

July 11

<https://www.congress.gov/crec/2016/07/11/CREC-2016-07-11.pdf> original page numbers

Reid(NV) p.89, Cardin(MD) p.91 Whitehouse(RI) p.92, Coons(DE) p.92, Udall(NM) p.93, Whitehouse (RI) p.94, Warren(MA) p.95, Whitehouse(RI) p.96, Kaine(VA) p.96, Schumer(NY) p.100, RESOLUTION p.108, Merkley(OR) p.109, Whitehouse(RI) p.111

July 12

<https://www.congress.gov/congressional-record/2016/07/12>

Boxer(CA) p.170, Durbin(IL) p.180, Schatz(HI) p.184, Franken(MN) p.186, Heinrich(NM) p.188, Shaheen(NH) p.189, Reed(RI) p.191, Peters(MI) p.192, Blumenthal(CT) p.194, Markey(MA) p.213, Whitehouse(RI) p.217

The 41 relevant pages were interspersed among other remarks.

They were extracted, combined into this single PDF, pages renumbered, annotated, irrelevant text grayed.

Annotations by John Mashey 07/16/15

Blue: the Senators, and pro-science sources and helpers

Pink: funders and agents of denial, both fossil and tobacco

Index, with page #s in this PDF, and the original page#s from the 2 Congressional Records

2016.07.11	Page	Page
Reid(NV)	2	89
Cardin(MD)	4	91
Whitehouse(RI)	5	92
Coons(DE)	5	92
Udall(NM)	5	93
Whitehouse(RI)	7	94
Warren(MA)	8	95
Kaine(VA)	9	96
Schumer(NY)	12	100
RESOLUTION	14	108
Merkley(OR)	15	109
Whitehouse(RI)	17	111
2016.07.12		
Boxer(CA)	20	170
Durbin(IL)	22	180
Schatz(HI)	24	184
Franken(MN)	25	185
Heinrich(NM)	27	188
Shaheen(NH)	28	189
Reed(RI)	30	191
Peters(MI)	31	192
Blumenthal(CT)	33	194
Markey(MA)	35	213
Whitehouse(RI)	39	217
LAST PAGE	41	219

the other unarmed Black men who died in confrontations with law enforcement.

Some 512 people have been shot and killed by police this year so far. Black Americans are killed at a rate 2½ times greater than that of Whites. According to the Washington Post, the number of fatal shootings by police officers increased during the first 6 months of this year. Twenty-six more people have been killed this year than during the first half of last year.

The evidence is indisputable. We have, as President Obama called it last year, a slow-rolling crisis of troubling police interactions with people of color, and because we are not addressing the problem, people are rightly outraged. We all should be outraged. In America, police brutality is not a new issue.

I echo the pleas from the Congressional Black Caucus leaders who are calling for more funds and more training for our police departments. We must help ensure that those who police our neighborhoods have proper training in community-oriented policing and deescalation tactics. The Black Caucus has said that, I agree.

The Dallas Police Department is exemplary in their effectiveness of community policing. Long before this tragedy in Dallas, long, glowing articles have rightfully been written about the Dallas Police Department. America looks to Dallas and other police chiefs look to Dallas not only to grieve for the fallen officers but to learn from the department's improvements under the leadership of Police Chief David Brown. But, as Dallas Mayor Mike Rawlings said in the aftermath of these attacks, we must get to the root cause.

From Baton Rouge, to St. Paul, to Dallas, intolerance and hate are breeding division and violence. As a nation, we must work to bridge the gaps between police and the communities they serve and unite against prejudice and brutality.

I apologize to everyone for taking a little extra time, but it is necessary because of the exchange the Republican leader and I had.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Madam President, over the next 2 days, Senate Democrats, led by Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, will speak about how the world is being distracted and misled on climate change. The Senator from Rhode Island has been the champion of this frightening issue—climate change. He has spoken 143 times on the Senate floor calling for action.

Dozens of shadowy organizations are waging a campaign to mislead the public and undermine American leadership on climate change, the Paris climate agreement, and clean air initiatives across the country. Every day that is going on. All of these shadowy, dark entities—such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Heartland Institute, and the Cato Institute—are all fronts for the Koch brothers. Clearly, these

groups all have one thing in common: They are bankrolled by the multi-billionaire Koch brothers.

Charles and David Koch and the shadowy groups they fund have a simple agenda—to promote their own interests at everyone else's expense. These two brothers own Koch Industries, one of the largest privately held corporations in the entire world. Together, Charles and David Koch are worth, some say, up to \$100 billion but at least \$80 billion.

Why would the Koch brothers mastermind a plot to convince America that climate change doesn't exist? Because denying climate change is fundamental to the Koch business model. That is why it is done. The volume of pollution the Koch Industries emit into our environment is staggering. The company is among the worst in toxic air pollution in the entire United States. Koch Industries churns out more climate-changing greenhouse gases than oil giants Chevron, Shell, and Valero.

To acknowledge that climate change exists is to acknowledge that the Koch brothers' empire contributes to it, but the Kochs will not take that responsibility because they don't care. The Kochs don't care about climate change. They don't care that it is making wildfires more frequent and intense and that they are endangering the lives and property of millions of Americans, especially in the West.

As I speak, there are fires raging all over the western part of the United States—Arizona, California, and other States. They are very vicious in those States. The Koch brothers, as wealthy as they are, don't care about Nevada. They don't care that Nevada is enduring the 15th year of a terribly difficult drought. The Kochs don't worry about the water levels in Lake Mead. They don't worry that they have dropped to the lowest level since the Great Depression, when the lake was first filled.

The Kochs have ignored the underlying cause of the California and Nevada droughts—the unsustainable amounts of carbon being dumped into our atmosphere because of fossil fuels. One of the chief contributors, of course, is the Koch brothers. Those who ignore the climate crisis or deny it exists do not have a valid point of view. They are wrong. They are out of touch with reality.

These wealthy moguls, the Kochs, aren't just on the other side of this debate. They are on the other side of reality. Their flagship organization, Americans for Prosperity, is carrying the Kochs' toxic agenda into statehouses and city halls across America. They are involved at every level of government, trying to buy government. They are doing pretty well. They buy their own scientists to publish misleading reports to confuse the public about the overwhelming scientific consensus on climate change.

This isn't my theory. This is fact. A Drexel University Professor found that

in 7 years half a billion dollars was spent by the Koch network on a "campaign to manipulate and mislead the public about the threat posed by climate change."

Consider the example of one of their front groups, the Nevada Policy Research Institute. The Kochs use this institute to fight efforts to increase my State's use of clean energy, even though to date \$6 billion has been invested in clean energy projects in Nevada, including tens of thousands of jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue. This is in spite of the Kochs' bankrolling of more coal and more oil.

I can remember when I came out against more coal-fired plants in Nevada. I didn't know where all this opposition was coming from. I know now. It is the Koch brothers. The Kochs don't appreciate Nevada's renewable energy acceleration. So they fund the Nevada Policy Research Institute to bash clean energy solutions.

The Kochs are heavily involved in the Nevada State Legislature. This Koch front group recently hired an academic to write a report saying that renewable energy was raising Nevada's energy costs. How about that one? The report, of course, was false and, of course, it is misleading.

When experts studied the report, it was found to be without basic facts. The Nevada Policy Research Institute went so far as to oppose the Tesla Gigafactory that is being constructed just outside of Reno, which will use clean energy and employ thousands of Nevadans. This is a project that every State wanted to have in their State. Nevada was fortunate to get it there. The footprint of that facility is so large that the only standing building that would be any larger is the Boeing factory in Seattle.

Listen to what I said. All the energy will be with renewable energy. The Kochs don't like that. Even though they oppose something as basic as bringing thousands and thousands of jobs to Nevada through the Tesla Gigafactory, this kind of deceitful activity from large corporations has occurred before. But the Kochs deserve to be in the hall of fame. They have done so much deceitful activity that other corporations are on the sidelines. They are in the minor leagues.

For more than 40 years, Big Tobacco confused scientific consensus about the effects tobacco had on our health, leading to millions of premature deaths. Just like the tobacco companies, Big Oil has known about the harm it is causing. As early as 1981, Exxon's in-house climate expert knew that climate change was an issue, but they bought off enough scientists so they could stall for a while longer. In spite of knowing, Exxon provided over \$30 million to 69 organizations to cast doubt on the science of climate change. This is what a clean environment confronts—lots of Koch money and lots of falsehoods.

REID

July 11, 2016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S4929

The Koch brothers and their shadowy organization know the truth. Science has long been proven, but they don't care. They will sacrifice the future of our planet for bigger Koch profits. I join my colleagues today and tomorrow, calling attention to the web of denial financed by the Koch brothers and other fossil fuel interests. The Kochs' money and power amplified the climate deniers' voices.

The government belongs to the people. Our planet belongs to the people—not the Koch brothers, these multi-billionaires. It belongs to the people. The public deserves to know who is behind these deceitful efforts, to allow better informed decisions about understanding climate change, and we are going to continue doing everything we can to show the evil nature of the Koch brothers.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 5293, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 524, H.R. 5293, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

TRAGEDY IN DALLAS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, last Thursday night, hundreds gathered in downtown Dallas to engage in a peaceful protest. Dozens of police officers were on hand to make sure that these protesters could exercise their rights under the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and protesters even snapped pictures of themselves with the officers in a show of harmony, underscoring the peaceful nature of the event.

