

informed decisions regarding postmenopausal hormone therapy;

Whereas WHI reduced the incidence of breast cancer by 10,000 to 15,000 cases per year, and the overall health care savings far exceeded the WHI investment;

Whereas ORWH supported the National Cancer Institute's development of a vaccine that prevents the transmission of Human Papilloma Virus, resulting in a decrease in the number of cases of cervical cancer;

Whereas, in 1994, ORWH co-sponsored with the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases a landmark study, the results of which showed that giving the drug AZT to HIV-infected women with little or no prior antiretroviral therapy reduced the risk of mother-to-child transmission of HIV by ⅔;

Whereas according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, perinatal HIV infections in the United States have dropped by more than 90 percent;

Whereas ORWH co-funded a large clinical study of the genetic and environmental risk factors for ischemic stroke, which identified a strong relationship between the number of cigarettes smoked per day and the probability of ischemic stroke in young women, prompting the targeting of smoking as a preventable and modifiable risk factor for cerebrovascular disease in young women; and

Whereas over the past 25 years, ORWH has contributed support toward major advances in knowledge about the genetic risk for breast cancer, and discovery of the BRCA1 and BRCA2 genetic risk markers has enabled better-informed genetic counseling and treatment for members of families that carry mutant alleles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends ORWH for its work over the past 25 years to improve and save the lives of women worldwide and expresses that ORWH must remain intact for this and future generations;

(2) recognizes that there remain striking sex and gender differences among many diseases and conditions on which ORWH should continue to focus;

(3) encourages ORWH to continue to focus on ensuring that NIH supports biomedical research that considers sex as a biological variable across the research spectrum; and

(4) encourages the Director of the NIH to continue to consult and involve ORWH on all matters related to the influence of sex and gender on health, especially those matters pertaining to the consideration of sex as a biological variable in research with vertebrate animals and humans.

The amendment (No. 2665) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the title)

Amend the title so as to read: "A resolution celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Office of Research on Women's Health at the National Institutes of Health."

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I think the parliamentary choreography does not show what we just did.

We are now, through a resolution cosponsored by Senator COLLINS and me, cosponsored by all the women of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Office of Research on Women's Health at the National Institutes of Health.

Twenty-five years ago, on September 10, 1990, the Office of Research on Women's Health was established at NIH. It ensured that women were included in NIH-funded research protocols. It set research priorities, scientific peer review and scientific knowledge, and it promoted medical research.

There were two outcomes that I am so proud of—No. 1, what we have done to improve women's health, and No. 2, we showed that a process of working on a bipartisan basis actually worked.

This is not to tell old war stories about legislative issues. Twenty-five years ago women were not included in the protocols at NIH. There were many reasons given, most of them not scientifically reliable or accurate. Working together, Senator Nancy Kassebaum and I—the only two women in the Senate at the time—joined hands with the House—Congresswoman Pat Schroeder, Connie Morella, and Senator Olympia Snowe—and we worked together to get legislation passed to get women included in the protocols, scientifically appropriate, and to establish the office of women's health. We worked then with Senator Tom Harkin and Arlen Specter here and Senator Ted Kennedy and Senator Kassebaum to get it done. These roll-calls of people who are no longer with us in this institution and some who passed by showed we got it done. It was modest in money, big in dreams. I will give one outcome of what they did.

George Bush the elder appointed Dr. Bernadine Healy to be head of NIH. Dr. Healy led a scientific study on hormone replacement. She was able to get the money because of Tom Harkin, Arlen Specter, and all of us, all working together. I was an appropriator as well who helped and assisted, Senator Kennedy, Senator Nancy Kassebaum—now, of course, Baker. And guess what. This is the outcome: Because of that hormone replacement study, medical practice was changed because of the excessive use of hormones in inappropriate situations. As a result, it is estimated by public health epidemiologists that we save 15,000 lives a year. Because of the hormone replacement study, breast cancer rates went down 12 percent.

So when they say: Can't you guys and gals work together? When we do, we save lives. We save lives. It is estimated that over 600 lives were saved because of this one study alone, and more will happen every year. So when we get it together, yes, we save lives, hundreds of thousands at a time.

