301(3) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(3))); and

''(14) the term 'voting system' has the meaning given the term in section 301(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(b)).''.

RESTORE THE HARMONY WAY BRIDGE ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 120, S. 1833.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1833) to transfer a bridge over the Wabash River to the New Harmony River Bridge Authority and the New Harmony and Wabash River Bridge Authority, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 1833) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 1833

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Restore the Harmony Way Bridge Act''.

SEC. 2. TRANSFER OF BRIDGE AND LAND.

Notwithstanding any provision of the Act of April 12, 1941 (55 Stat. 140, chapter 71), not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the White County Bridge Commission shall convey, without consideration, to the New Harmony River Bridge Authority and the New Harmony and Wabash River Bridge Authority, any and all right, title, and interest of the Commission in and to the bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Indiana, the approaches to the bridge, and the land underneath or adjacent to the bridge and the approaches to the bridge.

SEC. 3. REPEAL.

The Act of April 12, 1941 (55 Stat. 140, chapter 71), is repealed effective on the date that the White County Bridge Commission completes the conveyance described in section 2.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 18, 2019

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, July 18; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Corker nomination.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of our Democratic colleagues and Senator SULLIVAN.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, for a long time, people opposed to climate action said that tackling climate change would be too costly, would harm economic growth, would be bad for American businesses, and would kill jobs. It turns out these were phony arguments peddled by fossil fuel interests. It turns out they are flat wrong. It turns out that actually the true economic hazard is not climate action but climate inaction.

We have recently seen an explosion of warnings from economic regulators, central banks, insurers, investment firms, and risk analysts that we face economic peril if we fail to address climate change. These are not green groups; these are neutral business and economic experts—the people whose job it is to protect us from risks to financial stability and the people who make a business calculation about what we stand to lose from unabated climate change.

Their warnings are many, and their warnings are serious. One example: Just last month, Moody's warned that climate change will increasingly disrupt and damage critical infrastructure and property and will hurt worker health and productivity across the globe. Moody's, the credit rating giant, estimated—hang on—$69 trillion. We talk about millions around here pretty readily. We talk about billions when we are talking about really big money. Moody's estimated $69 trillion of economic damage globally by 2100, even if we limit global warming to only 2 degrees Celsius. The Presiding Officer and I are probably not going to pay a lot of that. The pages will. We are not currently on track for only 2 degrees Celsius; we are currently on track for around 3 degrees of warming, which Moody's said would put us at further risk of hitting tipping points beyond which lurk far larger, more lasting, and more ominous dangers.

Here is another example: In May, the European Central Bank warned that climate change presents significant economic risks to the economy, to asset values, and to financial stability.

The longer we wait, the longer we fiddle around in this Chamber not doing anything, the more it will cost to protect ourselves in the future. That old saying about a stitch in time saving nine applies here as well.

The ECB said that these risks could cause what they called ''systemic issues,'' especially where markets do not price climate-related risks correctly. ''Systemic issues'' is a bland term. It is central banker-speak. What it means is something pretty serious. Systemic issues means this is so bad that it could take down the entire economy. The European Central Bank is not alone. The Bank of England has been warning of systemic risk from climate change or from not doing anything about climate change for some time now. I think there are now over 30 sovereign banks that have made or adopted such warnings.

Just last week, Senator SCHATZ asked Federal Chairman Powell whether severe weather is increasing due to climate change. Powell did not equivocate. He said simply: ''I believe it is, yes.'' That is the leader of the most influential bank in the world accepting without hesitation a major threat to our financial system, echoed also by a Federal Reserve report out of California. Climate change, they point out, is a major threat to our financial system, to everything from coastal real estate values, which Freddie Mac predicts will crash, to stock market share prices, about which there are numerous adverse predictions if this goes unchecked.

America's biggest financial institutions see what is coming. In the House Financial Services Committee hearing in April, CEOs from six of America's biggest banks agreed that climate change is a serious risk to the financial system, and they said they are trying to take action to address that risk.

There is an unfortunate sidebar, however. Big American banks that claim to support climate action include four of our biggest banks: JPMorgan Chase, Wells Fargo, Citigroup, and Bank of America. These banks all supported the Paris Agreement. In 2017, the CEOs of JPMorgan Chase, Citigroup, and Bank of America even signed a letter urging President Trump not to withdraw from the Paris Agreement.

These banks are all trying to reduce their own emissions, and all have commitments to get to 100 percent renewable electricity—all good steps. But the biggest direct impact these banks have on climate is not through the promises they make but through the investments they make. On that score, these four banks are steering us to climate calamity.

A group of environmental organizations released a report in March adding up fossil fuel financing by 33 large, private sector banks from around the world. These four American banks—JPMorgan Chase, Wells Fargo, Citigroup, and Bank of America, which all support the Paris Agreement and are all reducing their own carbon emissions—they are the four largest funders of fossil fuel projects. Combined, they invested over $580 billion in new fossil fuel projects over the past 3 years. JPMorgan was the worst, with $196 billion of fossil fuel funding in 3 years. JPMorgan was also the top U.S. funder of tar sands, Arctic oil and gas, and coal mining—the most emissions-intensive fuels.

The big American banks accounted for over a third of the surveyed global fossil fuel financing since the Paris Agreement was signed in 2015. Worse, their investment in fossil fuel projects actually increased after the Paris Agreement. Wells Fargo nearly doubled its fossil fuel financing from 2016 to 2018. Obviously, these investments in new fossil fuel projects do not align with the banks' stated support of the Paris Agreement. The math doesn't work. The Paris Agreement aims to limit warming to well below 2 degrees Celsius and to try to limit warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius.

A study just published by Nature shows that the world's existing fossil fuel infrastructure will emit enough carbon pollution to blow us past 1.5 degrees of warming. The authors wrote that little or no additional CO_2-emitting infrastructure can be commissioned. Little or no additional CO_2-emitting infrastructure can be commissioned if we are to meet the Paris Agreement climate goals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the article titled ''How Much Global Warming Is Fossil Fuel Infrastructure Locking In?'' from Inside Climate News be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

That is the math. If the banks are true to their stated support of the Paris Agreement, they should not finance any new fossil fuel projects—unless, of course, they also finance capturing all the carbon emissions, and they are not doing that.

It is true that these banks have announced goals to increase their financing of clean and sustainable projects, but they are only goals, and combined, even their goals only amount to around $100 billion per year, which is about half of what they have actually invested in fossil fuel projects each year since Paris.

Citi even released a report finding that maintaining our current fossil fuel-heavy economy would cost more than moving to clean, low-carbon economy—cost more to stay in the fossil fuel economy than to move to a clean energy economy—and they said that is not including factoring in the economic damage from climate change, which Citi reckons could total $72 trillion—$72 trillion under business as usual. Citi projects that transitioning away from the projects they are investing in to a low-carbon economy will save money on its own and it will help avoid tens of trillions of dollars in further economic damages. Yet they aren't investing consistent with their principles.

According to the International Monetary Fund, fossil fuels are subsidized to the tune of $650 billion per year in the United States. So there is no question that this massive subsidy—probably the biggest subsidy in the history of the planet—makes investing in fossil fuels profitable. But the contradiction remains. These banks all say they support the Paris Agreement. They all recognize that it is economically vital to