As we know now, near the end of the route, all this was shattered as a gunman opened fire on law enforcement officers in a targeted, senseless, and vicious attack. It was made clear early on, that the attackers' goal was to kill as many police officers as possible, and he made a calculated effort to do just that. To attack those who work day in and day out to keep our communities safe is absolutely revolting. It is an act of pure evil and the shameful work of a coward.

Today our country grieves with Dallas, the Dallas Police Department, who lost four of their own, and Dallas Area Rapid Transit, who lost an officer while protecting the community that night.

These officers did what all of our law enforcement officers potentially would be called to do; that is, they put their lives on the line. Some gave their very lives, and several others were injured in actions that can only be described as heroic. These officers were certainly worthy of the badge they wore, and their courage makes me proud to be a Texan. They could have turned around and run away from the sound of gunshots and commotion. They could have given up and decided their lives were more important than the lives of those they had vowed to protect, but they didn't. That is not who they are. They are made of better, braver stuff than that. In fact, these officers ran to the sound of gunshots without hesitation to protect the community they serve.

Dallas police chief David Brown recounted that many ran out in the middle of the gunfire knowing they were making themselves targets of the attack in order to get injured officers to safety and to medical help. Many used their own bodies to help shield protesters who were fleeing in terror.

That is what the men and women of the Dallas police force are made of—undeniable valor and unfailing courage. To say we are indebted to them for their service to the community is an understatement, but I want to thank each and every one of them who didn't hesitate to put it all on the line to defend and protect the people of Dallas.

Today and tomorrow, when the President comes to Dallas, our country will continue to mourn with the whole Dallas community. We grieve for the first named officer who was killed, Officer Brent Thompson. Officer Thompson was a newlywed who married a fellow officer just a couple of weeks ago. We grieve for the loss of Patrick Zamarripa, who bravely served three tours in Iraq and leaves behind a wife, a son, and a 2-year-old daughter. We likewise grieve for the family and friends of Lorne Ahrens, Michael Krol, and Michael Smith—three other officers who were killed. We offer our prayers for those who were wounded, including a woman who happened to be an African American who was shot in the leg while trying to shield her sons from the bullets. We pray for her and the several other police officers who were shot but survived as they begin the long road to recovery.

I mentioned the race of the woman who was shot to underscore that while the shooter said he intended to kill White police officers, his actions did not discriminate based on race. Everyone who was in the line of his sight that night was a target.

This is a national tragedy, the deadliest day for American law enforcement since the events of 9/11. Tomorrow I will join leaders in Dallas, President Obama, and former President Bush at the memorial service to honor the lives of those we lost and to pray for healing and peace for the city and for our country.

While it should not take an event like this to jolt our consciences, we

have to consider more ways to support our public servants who are tasked with the daunting responsibility of keeping order, enforcing the rule of law, and protecting our communities. One way we can do that is to support additional training for our law enforcement, like some legislation that I have introduced called the POLICE Act, which has passed the Senate unanimously. It would make millions of dollars available for law enforcement to pursue active-shooter training.

In other words, we have learned the hard way that by trained police officers running to the gunshot, we can actually save lives while endangering, obviously, the lives of the police officers engaging in that active-shooter practice. But with training, these officers can minimize their own exposure and, hopefully, save more lives. I hope the House will pass this legislation soon so we can send it to the President's desk.

I also would note the contribution of my friend and colleague Congressman JOHN CARTER from Central Texas, who has sponsored legislation in the House. It is pretty clear that we don't have all of the answers. That goes without saying, but we know we can make a difference if we try. In addition, I plan on introducing other legislation soon that would help law enforcement go after the violent criminals who intentionally target police officers and give additional authorities to our law enforcement officers to help them better defend both the public and themselves.

As we continue to grieve and say our prayers, let's not neglect our work to support law enforcement so that they can better protect and defend our communities. Our law enforcement officers deserve our utmost respect for the essential, irreplaceable role they play in our communities.

Tragically, the officers we lost last week were killed and injured for simply doing their job; that is, for keeping the community safe. They were shot while actually protecting protesters so that they could exercise their constitutional rights of free speech and assembly. These officers didn't do anything wrong. They weren't responsible for any of the real or perceived injustices that have occurred in other parts of the country, but they were targeted by a twisted and demented mind who lost his own life in pursuit of this terrible crime. There is no—zero—justification for the taking of these lives.

As our country continues to grieve, I hope we will also unite to support those who put their lives on the line to keep us safe.

Madam President, I see a Senator wishing to speak, so I will yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I see that Senator CARDIN has arrived, so I will yield to him in one moment. But while Senator CORNYN is still on the floor, I want to express the

sorrow and sympathy of the law enforcement community in Rhode Island for the loss Dallas has sustained.

As anybody who has served in law enforcement knows, the two worst words an officer can hear are “officer down.” They don’t know who it is, but they know it is one of theirs, and it is a sign of a casualty among the brotherhood and sisterhood of the police department. Those Dallas police officers had to hear the same words over and over again on that deadly night: Officer down. Officer down. Officer down.

I think it has shocked the entire country, and I have certainly seen people come from all around the United States when we have lost police officers in Rhode Island. They come and stand in the freezing cold outside of churches where a funeral is going on. They come in groups wearing bands. They come to show their respect. It is not just the men and women of law enforcement in Dallas and in Texas who feel this, everyone across the country does. I wanted to express that to the people of Dallas, the law enforcement community of Dallas, and our friend Senator CORNYN of Texas.

With that, I will now yield to Senator CARDIN, who will speak on a different subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, first I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his extraordinary work on an issue that affects the United States and the global community, and that is the reality of climate change and the impact it is having on the United States and on the global community.

Senator WHITEHOUSE and I, along with eight other Members of this Senate, represented the United States at the COP21 conference in Paris in which over 190 nations came together on an action plan to deal with climate and climate change. That would not have happened but for U.S. leadership. I am proud of the work that was done by the United States in setting up a blueprint so we can deal with the impact of climate change in the international community.

We can talk about the specific aspects of climate change and the impact it is having on the security of America. We can talk about the number of climate refugees—people who are going to be forced to leave their lands because of the rising sea level. We can talk about the impact of famine by droughts and floods that are occurring as a result of climate change. We can listen to our generals talk about the impact it has on our national security.

I start by saying that this is an issue of international concern that affects America’s security. We can do something about it, and we have done something about it. U.S. leadership has brought about a game plan to deal with this issue. So it is particularly frustrating to see special interest groups that have a direct financial interest in

maintaining the status quo by continuing to use high-carbon productions in order to produce their products, and they finance groups that produce documents to justify the science deniers. That is a particularly frustrating aspect, particularly since we recognize how much we need U.S. leadership.

I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for bringing to our attention the different special interest groups interested in high-carbon emissions and maintaining the status quo of our climate. They have financed these groups to come up with studies that are really phony in order to justify their opposition to responsible legislation here in the United States and around the world that will lead us to a safer course on climate change.

This is particularly important for us in America. I will get a little parochial for one moment, if I might. The Chesapeake Bay is one of the most vulnerable regions in the Nation to the effects of climate change. According to a report from the Chesapeake Bay Program’s Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee, some of these effects, including rising water temperatures and sea levels, have been observed in the watershed, and the region is expected to experience further shifts in its environmental conditions.

As water levels rise, so will coastal flooding and erosion. Marshes and wetlands will be inundated with saltwater and will disappear faster than wetland plants can populate higher ground.

There was an article in our local paper talking about the islands in the Chesapeake Bay—Tangier and Smith. They are disappearing. These islands won’t be there in the future. And we already have islands that used to be inhabited in the Chesapeake Bay that don’t exist.

A loss of marshes and wetlands will mean a loss of the habitat that traps pollution and provides food and shelter to fish, shellfish, and birds, and a loss of livelihood to Maryland’s men and women who earn a living by fishing, crabbing, and oystering in the Chesapeake Bay. It has a direct economic impact in addition to the safety issue.

Strong rain and snowstorms can damage crops, erode soil, and increase flooding. Floods can damage ports, marinas, and historical monuments, and threaten buildings, sewer systems, roads, and tunnels. Meanwhile, a network of groups purporting to be unbiased has misled the public about the scientific certainty of climate change.

In Maryland, junk science is a thing of the past. I take the time to point that out. The now-defunct Annapolis Center for Science-Based Public Policy was founded in 1993 by a former vice president of the National Association of Manufacturers. In its own words, the center was a “national, non-profit educational organization that supports and promotes responsible energy, environmental, and health and safety policy-making through the use of sound science.” Nothing could be further from the truth.

In 1997, the Annapolis Center hosted a workshop discussing both the scientific and economic uncertainty of climate change and that a “firm, unqualified conclusion on the direction and rate of climate change” will come “many decades in the future.” That was their finding. For reference, Dr. James Hansen, who was then a scientist at NASA and is still one of the most world-renowned climate scientists, testified before Congress nearly a decade earlier as to the certainty of climate science. Fortunately, the Annapolis Center is not sending out this kind of misinformation any longer. They are no longer in existence. They closed their doors, thank goodness. They were funded by special interest to produce a document that they could use to try to prevent the progress that was being made on climate change with our policymakers, including Congress.