So I commemorate the great work of the Office of Research on Women's Health, and I want to once again, joining with my dear friend and esteemed colleague Senator COLLINS, show that when we work together, we can really make a change—a change that improves the lives of the American people, and women all over this country thank this body for the leadership we have provided.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am delighted to join with my friend and colleague, the Dean of the Senate women, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, in sponsoring this resolution to commemorate the 25th anniversary of

NIH's Office of Research on Women's Health. This office has improved and saved the lives of countless women not only in our country but worldwide. It has been a great success.

Our resolution, as Senator MIKULSKI mentioned, is cosponsored by every single one of the women serving in the Senate today. I always point out that just as the men of the Senate span the ideological spectrum, so do the women of the Senate. But we have come together to endorse this resolution because each and every one of us recognizes the critical, lifesaving work that has been done by this office at NIH.

As the Senator from Maryland has pointed out, this was a collaborative effort among women—including my former colleague, Olympia Snowe—in both the House and the Senate 25 years ago to redress the fact that so many clinical trials that were being conducted by NIH or through NIH funding excluded women. I remember one on heart disease that was called Mr. Fit. Mr. Fit. Not a single woman was included in this groundbreaking study despite the fact that women die of heart disease more than any other disease and despite the fact that women react differently than men do to different therapies, to different drugs.

Our resolution commends the office for its work over the past 25 years to improve and save the lives of women. It recognizes that there remain striking gender differences among many diseases and conditions on which this office should continue to focus. It also encourages the office to continue to focus on ensuring that NIH supports biomedical research that considers gender as a biological variable across the spectrum of research projects that we are doing. And it encourages the Director of the NIH to continue to consult and involve the Office of Research on Women's Health on all matters related to the influence of gender on health, especially those pertaining to the consideration of gender as a biological variable in research with humans.

I am delighted that we have now been able to clear the obstacles to the adoption of this resolution and that it has been approved without dissent. As my colleague has indicated, it is an example of a development that was taken 25 years ago in response to a real problem of women being excluded from clinical trials, from health care research, and we have made a difference with this office. That is why I am proud to join with my friend the senior Senator from Maryland, the Dean of the women of the Senate, in sponsoring this legislation with each of our female colleagues serving the United States as Members of this great body.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:38 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SCOTT).

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015— Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

BAN ON DOMESTIC OIL EXPORTS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, there is a proposal that is going to be made before the House of Representatives and before the Senate. That proposal will lift the ban on the exportation of American oil—oil that is drilled for here in the United States. The oil industry wants to have this ban lifted. You have to go back in history 40 years, to 1975, in order to find why that ban on exported oil is on the books. In 1975 we were at the height of the first oil embargo from OPEC. We were importing 30 to 35 percent of the oil we consumed in the United States. A ban was put in place for us to export our own oil if we were importing 30 to 35 percent of the oil that we were consuming in America. It put us at a big disadvantage if we took that approach to our own oil.

Today the United States imports 25 to 30 percent of all the oil which we consume. Mark Twain used to say that history doesn't repeat itself, but it does tend to rhyme. Today is a lot like 1975 in terms of the amount of oil that we import into our country. Right now we import 5 million barrels of oil a day. We import oil from Iraq, we import oil from Venezuela, and we import oil from the Persian Gulf in order to fuel our economy. Now the oil industry says: Let's start selling the oil we have and drill for in the United States out in the open market. Why does the oil industry want to do that? Because when oil is drilled for in the United States, the price that is set is set in Oklahoma. Cushing, OK, is where the price is set. On average that price is \$3 to \$6 less expensive per barrel than the oil that is on the open market. That is called the Brent crude price. But it is the world price. That is not our price. Our price is \$3 to \$6 less.

The oil industry in America wants to get our oil out in the open market so they can sell it to other countries. What countries? First in line would be China. After that, most likely, are other Asian nations. That makes a lot of sense for oil companies. It does not make any sense for American consumers. By keeping the ban in place, Barclays Bank estimated that all that oil here put pressure on prices and lowered prices for consumers by \$11 billion last year. You can see it when you look at the price at the pump when you go to fill up.

This year Barclays Bank estimates that there will be a \$10 billion reduction in cost for consumers. You can see it at the pump. You can see the price coming down. The pressure works for consumers. The oil industry does not

like that. They want to get that oil out of America. They want to get a higher price on the global market.