Accelerating the transition to a low-carbon economy will produce many benefits with regard to sustainable economic growth, public health, resiliency to natural disasters, and the health of the global community.

My colleague in the House, Congressman DELANEY, and I have filed resolutions in the House and Senate affirming the establishment of a national goal of more than 50 percent of America’s electricity production coming from clean and carbon-free electricity by 2030. This is doable. Despite the misinformation that has been put out by these special interest-funded groups, we can do much better on the use of noncarbon sources to produce our electricity. Our “50x30” resolutions are co-sponsored by 30 Senators and 103 House Members. The resolutions are also endorsed by the Union of Concerned Scientists, Green Latinos, Green for All, Climate Hawks, and the House Sustainable Energy and Environmental Caucus.

I am proud of the legitimate, science-based work of groups like the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science. I applaud its hard work and the positive news of an improved score on the Chesapeake Bay report card for 2015. We are making progress. Why? Because we are following science-based solutions to deal with reducing carbon emissions.

I am proud of recent efforts to divest in fossil fuels in Maryland. The foundation that oversees the Maryland State university system’s \$1 billion endowment announced June 28 that it will stop investing directly in coal, oil, and natural gas companies—a victory for a student-led movement to direct more of the portfolio clean energy. The University System of Maryland Foundation, which helps fund scholarships, endowed professorships, and more, said it would sign on to a United Nations pledge to be more socially aware of its investments and appoint a staff person to identify opportunities in renewable energy.

I am also proud of the work of the Maryland board members of the U.S.

July 11, 2016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S4931

Chamber of Commerce. They have adopted proactive climate policies or practices.

This should not be controversial. This is good for business, not bad. For example, board member Xerox Corporation, headquartered in Germantown, MD, is doing its part to reduce the financial risk of climate change. It signed the American Business Act on Climate Pledge and pledged to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions and energy consumption by 20 percent by 2020. It is good for the environment, it is good for dealing with the impacts I have mentioned, and it is also good for business. This pledge is sponsored by the White House, and 154 businesses signed, voicing support for a strong outcome in the Paris climate negotiations.

Another example is the Maryland State Retirement and Pension System. It is a proud member of the Ceres Investor Network on Climate Risk, a voluntary network of companies that have committed to improve their environmental and social performance and to publicly report their sustainable strategies.

These and many other examples across Maryland demonstrate—contrary to what the chamber of commerce has said—that there is a business and economic case to be made to take steps to fight climate change.

Unless we all act, we will continue on a trajectory that leads to a grim future for us and our children. The first step that must be taken is the recognition that climate change is real and that it is happening right now so we can work cooperatively to come up with creative solutions rather than continuing unproductive arguments about whether everyone agrees the science is settled.

The types of activities we have seen should have no place in American politics. It is one thing to have disagreements on how we can resolve problems; it is another thing to say that the science points in an opposite direction than it does, particularly when it is funded by special interests that have a financial reward for trying to prevent science from dictating the policies—or leading us to the policies—in this country. I am proud to be part of the effort Senator WHITEHOUSE has brought to the floor to expose these types of organizations. I am pleased that the organization that existed in Maryland no longer exists. I am proud of the great work that is being done.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL WOLFE

Madam President, before I yield the floor, I wish to point out the incredible help I have had in my office from a detailee, Michael Wolfe. Michael is a Brookings fellow who has worked in my office. His home agency is the EPA, where he is the senior program analyst in the Office of Air and Radiation. He has worked at the EPA since 2004, dedicating most of his professional career to serving the American people.

I know how fortunate my colleagues and I are when we get detailees from

the executive branch to work in our offices. They provide extremely valuable help. Michael Wolfe has been an incredible resource to our office. He has been part of my team, and he is a civil engineer by training, which is something we desperately could use in my office. He was instrumental in my work on water infrastructure this year. He has also worked tirelessly to protect the clean water rule, the Chesapeake Bay agreement, and increase access to public lands in Maryland.

While Michael is incredibly smart, the first thing one notices about Mike is that he nearly always smiles. Even on tough days, he brightens up our office. It has been a pleasure to know him. He will be leaving our office next week, and I wanted to take this time to personally thank him for his service to the Senate.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, we expect that the Senator from Delaware will be here shortly, but in the meantime, let me begin with a few remarks.

This is the 144th time I have come to the floor to urge Congress to wake up to the threat of climate change. This week, something new is happening. I am joined by colleagues who will help me shine a little light on the web of climate denial and spotlight the bad actors in the web who are polluting our American discourse with phony climate denial.

This web of denial, formed over decades, has been built and provisioned by the deep-pocketed Koch brothers, by ExxonMobil, by Peabody coal, and by other fossil fuel interests. It is a grim shadow over our democracy in that it includes an electioneering effort that spends hundreds of millions of dollars in a single election cycle and threatens any Republican who steps up to address the global threat of climate change.

Just one of those electioneering groups, the Koch brothers-backed Americans for Prosperity, has openly proclaimed that if Republicans support a carbon tax or climate regulations, they would be “at a severe disadvantage in the Republican nomination process.” It would mean their political peril. When that threat comes from a group that has openly and notoriously pledged to spend \$750 million in an election cycle, that is a threat that serves notice on the political class to behave, and regrettably the political class too often does behave in the face of that kind of money.

I see that Senator COONS has arrived, and I am delighted to yield the floor to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I wish to thank my great colleague, the Senator from Rhode Island, for his tireless efforts to keep climate change on this Chamber’s radar. One day I hope that

we can move it from our radar to our to-do list and ultimately to the history books.

Today I am pleased and proud to join my colleagues to speak about something I thought we had established in grade school but apparently bears repeating; that is, the importance of science. It is troubling that today in the 21st century, there is any doubt about the importance of real, sound science in many facets of our lives. It is troubling that we still need to defend science here on the Senate floor.

Scientific discovery and invention are the engine of our economy. Science leads to transformative technologies and new ways of thinking in a wide range of fields, including health care, manufacturing, agriculture, clean energy, and national security.

Scientific inquiry is also the foundation of good public policy. It shapes and informs how we inform global threats such as ozone depletion, an issue on which the international community has made real progress. Science must play an equally central role in how we address climate change.

When we want to know what to do about a public health or environmental crisis, we turn to science. For example, rigorous, careful data collection and analysis are critical to understanding long-term trends. Data can show the effectiveness of a medication in treating a disease, for example, or the ability of a new material to withstand extreme conditions over time. And data can help us make good decisions based on those trends. Never have we had a greater ability to collect and analyze data than today. That is why more than ever in today’s world, science should drive policy, not the other way around.

In a number of areas, I have worked with my Republican colleagues on bipartisan bills that help substantially advance scientific inquiry, from encouraging citizen science projects to improving public-private partnerships with our national labs. So why is climate science so threatening to some?

Sadly, there are far too many organizations in existence today that have it backwards. These organizations have attempted to distort science for purely political ends because the facts threaten the bottom line of those who have created and sustained them. These organizations claim to use sound science to support policy objectives, but their actions indicate that the only science they find sound is the kind that sounds like profits.

One of these organizations is the now-defunct The Advancement of Sound Science Coalition, known as the TASSC—an organization that played a key role in obscuring the facts around the dangers of tobacco use. TASSC was originally founded back in 1993 under the guise of promoting “sound science in policymaking.” In reality, as was later uncovered in the documents that came to light in the course of litigation against the tobacco industry,

TASSC actually had the opposite goal. The year it was founded, it stated in private documents at the time that one of its goals was to lay the groundwork to help Phillip Morris advance its agenda of promoting tobacco use nationally and at the State and local level. How? Let me quote from one of these discovered documents: by “encouraging the public to question—from the grassroots up—the validity of scientific studies.”

These are not the statements of an organization devoted to scientific inquiry and data-driven policy.

Let me be clear. The problem doesn't lie in industry hiring scientists to argue their case. That is well within the rights of industry and of any organization in our country. The problem is when groups like this one misrepresent their very motives, hide their sources of funding and industry ties, and push out misleading or even incorrect information under the guise of “sound science.”

We all know today that smoking tobacco is profoundly harmful to our health. Yet these same organizations, the ones that decades ago promoted “science” that hid the truth about tobacco and threatened public health for far too long, are now in sadly too many cases doing the same with climate change.

Fortunately, today, this group I am discussing, TASSC, is now defunct. But its former executive director, Steve Milloy, is still an active climate change denier who helped draft the 1998 “Global Climate Science Communications Action Plan.” It included the statement: “Victory Will Be Achieved When Average citizens ‘understand’ . . . uncertainties in climate science; recognition of uncertainties becomes part of the ‘conventional wisdom.’”

Quite simply, his goal was and continues to be to persuade people, using incorrect, scientifically unsound information, to doubt the science about climate change, one of the greatest global challenges we face. His policy goal is to halt action on climate change, and he is using science incorrectly to achieve this political end. Frankly, this is irresponsible and it flies in the face of the foundation of the scientific method.

As someone who trained in chemistry in college, I am familiar with how scientists are trained to formulate hypotheses, carefully construct experiments to test those hypotheses, and without bias or preformed assumptions, then draw conclusions about those hypotheses. Starting with the answer and considering only evidence that supports the answer—that is not science; that is politics.

The very existence of groups like TASSC and others that my colleagues will speak about this evening and tomorrow make clear that we must work even harder to defend and support science throughout our society.

That means providing robust funding for our national lab system.

That means establishing a Federal effort to coordinate research in a new

subfield of chemistry that I have been excited about promoting.

That means supporting the use of crowdsourcing and citizen science methods in Federal agencies.

That means supporting policies that will support industry-relevant training in engineering, including advanced manufacturing.

All of these are efforts that I have been involved in and that enjoy bipartisan support. My colleagues know that I make an effort to promote pragmatic, bipartisan policy ideas. Science should not be a partisan issue, and neither, frankly, should climate change.

Climate change is all too real for those of us who live in low-lying coastal States like my home State of Delaware, where flooding has already devastated homes and communities up and down the State. The science is clear: This severe flooding is only going to increase as temperatures continue to rise around the globe and as the sea level rises as well.

We live in an era of unprecedented scientific and technological advantages. The NASA Juno spacecraft mission to Jupiter; the ability to use 3-D printing to manufacture custom products, specifically prosthetics; the evolution of new developments in robotics and genomics—these advances capture our imagination, and they can change our world. These developments happen because America's best trained scientists and engineers have spent decades undertaking rigorous and innovative research and applying their findings to address the big questions of our world.

Certainly the challenges of climate change are daunting and urgent, and so we should be focused on using the best science available to tackle these challenges with the best policy solutions possible—not convincing people who prefer denial and deception that the science isn't even real.

I wish to thank my friend and colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE for his tireless leadership in addressing climate change and for assembling today's important colloquy.

If I might, with the forbearance of my colleague from New Mexico who I see has come to the floor, I wish to take just a few more minutes to address an unrelated but urgent topic.

TRAGEDY IN DALLAS

Madam President, before I invite one of my colleagues to continue today's colloquy, I just want to say a few words about the tragic events in Dallas. Just four days ago, a peaceful protest in Dallas that brought together protesters and police in an example of the very best of our Nation was torn apart by a cowardly and savage act that reflected the very worst. Five police officers were murdered, leaving their families, friends, and country in shock, in mourning, and in search of answers, and six of their colleagues were injured.

Last week was a very difficult one for America. From Dallas to many other

cities, including Baton Rouge and St. Paul, MN, far too many lives were cut short by violence, far too many families will never be whole again.

But as our President said this weekend, America is not as divided as we may appear. We are united in mourning the tragic deaths of Brent Thompson, Patrick Zamarripa, Michael Krol, Lorne Ahrens, and Michael Smith, and in mourning Philando Castile and Alton Sterling. We are united in our grief for their families and communities.

We are united in our respect and admiration for police and first responders, the overwhelming majority of whom do their dangerous jobs with bravery and selflessness.

But we are also united in our awareness that we have so much more work to do to strengthen the relationship between law enforcement and the communities they serve and protect. We are united in our understanding that moving beyond this tragic and unacceptable status quo—to heal our wounds and build toward a national community of respect and compassion—will challenge us in ways both new and uncomfortable.

But as Franklin Roosevelt said in an address exactly 80 years ago today: “There are no limits to this Nation's capacity to obtain and maintain true freedom, no limits except the strength of our Nation's desire and determination.”

I am confident our desire and determination will build an America in which police officers can serve their communities, worrying only about how to make their communities safer, not whether they will come home that night.

Our desire and our determination can and should build a Nation in which every American can live, work, play, and worship free of concerns about discrimination, a Nation in which all of us are able to abide by the law as written with a law as lived. We must do better and we will do better.

I thank my colleagues for the opportunity to join in this colloquy, and I wish to yield the floor to my colleague from the State of New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. UDALL. Madam President, I thank the Chair for the recognition. Let me also, as my other colleagues have done, thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his leadership on climate change, global warming, and the work he has done in that area.

I was also part, with Senator COONS, of the Paris 10 who went to Paris and did everything we could to let the rest of the countries in the world and their representatives know, as Senator COONS knows very well, that we are in this for the long haul and we are going to make sure that it happens and that the United States will continue with all of the good policies that have been put in place.

July 11, 2016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S4933

Senator WHITEHOUSE has shown particularly good leadership in the area of exposing a sophisticated network of climate deniers, a network of special interest groups and front groups that have all rallied around the slogan of being climate deniers. I rise to join my colleagues to draw attention to what we are calling the web of denial—inter-connected corporations and special interest groups spending millions of dollars misleading the public about the harmful effects of climate change.

Contrary to what these groups want the American people to think, climate change is a fact, it is a reality, and we have to deal with it. Carbon dioxide, a greenhouse gas and a byproduct of fossil fuels, is a major contributor to global warming. This is not some ideological belief I share with some of my colleagues. We wish global warming did not exist and that it was not threatening our health, our livelihoods, and the environment, but it is real, and New Mexico and the Southwest are in the bull's-eye. We are seeing it in the form of more frequent droughts, increasingly severe wildfires, and rising temperatures. There is no doubt and the data cannot be denied. Scientists cannot be ignored. We can see it before our eyes in New Mexico and across the country in so many different areas.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the National Academy of Sciences, and independent researchers at our most esteemed universities have written extensively about this link between greenhouse gases and the warming of the Earth.

Scientists at Las Alamos and Sandia National Labs in New Mexico are key parts of this scientific effort. We trust these institutions to perform the scientific research that is critical to our Nation's national security. They ensure our arsenal of nuclear weapons is safe and secure. So when these scientists tell us that manmade climate change is real and poses a serious threat, we should listen and take them seriously.

The evidence has been mounting for decades. The research has been thorough and unbiased. Countries around the world have been pressing to address this challenge in a global manner. So why are people still trying to foster a debate? Why are they asking if global warming is really happening? That is what we are here to discuss—the web of denial.

There are many who have different agendas that are not rooted in truth or science, and those agendas are playing out in our politics in the most disgraceful way possible, through the dark money that is poisoning the system and spreading lies to benefit a few. It started when industry became concerned that this link could harm the bottom line. Over the years, industry groups have spent millions of dollars to influence the debate through dark money and front groups. Many of my colleagues have talked about this today and many more will talk about

it tomorrow. The evidence of this strategy is profound.

An early example is, the **Information Council for the Environment, or ICE**, and the **Greening Earth Society**. These groups sound technical and environmental, but they aren't. They were cooked up in the boardrooms of fossil fuel industry executives—people who put profits over public health. They were designed after focus groups and market data convinced them the public trusted scientists more than politicians, more than political activists, and certainly more than industry press people. These groups, founded by the **Western Fuels Association**, aimed to shape the global warming discussion at a crucial time in the early 1990s, as the world was gathering in Rio and Kyoto to hammer out agreements and tackle the problem.

ICE ran several print and radio advertisements asking: "If the Earth is getting warmer, why is Kentucky getting colder?"

Another quote: "If the Earth is getting warmer, why is the frost line moving south?"

"Who told you the earth was warming, Chicken Little? And how much are you willing to pay to solve a problem that may not exist?"

These questions and claims were misleading and false, but they helped to stir up the public. The public was looking to trust independent scientists and analysts, not industry front groups. Even more concerning is the way global warming deniers have refocused their strategies at discrediting scientists and researchers.

We have seen a terrible trend. As the public has become more aware of these front groups, they have changed their tack. Now they are working to discredit and disavow the credible scientists who are out there, charging that scientists have hidden agendas, wanting more research dollars and more Federal funding. I find this absurd and ominous.

The funding for the **Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change**, the **National Academy of Sciences**, and university researchers is transparent. The money is there for the public to see. None of these folks is getting rich. They don't have profits to protect. They are providing the public with data and with research, but it is getting harder and harder to stop these outside groups from spreading their smear campaigns. These groups have an interest in making sure Congress never gets anything done to prevent climate change, and they are using our broken campaign finance system as a tool to keep it that way.

We used to have sensible laws on campaign finance. We used to have an enforcement agency, a watchdog over the Federal finance system. The laws have been gutted by the Supreme Court's devastating decisions, whether it is Citizens United, McCutcheon, or many other misguided decisions. The enforcement agency, the Federal Elec-

tion Commission, has become completely dysfunctional and mired in gridlock, leaving super PACs and special interests free to pollute the political system with unlimited dark money and always to protect someone's bottom line. That is the way **Western Fuels Association** and so many other companies have put pollution above public health.

We need to fix the system. A few months ago, several of my colleagues and I got together to discuss the state of our democracy. The question we asked ourselves was this: What can we do to repair this damage, to return the government to the people—the government by and for the people. The product of these meetings was the bill we introduced last month, the We the People Act. It will bring dark money out of the shadows and create a real watchdog to enforce campaign finance laws and rein in the influence of special interests and lobbyists.

The "we the people" reform package includes my constitutional amendment to overturn Buckley, Citizens United, and other decisions. It will allow Congress and the States to enact real reform, to get the flood of money out of our political system, laws that five conservative Justices on the Supreme Court can't overturn.

I know the political climate of an election year makes bipartisanship unlikely, but I will reintroduce the "we the people" reform package in the next Congress and hope my Republican colleagues will join me.