As to national security, does it really make any sense for the United States to be sending young men and women over to the Middle East in uniform, into that highly unstable part of our planet in order to ensure that this stability leads to huge ships with oil in it coming from the Middle East into America, while simultaneously having the oil industry saying let's export our own oil that we already have? It makes no sense. As long as we are exporting young men and women over to the Middle East to fight, to protect ourselves, we should not be exporting our own oil domestically. It makes no sense whatsoever.

Our own Department of Energy says that our production in America is going to peak in the year 2020—peak—and then decline for the next 20 years. We import 5 million barrels a day. Our oil production will peak in the year 2020 and then start to decline, and the oil industry wants to start exporting our own oil. Many of the advocates of that say: You wouldn't have a ban on any other product being exported from the United States. That is probably right. We don't have a ban on the export of widgets or watches. But on the other hand, we don't fight wars over widgets. We don't fight wars over watches.

Oil is different. Oil has been at the center for 50 years of this powerful geopolitical battle that the United States has been drawn into in the Middle East. Let's not kid ourselves. We are living it every day, looking at the lead stories on every television network in our country—every day.

In terms of what we lose, the domestic refining industry is totally opposed to this. The oil refining industry of the United States is totally opposed to exportation. Why? Because they are investing in the construction of new refineries here to refine American oil here in refineries that are constructed and employing hundreds of thousands of people within our own country. The refining industry opposes it. It would be a \$9 billion loss and a reduction by 1.6 million barrels of oil per day that could be refined in the United States. The shipbuilding industry is opposed to it.

We are seeing a 40-percent increase in the amount of shipbuilding in America. Here is what is happening. The oil is produced in the oil patches. It is put on ships, and it is sent to Pennsylvania, sent to New Jersey, sent to other parts of America. You need ships to do that. Then that oil gets refined in Pennsylvania, and it gets refined in other parts of the country. That would end this incredible shipbuilding boom that we have seen.

Where will these exports go? We are not like Russia. We are not like Saudi Arabia. We don't have state-run oil companies. We are a capitalists. Capitalists go for the highest price no mat-

ter where it is. You put the oil out on the open seas, and our companies will head toward the highest price.

Who is going to pay the highest price? China is going to pay the highest price. Other countries that are wealthy are going to pay the highest price. We can't pretend that it is going to go to where the geopolitical needs of the Secretary of State or Secretary of Defense are going to go. That is not how capitalism works. You go towards the highest price. That is the fiduciary responsibility that you have as a CEO of a company. That does not get mixed up within our society. The hand on the tiller of those ships is heading towards the highest price.

Who benefits? The oil companies will benefit. There are estimates that by 2025, they will be making an extra \$30 billion a year in profits—per year. It makes sense for the oil companies.

Who are the losers? Our consumers are going to be big losers. Our national security is a big loser. We are exporting our strength, our oil, even as we need 5 million extra barrels a day. Our domestic refiners are big losers. Our U.S. shipbuilding industry is a big loser, and our environment is a big loser.

Can you imagine it? The Pope is arriving next week, and he is going to talk about the role that human beings are playing in the dangerous warming of our planet. What the oil industry wants us to do is to continue to engage in expanded fracking of oil on our own soil, even though we haven't fully figured out how to contain the methane that comes out of that fracking, and then put it on ships and send it around the world. Where are the benefits for the American people? Our environment takes all of the risks, and the oil goes out to the open seas with the benefit to the oil companies. It makes no sense at all.

Within 10 years, they are making an extra \$30 billion every single year from that additional profit that they get by selling it overseas, rather than keeping it here and keeping the pressure on lowering the price for consumers here in our country.

Many times you hear them saying: We really should be able to drill off the coastline of the United States, all the way up to Maine, down to Florida, from San Diego up to the top of Alaska—right off the coastline. What about the fishing industry? It could endanger it. What about tourism on those beaches if this is spilled? It could endanger it. But they say: We must do it in order to ensure that we have the oil that we need here in the United States.

You can't have it both ways. You can't say that we have enough oil that we can export it out of our country, and simultaneously say that we must drill off of our coastlines in dangerous conditions because we don't need the oil because we can export it. You can't have it both ways. No one is allowed to do that.

There is a pretty high contradiction coefficient in the argument made by