Poll after poll shows that our constituents across the political spectrum want reforms tackling climate change, eliminating dark money from our political system, and standing up to groups that distort public perception. It is time we listened. Our democracy, our environment, and the planet are at stake.

I see Senator WHITEHOUSE is here and there may be others. Once again, I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his leadership. I think one of the things he has done in our caucus, on the floor, and being constantly vigilant about it is, how many of these groups are out there networking with each other. It is a very sophisticated operation that has to be exposed if we are going to get down to what is happening and get down to what we need to do.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, for purposes of the floor, I would like to say I understand Senator SULLIVAN from Alaska will be coming, and I will end my remarks so he can speak as soon as he arrives, but in the meantime, I would like to intersperse my remarks between the various speakers who come. So Senator SULLIVAN should not be disconcerted if he sees me speaking. I will draw to a rapid conclusion and allow him the floor and I will reclaim it at the conclusion of his remarks.

When I finished my remarks a moment ago, I was describing the polluter-funded front group that with one hand threatened to spend \$750 million in this election cycle and with the other hand threatened to cause “severe disadvantage” in the Republican nomination process and “political peril” to people who crossed them in their denial of climate change. That raises the obvious question: Why all that money? Why all those threats? Well, the threats are there and the money is that big because the stakes are very high.

The International Monetary Fund, which is a generally respected organization filled with very intelligent people, has determined the fossil fuel industry receives nearly \$700 billion in what they call effective subsidies in the United States alone every year. How hard would you fight to protect an effective subsidy of \$700 billion a year? No wonder throwing \$750 million around seems like a wise investment by the big polluters.

The fossil fuel industry has another problem, which is that it faces worldwide consensus about the urgent need to address climate change, consensus from the American public, consensus from every single major American scientific society, consensus from a vast number of major American companies. Essentially, the heraldry of American corporate leadership signed on to the Paris Agreement—every single U.S. National Lab, the scientists who have been mentioned before from NASA and from NOAA, whom in every other respect we count on.

Imagine the NASA scientists who have put an explorer onto the surface of Mars, and they are driving a rover around the surface of Mars right now. Do we think they might know a little science? And yet when they tell us climate change is a serious threat, suddenly we can't pay any attention to that any longer because you have the Koch brothers, with all their money, telling everybody don't listen. You also have America's national security, military, and intelligence leaders warning us of the threat. You have the Pope calling on us to take action and most world leaders.

So if you are the fossil fuel industry, what do you do? You come to Congress, to the chokepoint for legislation, and you put a chokechain on the Republican Party so you can snap it to heel. In support of that, they perpetrate this web of climate denial.

This is actually a graphic of the web that was done by one of the academic researchers who specializes in this area. Why do they do this? Well, to do their best to fool the public about the risk of climate change, to provide talking points to rightwing talk radio, to take advantage of a lazy media's impulse to offer both sides of the story, even when one is false, and of course to hide the hands of the fossil fuel protagonists who are behind the scenes.

So it is long past time we shed some light on the perpetrators of this web of

denial and expose their filthy grip on our political process. It is a disgrace, and our grandchildren will look back at this as a dirty time in America's political history because of their work.

I am grateful to my colleagues who are joining in this effort, today and in the days to come, to help spotlight the lengths to which the Koch brothers and other fossil fuel fronts go to advance their economic self-interests by sabotaging America's response to the climate crisis.

As we look into this, we are aided by a growing body of research examining the web of denial and examining how the actors in that web propagate climate denial. So let's listen to some of the experts.

Drexel University professor Dr. Robert Brulle calls the web of denial in his research “the climate change counter-movement.” In his 2013 paper, “Institutionalizing delay: foundation funding and the creation of U.S. climate change counter-movement organizations” Professor Brulle describes that movement as a constellation of organizations—as you see here depicted in a graphic from that very paper—that, he says, “engages in a wide variety of activities opposing any legislative attempts to enact mandatory restrictions on carbon emissions.”

The green diamonds—here, and here, and here, and here—are the big funders: fossil fuel billionaires' foundations, for instance, the American Petroleum Institute, and so on.

The blue circles—here, here, and here—are the who's who of climate denial groups. The Heartland Institute is in here, for instance. They are that classy bunch who compared folks concerned about climate change to the Unabomber, just to give you a sense of what sort of people they are. There is the Hoover Institution; there is the Heritage Foundation; there is the Cato Institute; there is the Mercatus Center, to name just a few of the climate saboteurs on Dr. Brulle's graph.

Brulle's research describes these groups as part of what he calls—and I will quote him here—“a deliberate and organized effort to misdirect the public discussion and distort the public understanding of climate”—“to misdirect . . . and distort.”

The coordinated tactics of this network in its effort to misdirect and distort, said Brulle—and I will quote him again—“span a wide range of activities including political lobbying”—we certainly see plenty of that here—“contributions to political candidates,” plenty of that—“and a large number of communication and media efforts that aim at undermining climate science.”

This is Professor Brulle's depiction of the web of denial. This chart is from a 2011 study by Professors Riley Dunlap of Oklahoma State University and Aaron McCright of Michigan State University, describing the behavior of the major actors in what they call the “climate denial machine.” That is their quote. Remember, Professor Brulle

calls it the “climate change counter-movement.” These two researchers call it the “climate change denial machine” and, of course, we call it the “web of denial.”

I see that Senator WARREN has come to the floor. I will gladly yield to her and resume my remarks when there is again room on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for yielding. I just want to talk a little bit about data. I believe in data. I try to find good information about issues and use that information to inform my work. We need good data. But can we trust the think tanks and public policy groups that hold themselves out as offering solid independent research?

The work at these think tanks and public policy groups is increasingly funded by wealthy corporate interests, and the line between objective scholarly research and pay-for-play studies is becoming blurred. The problem is compounded by the fact that corporate financial support often occurs in the dark. Think about it this way: Companies are required to disclose their expenses when they directly lobby lawmakers. But these same companies are allowed to make huge secret contributions to think tanks, even if they have the same goal of influencing those same lawmakers.

Today, climate deniers have an increasingly difficult time selling their anti-science positions. So a small industry of think tanks has emerged to give the veneer of plausibility to their bizarre views. Take a look at just one organization, the Science and Public Policy Institute. The Science and Public Policy Institute describes its mission as providing “research and educational materials dedicated to sound public policy based on sound science.”

That seems pretty reasonable. But where is this sound public policy and sound science actually coming from? Well, for several years, the chief science advisor at the Science and Public Policy Institute was a man named Willie Soon, one of the most notorious climate change deniers around. Armed with scientific credentials and a part-time job at the Smithsonian Institution, Soon churned out paper after paper, disagreeing with the overwhelming scientific consensus that human activities are driving climate change.

Eventually it was revealed that—surprise, surprise—Soon had accepted \$1.2 million from the fossil fuel industry. Exxon, the American Petroleum Institute, the Charles G. Koch Charitable Foundation, and coal giant company, Southern Company, made payments to Soon, payments that he rarely disclosed when promoting his climate change denial research.

In other words, Soon was raking in fossil fuel cash by producing research helpful to the fossil fuel industry. Great deal. Willie Soon left the Science

July 11, 2016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S4935

and Public Policy Institute a few years ago.

These days, the most prominent figure at the organization is Christopher Monckton, the think tank's chief policy advisor. So let's ask the question here: Who is Christopher Monckton? Oh, boy, Christopher Monckton is a former politician from the UK. He has presented himself as a member of the House of Lords, a claim that is so off base that the House of Lords was forced to do something that it had never done before, and that is issue a statement saying: No, he is not part of the House of Lords, and he should stop lying about it.

Monckton used to represent the ultraconservative, anti-immigrant UK Independence Party that recently led the Brexit campaign. In fact, Monckton thought Brexit was such a good idea that he has also called for a Brexit, as he puts it, pushing for Texas to secede from the United States to protect itself against Muslim and Latino immigrants.

Monckton is clear about where he stands on climate change and on the people who are concerned about it. He said that global efforts to fight climate change are part of a "totalitarian" plot to create a "world government," and he has compared climate change activists to "Hitler youth."

To be clear, these allegations of government overreach are coming from someone who believes that reading the Koran out loud should be a prosecutable offense in the United States and who once called for everyone with AIDS to be rounded up and permanently quarantined.

Now he has backed away from that last idea, but don't worry. Monckton has found a new idea to address AIDS. He claims to have invented a miracle cure that can treat everything from HIV to multiple sclerosis to the flu. You can't make this stuff up.

The fact is, Monckton is not a climate scientist or a scientist of any kind. His degrees are in classics and journalism. Actual scientists who have taken a look at his work have found his conclusion to be completely made up.

So why does it matter that scientific posers like Christopher Monckton and industry-funded hacks like Willie Soon are running around saying crazy things about climate change? Well, I will tell you why it matters. It matters because by attaching themselves to the Science and Public Policy Institute and other credible-sounding think tanks, people start to take them seriously.

You don't think so? Monckton has testified in front of Congress three times, each time representing the Science and Public Policy Institute. A former chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee called him "one of the most knowledgeable, if not the most knowledgeable, expert from a skeptical point of view on this issue of climate change." Soon's work has been repeatedly cited by influential climate

change deniers, those in Congress and elsewhere.

As Senator WHITEHOUSE has pointed out, Monckton, Soon, and the Science and Public Policy Institute are part of a much larger network of pseudo-scientific researchers and organizations who get paid to spin a web of denials about the science behind climate change. It is a network that has been funded by the fossil fuel industry and by its friends.

But there is no getting around it. Climate change is real. It is caused by humans. If we are going to address it in a meaningful way, we need to take decisive action now. This is why the fake science think tanks are so dangerous. They throw enough fake facts into the process to justify inaction, enough fake facts to excuse inaction, enough fake facts to let every politician in the pocket of Big Oil or Big Coal keep right on blocking meaningful action while the earth slowly chokes on its own filth.

It is time to stand up to the fossil fuel industry and its well-funded PR efforts and say enough is enough. Our children's futures are at stake. We will not sit on the sidelines while big fossil fuel companies call the shots here in Washington.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I thank Senator WARREN for her terrific remarks. When I left off speaking, we were talking about the—not just the web of denial of organizations that have been propped by the polluters to look as though they are real and to broadcast phony science, but also to know that people are on the hunt looking for them.

I had begun to talk about the academic researchers who are treating this web as a social phenomenon—as a bizarre sociopolitical phenomenon—and beginning to look at how it works. I mentioned first Dr. Brulle of Drexel University, and then we were looking at the work of Dr. Dunlap and Dr. McCright—Dr. Dunlap from University of Oklahoma and Dr. McCright from Michigan State University.

Let's look for a minute at what they say in their publications. When you listen to this, consider today's blockaded Senate Chamber. I will quote them.

It is reasonable to conclude that climate change denial campaigns in the U.S.—

This stuff—have played a crucial role in blocking domestic legislation and contributing to the U.S. becoming an impediment to international policymaking. Because of the perceived threat posed by climate change to their interests—

To the fossil fuel interests—actors in the denial machine have strived to undermine scientific evidence documenting its reality and seriousness. Their success in these efforts weakens an essential component of societal reflectivity when the need is greater than ever.

With that quote, I will yield the floor. I see my friend Senator SULLIVAN has arrived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise to join my colleague from Rhode Island and other colleagues this evening who are talking about the critical issue of climate change, especially the facts around climate change but also the fact that there are many who would deny the facts. This is a very important issue to the Commonwealth of Virginia. Climate change is not an abstraction. Climate change is not a next-year or next-decade issue. Climate change in Virginia is a today issue.

Earlier today, I was in Norfolk, VA, which is in the Hampton Roads area, near the Chesapeake Bay and the Atlantic Ocean. Norfolk, and the surrounding communities, is the largest concentration of naval power in the world. It is the center of American naval operations, the headquarters of the U.S. Atlantic fleet, and it is already having to spend millions of dollars to elevate the piers where aircraft carriers come and go due to sea level rise. The Hampton Roads area is listed as the second most vulnerable community in the United States to rising sea levels after New Orleans.

This is a challenging issue in a lot of ways. I have friends who live in these communities who recently bought homes, but now their homes aren't marketable. For most Americans—certainly for me—my home is the most valuable asset I own. If you have that, and then you suddenly can't sell it because climate is changing, sea level is rising, flooding is more recurrent, and no one will buy your home, it is a very serious issue.

In addition to the effect on individuals and businesses because of sea level rise, the effect on the naval station is significant. Current estimates are that rising sea levels in Norfolk will take the main road entrance into the center of American naval power and have that under water 3 hours a day by 2040 just because of normal tidal action. In times of storms, it would be worse. Imagine an America that counts on that Navy, counts on that naval presence around the globe having its largest base inaccessible because of sea level rise.

We have an interesting community. One of the most unique parts of Virginia is a small island, Tangier Island, in the center of the Chesapeake Bay. It has been continually inhabited since the 1600s as a community for water men and women, the folks who have traditionally made their living by going out and catching crabs, oysters, and fish. This is a small island, a few acres. It is one of the only places you can go in the United States where you can hear English spoken as Shakespeare would have spoken it, with a language that is an Elizabethan language. The community is very isolated in that way, and so you hear this beautiful English spoken there. The community has many wonderful virtues to it, but the Chesapeake Bay is coming

up around this community and eroding it.

I received a letter from a middle school student within the last month—a handwritten letter that might have been the most heartfelt communication I have received in 4-plus years in the Senate—saying: What are you doing about sea level rise? What can you do to help us deal with these issues so Tangier, as an island, does not completely disappear? So for these reasons and many others, in Virginia, we take this very seriously and we have to deal with it.

I will tell you something else about Virginia. Virginians believe in science. The Virginia political figure we most admire was the preeminent scientist of his day, Thomas Jefferson. He was a scientist.

Virginians overwhelmingly believe in science. Seventy percent of Virginians accept the scientific consensus that human activity is causing climate change and that it is urgent we do something about it. Seventy percent of Virginians believe in that proposition.

I am here because my friend from Rhode Island asked me to come and talk about the fact that there is an organized effort—not just a battle about the policy about climate science—to knowingly try to misrepresent the status of climate science and suggest that climate change is not occurring. They are denying it exists, they are denying it is a concern, and they are working against any reasonable solutions.

Of course, we have to be open to points of view, reasonable differences of opinion, and have a debate, but when the science is settled on some things and people in an organized way—who know better—are trying to fight against it, we should be suspicious.

So a group of Senators are speaking today and tomorrow to discuss these organizations that constitute what my friend from Rhode Island has termed a “web of denial,” an organized effort to deny science.

Let me just talk a little bit because a number of these deniers are companies that at least have PO boxes or nonprofit organizations that at least have PO boxes in Virginia. The same Virginia where Tangier Island is disappearing, the same Virginia where the Navy is having to spend to shore up their infrastructure, also has some shadowy organizations that are trying to deny the real science involved.

There is an organization involved called the **Science and Public Policy Institute**, and it purports to summarize available academic literature. Here is a quote:

They further note that decadal variability in sea level is observed, but to date there is no detectable secular increase in the rate of sea level rise over the period 1950–2000. They also report that no increase in the rate of sea level rise had been detected for the entire 20th century.

This is a group that throws in a few “sciency” words like “decadal variability,” but what they are really say-

ing is there is no sea level rise. This is at odds with the conclusions of virtually every scientist who studied this issue, including scientists at Virginia universities—Old Dominion University and at the Virginia Institute of Marine Science at William & Mary. Those scientists say sea level rise has risen a foot since industrialization, and the range of future sea level rise on the Virginia coast is anywhere from 1½ additional feet to 7 feet by the year 2100. They will acknowledge some question about it is going to be 1½ feet, is it going to be 7 feet, but they don’t challenge the basic science surrounding sea level rise. So which is it—1½ feet to 7 feet or you don’t need to worry it? Don’t worry, be happy.

Without getting a Ph.D. in atmospheric science and building your own quantitative models, how do you know who is right? Here is a clue. Look at who funds these organizations. In the case of ODU and William & Mary, the **Virginia Institute of Marine Science**—which is one of the most preeminent marine sciences organizations in the Nation, with Scripps in San Diego and Woods Hole in Massachusetts—it is not hard. They are State universities. They are funded by the general assembly of Virginia, which are two Republican houses. They are reaching a scientific conclusion that says climate change is serious, but with the **Science and Public Policy Institute**, it is a bit nebulous, and it is kind of hard to figure out.

There are online sources that enable you to track how organizations are funded through foundations with ties, frankly, to the energy. According to one of these sources, called “**DeSmogBlog**,” one of this major funders of this institute, the **Science and Public Policy Institute**, is called the **Donors Capital Fund**, which has distributed \$170 million to various conservative causes and describes itself as being “dedicated to the ideals of limited government, personal responsibility, and free enterprise.”

A New York Times article from as far back as 2003, documents a connection between this foundation and an organization that also has a point of view, **ExxonMobil**. **ExxonMobil** is a funder or, in the past, has been a funder of this organization.

Why doesn’t **ExxonMobil** or a conservative organization just publish the material on their own Web sites under their own bylines? My guess is, they have scientists who actually know the science. There has been recent information about **ExxonMobil**. They understand the climate science. They couldn’t publish this under their own byline and meet their own standards of truthfulness, but they are providing funding to an organization that is denying climate change. In other words, the organization is just a delivery vehicle for information that is meant to be seen as impartial scientific information, but it is, in fact, not impartial at all. So when you see one group saying

there has been no sea level rise and another saying there has been a lot and we could be in for more, if you are wondering which one to believe, take a look at who is funding the research.

Here is another organization, the **Virginia Institute for Public Policy**: “Regulations prescribing a reduction, or even a complete cessation, of Virginia’s CO₂ emissions will have absolutely no effect on global climate.”

If there are Virginia regulations that even eliminate Virginia CO₂, it will have no effect on global climate. This is an interesting quote because it is not technically a lie because it is literally true. Virginia’s share of world CO₂ emissions is infinitesimal. So if Virginia eliminated it all, it wouldn’t affect the entire globe in a measurable way. But that is like saying: One vote? Your vote is not going to make the difference or one cigarette will not hurt you so go ahead and have one.

This argument is a kind of a classic hide-the-ball argument that makes a statement that is technically true, but it essentially is promoting a false point of view that, oh well, we shouldn’t do anything about it. Again, it is the use of a literal truth that is basically designed to pitch a message that is grossly misleading.

So let’s ask about this group, the **Virginia Institute for Public Policy**, who funds a group that would say something like that? Again, the **Donors Capital Fund** that funded the first organization I discussed, as well as the **Chase Foundation of Virginia** and the **Roe Foundation**, which support a list of conservative causes.

If you call an organization the **Virginia Institute for Public Policy**, it sounds kind of neutral and, again, probably trying to do a good thing, but if you go back and look at who is funding it and you again find the funding sources are heavily linked to energy industry groups like **ExxonMobil**, then you understand they are not quite as impartial as their name would suggest.

Here is another quote from the **CO₂ Coalition**:

Concerns about carbon dioxide being a quote-unquote “pollutant” are not valid. Climate change is proceeding very slowly, and the likely increase in temperature for the 21st century is about 1 degree Celsius or less.

Well, yes; is that technically true? The temperature of the Earth has increased by about 1 degree since industrialization, and 197 countries just signed an agreement in Paris last year to try to limit any further increase to no more than 1 degree additional.

So this group makes it sound like 1 degree, who cares about 1 degree? Well, a 100-degree fever is only 2 degrees more than normal, but it is enough to make you pretty sick. It is actually 1.4 degrees more than normal. It is enough to make you pretty sick.

The number of 0.8 sounds tiny in the abstract, but if that is your blood alcohol content, that gets you a DUI in Virginia. The number sounds small. Oh, gosh. Why would that make a difference? That gets you a DUI because you are impaired.

July 11, 2016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S4937

So, yes, the group using the one temperature, 1 degree in temperature, makes it sound like it is not that big of a deal—but it is that big of a deal.

This is the last one I want to discuss before I close. This is kind of a doozy because it is from an open letter to Pope Francis on the topic of the Pope's environmental encyclical. The group is called the Cornwall Alliance for the Stewardship of Creation. Nothing like going big if you are going to pick a name for yourself. I am glad there is somebody who is trying to be a steward of creation. Their quote starts with a quote from the 19th Psalm.

The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament proclaims his handiwork.

Beautiful aspect of the first verse in Psalm 19, but then the group goes on to declare in their own words this:

By using fossil fuels to generate energy to lift billions of God's precious children out of poverty, we liberate from the tomb of the earth the carbon dioxide on which plants and therefore all the rest of life depend. In light of these considerations, we believe it is both unwise and unjust to adopt policies requiring reduced use of fossil fuels for energy.

So somebody is really using Scripture to argue that making our energy production cleaner, safer, and cheaper violates the Christian tenet of caring for the poor.

I am a Christian, and many of us in this body have a deep-faith background in one faith or another, but I will use a non-Christian phrase to describe that argument. It takes a lot of chutzpa to claim your religious faith and compassion for the poor drives you to support pollution-intensive energy, especially when the organization refuses to reveal how it is funded.

In closing, we certainly don't want to imply that all groups that have an agenda or have a point of view are motivated by funding sources, but the web of denial the Senator from Rhode Island is asking us to come out and talk about tonight is one that includes a number of organizations that are climate deniers, and they are denying science that in my view they actually know to be true.

There comes a point when the truth becomes so hard to deny that those who deny it are simply not credible. And you have to then ask the question: Why are you denying it?

I assert that most of these organizations understand the science, they accept the science, and they realize it to be true. So why do they deny the science? The answer is greed. That is the basic answer. Many of the organizations we are discussing are funded primarily by fossil fuel interests. If they can delay, even by 1 year or 2 years or 5 years or even 6 months, the enactment of policies that would move us toward fewer fossil fuels, it will hurt their bottom line.

So rather than come up here and argue about what the right transition should be, they are handing funds over to organizations that are trying to confuse the American public about science itself.

Let me close and read from Pope Francis's encyclical, since the Cornwall Alliance for the Stewardship of Creation cherry-picked the piece. I am going to read it as a quote:

Is it realistic to hope that those who are obsessed with maximizing profits will stop to reflect on the environmental damage which they will leave behind for future generations? Where profits alone count, there are can be no thinking about the rhythms of nature, its phases of decay and regeneration, or the complexity of ecosystems which may be gravely upset by human intervention. Once we start to think about the kind of world we are leaving to future generations, we look at things differently—

As to future generations, we look at things differently—

we realize that the world is a gift which we have freely received and must share with others. Since the world has been given to us, we can no longer view reality in a purely utilitarian way, in which efficiency and productivity are entirely geared to our individual benefit. Intergenerational solidarity is not optional, but rather a basic question of justice, since the world we have received also belongs to those who will follow us.

Science and faith have a number of things in common, but one of the most important things they have in common is that their first duty has to be to the truth. I hope all actors in the political process, whatever their views, will remember that and have that same commitment.

I thank the Chair, and with that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, my colleagues from Virginia and Rhode Island, for whom I have a lot of respect, have been on the floor talking about an important issue—what my colleague from Virginia called a “today issue.” Well, I would also like to talk about a today issue as well, and one that I think certainly the American public is interested in.

In the past week we have had a lot of today issues. As a matter of fact, in the last week there have been new developments globally relating to our national security, the defense of the United States, and the importance of our military in ways that are pretty dramatic. I would like to list some of these, and this is literally in the last 7 days.

Today, Secretary Carter announced from Iraq, where he is right now, that the United States will be deploying another 560 troops in our fight against ISIS. A lot of us support additional troops, and the Secretary announced that. On Friday, at the NATO summit, President Obama announced that the United States will be deploying 1,000 U.S. troops and a separate brigade headquarters to Poland as part of an effort by NATO to strengthen its eastern flank against Russian aggression. The President was actually quoted in the Financial Times extensively. He stated: “This may be the most important moment for our transatlantic alliance since the end of the Cold War.”

Then he talked about all the different national security crises—ISIS,

the terrorist attacks in Orlando, Paris, and Brussels, conflicts from Africa to Syria, and Russia's aggression in Ukraine. This is the President speaking to the Financial Times. These are today issues. I also call them today issues.

On Saturday, North Korea launched another submarine-based ballistic missile off the country's eastern coast. It didn't go that far, but they are learning. Madam President, you and I were over there recently. They are learning. That is a continuing threat.

Then, last Wednesday, before the President went to the NATO summit—which, by the way was a successful summit, and I applaud the President and Secretary Carter for that summit—the President announced that he plans to leave 8,400 American troops in Afghanistan, more than he originally planned to keep, to combat the Taliban. Again, a lot of us applauded that decision. It could have been more, but it certainly is better than the trajectory he was going on, which was to go to zero.

During an Armed Services Committee hearing last week, former NATO Ambassador Nicholas Burns and the former Supreme Allied Commander, Marine Gen. James Jones discussed the report that was coauthored by the Atlantic Council, again talking about the importance of NATO's building up our military forces not only on the eastern flank but in the Arctic—an area in which, as Alaska's Senator, I am very interested—where the Russians have dramatically expanded their military footprint in exercises.

Over the weekend, in the Wall Street Journal, it was reported that even after reaching the Iran nuclear deal, Iran continued trying to illegally procure nuclear equipment from Germany. So we have the Iranian threat, which definitely is not going away after the ill-gotten and misguided nuclear deal by the President.

Tomorrow morning, there is going to be big news. There is expected to be a tribunal ruling on what is going on in the South China Sea. Again, the Chair and I were there recently, in that region of the world, in Singapore, for the Shangri-La Dialogue. To Secretary Carter's credit and Admiral Harris' credit, we have had two carrier battle groups out there recently—two. That is very important.

So this is what has happened in a week. This is what our military is facing in 1 week. So what did this body do? What did the Senate do as it relates to actions in terms of our military and dealing with all these threats of just 1 week? What did we do? Led by the Senate minority leader and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we filibustered spending for our troops. That is what the Senate did. We filibustered spending for our troops. That is right. We blocked funding for our military, which has to deal with all these issues.

Now, I know it was in the dead of the night. I think it took place around

July 11, 2016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S4939

others—on the Armed Services Committee and the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I know for a fact that my colleagues on those very bipartisan committees—Democrats and Republicans—support our troops, support national defense, and support the military. And I know many of my colleagues in this body—many on the other side of the aisle—have served with distinction in the military for decades and are strong supporters of our men and women in uniform. I have seen it. I have seen it my entire short time in the Senate. But four filibusters blocking funding for our troops inside of a year certainly makes one wonder what is going on with the leadership of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when it comes to supporting our troops. I hope they come down and explain it this week.

What we need to do this week is vote again on the Defense appropriations bill and do the right thing. We all know what the right thing is and the American people know what the right thing is. We need to fund our troops, we need to keep them safe, and we need to keep our country safe.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I am here to speak on the Koch brothers, but first I want to say briefly to my good friend from Alaska: Instead of playing political games, if he wants to pass a defense bill, we all know what has to be done in a bipartisan way. You don't just take a bill, throw it down, and say "Take it or leave it." That is what happened last year. We worked in a bipartisan way. Defense spending got an increase. So let's stop all the rhetoric and politicizing this issue. Let's work together and get it done.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Now, Madam President, I want to talk about the issue before us, and that is the amazing influence of the Koch brothers—two people—on what is going on in this country and particularly when it comes to climate change. I thank Senator KAINÉ, who spoke before me, and particularly Senator WHITEHOUSE, who has not only organized these speeches but has been the leader in our caucus on focusing on this issue, and it is getting good resonance with the American people.

We have talked. We have failed to act on a number of issues in the last few weeks—Zika, funding the opioid crisis, sensible gun safety measures, a Supreme Court nominee and other judicial nominees. It is stunning how little we have done our job. But probably at the top of the list which deserves attention is that Congress has not done its job on climate change. Why? Why? It is so apparent. Just look at any map of the globe. Senator KAINÉ and Senator WHITEHOUSE are exactly right about the reason: far-right groups dominated by the Koch brothers. They hide where they send their money, but they dominate it all. They and other

deep-pocketed energy interests have funded campaign after campaign against action on climate change. We know that the NRA has a stranglehold on gun reform. Well, the Koch brothers have a stranglehold on any legislation on climate change—at least as long as our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are in the majority in either House.

One of the key strategies—how do they do this? Lots of different ways. We have seen those ridiculous commercials. They are afraid to say who they are. They have these ads; lots of poor people, minorities; oh, the Koch brothers are hurting—are helping. Koch Industries. And then they have one little sentence: Get rid of regulations. That is all they say. So they have lots of different mechanisms for hiding what they believe but profoundly influencing America.

One of the ways they have done that is by funding think tanks and academic institutions to deliberately cast doubt on the signs of climate change in order to protect their own financial interests. The Koch brothers earn their billions leading the private oil, chemical, and manufacturing conglomerate Koch Industries. In short, they are the premier anti-environmental, pro-pollution duo of the 21st century, and over the past two decades, they have mastered a strategy meant to confuse the American people about climate change by funding "think tanks" and "university programs" that adhere to their anti-science agenda.

Take the Mercatus Center at George Mason University. They should call it the Koch Center. Charles Koch sits on the board. Over the last decade, it has received tens of millions in funding from the Koch brothers and \$300,000 at least from Big Oil. So it should come as no surprise that the Mercatus Center publishes research that closely mirrors the ideology of the Koch brothers and routinely advocates for policies that are in their business interests, especially climate change denial. They cloak their views in an academic guise, but if you just examine it, you know what is going on: Mercatus Center, funded by the Koch brothers, talks against climate change. Do we think that is objective? I don't. Let's look at some of the activities of the center. In 2001 they suggested that global warming would be "beneficial" and would "stimulate plant growth and make humans better off." These are the Koch brothers.

During the early years of George W. Bush's Presidency, the Wall Street Journal reported that 14 of the 23 regulations targeted for repeal by the administration were suggested by—guess who. The nonpartisan, objective, non-funded Koch brothers' Mercatus Center, including rollback of EPA pollution rules. In 2006 the Mercatus Center attacked the bipartisan work to reduce tailpipe emissions and implement new efficiency standards for automobiles and trucks. In 2007 Mercatus was able

to install staffers at the Bush Office of Management and Budget in charge of regulations. In 2009 Mercatus attacked the Obama administration's plan to monitor greenhouse gas emissions.

Some might be thinking, so what? It is just a few academic papers and policy recommendations. Why does it matter? It matters because this private sector-funded research is being used to give the false impression that there is a legitimate academic debate about climate change, and then that debate is used by colleagues as an excuse for no action. It is no different from how the tobacco industry funded research that minimized the health dangers of smoking cigarettes so they could turn around and argue: There is no conclusive evidence that cigarettes are dangerous. No need to regulate us.

Millions of people died because of that. And millions of people are getting ill and many millions more will lose their jobs and we will lose our globe because of what the Koch brothers are doing. We now know how deceptive and cynical their strategy was. Well, that was the tobacco industry. It is happening today, and it is having the same serious consequences.

Ninety-seven percent of climate scientists agree that climate change is happening. Democrats know that climate change is happening and want to do something about it today, but congressional Republicans, following their Koch brother funders, holding up studies by the Mercatus Center, funded also by the Koch brothers, refuse to act and even deny it exists.

I would say to the Koch brothers: At least be honest. If you really believe what you say, why not come clean? Why not put out a commercial that says: "Koch brothers. We don't believe in climate change. Koch Industries. We don't believe that we should regulate the environment." Put that on TV so when we are watching "Morning Joe," we don't have these glossy ads that give the exact opposite impression. Do you know why? They know no one is going to believe them. They want to use their money as power, secret power, and one of the secret power ways they use that money is through institutions like the Mercatus Center.

Before all of us can come together on climate change and do something significant—it is not easy—we have to start agreeing about how immediate and incredible the challenge is. With things like the Mercatus Center throwing sand in the gears, that becomes more difficult—not for legitimate reasons but because special interest money cloaks its beliefs in academic centers that stall progress.

Anyone who participates in this should be ashamed of themselves—not just the Koch brothers but so many others who put out these studies and take the money. Shame. Future generations and our generation are going to pay the price.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I understand the majority leader will be coming to close out the Senate shortly and then allow us who are speaking to continue after that. I see Senator SCOTT here, so let me yield to him.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

A FAMILY CONVERSATION

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, I believe our Nation is in desperate need of a family conversation. The American family as a whole needs to sit down, come to the same table, and talk with our relatives. That means each of us talking to each other about the challenges we have seen in our Nation over all of last week—a challenging week in America's history, without any question; a challenging time period for Americans all over this country, without any question; protests, riots; challenges we haven't seen in a very long time.

We stand here today at a crossroads. Our Nation is experiencing turmoil we haven't seen in generations—decades since we have seen this type of turmoil all around the country. My heart breaks for all of us.

This week on this floor, I will give a series of speeches in hopes of illuminating some of the issues before us, as well as what I believe are essential steps toward closing both the wounds newly opened and others that have actually never healed. In other words, there are wounds that have existed for more than a generation, and it is time for the American family to work together to heal some of these wounds.

Last Friday, deep in the heart of Texas, we saw both the best and the worst of humanity. Only in America would you see police officers alongside protesters who were protesting police brutality. If you take a step back and picture it for just a moment, here is a scene of police officers protecting protesters who are protesting police brutality. In this picture, we don't see tension or animosity; we see smiles. We see police officers working, taking pictures, and making sure that everyone was having the appropriate time and, for some, even an enjoyable experience with law enforcement.

But then the shots rang out. Police turned very quickly to protect those protesters, and protesters helped police identify where the shots were coming from. Somehow at the exact same time, Dallas came together and at the exact time was torn apart. In what appears to be one man's warped mind, retribution became his answer to frustration, and his hate left five police officers dead and seven other officers wounded. We continue to mourn for them and their families today. We must not—we must not—become a society where revenge is the rule of the day.

Our Nation is dependent on the rule of law, and to enforce the law, we need honest, hardworking men and women to take up the shield. For the over-

whelming majority of cops, it is a calling. It is not a job. It is in the fashion of Romans 13—a chapter that speaks very clearly about the fact that government officials wearing a sword can be ministers; in other words, sharing love and affection and appreciation for those they guard and having the ability to provide punishment when necessary. We are talking about men and women who work for a very low wage all over the country and who see their job as a calling. So many of them—the vast majority—do it so well.

Law enforcement officers simply want to do two things: protect and serve. We cannot allow the actions of a few to overwhelm the good of the majority. To illustrate this, I want to share a few stories so we can put in frame, put in focus the sacrifice and the commitment that so many officers exhibit every single day throughout our Nation.

My first story is a story of a young lady named Jillian Smith, a young African-American female police officer from just west of Dallas in Arlington, TX. In December 2010, Officer Smith responded to a domestic violence situation. She arrived and met a beautiful 11-year-old girl and her mother, both fearful.

I want to stop for a moment and make sure we get the frame.

Here comes an officer, Officer Smith, who shows up to make sure the folks who called were safe. The people who called were an 11-year-old girl and her mother. They were fearful the mother's boyfriend would show up and do something dangerous. And dangerous—he did do something incredibly brutal.

Officer Smith, hearing gunfire, in an instant jumped on top of the body of the 11-year-old. As the bullets rang out, she kept herself on top of that 11-year-old girl. The girlfriend's boyfriend would end up killing the mother and then killing himself. Before he did so, he killed Officer Smith. Without a second thought, Officer Smith did what so many law enforcement officers do instinctively—protect those who are exposed. Officer Jillian Smith, a true American hero, gave her life to protect the life of an 11-year-old girl she had never met before knocking on that door.

This story and other stories aren't unusual. They want to serve and protect. We saw this same heroism last Friday evening, as told by Shetamia Taylor. Miss Taylor was at the protest. She was there exercising her first constitutional right. Then the sniper started shooting.

Miss Taylor had gone there with her four sons. She, for the lack of a better word, freaked out. Bullets were flying. She ran to cover her one son. According to her account of the situation, before she knew it, there was a cop who was covering her and her son. The next thing you knew, another cop was at her feet and another cop toward her head. In the midst of a sniper shooting at cops, she found herself surrounded, cov-

ered by police officers who were just doing their job, risking their lives for this mother and her son.

What a picture: the best of America, very clear; the sniper, the worst of America, is just as clear.

Miss Taylor made a very good point when discussing what happened. Here is her quote. She said: "These are the people you call when you're in a situation. . . . What are we gonna do if they stop policing?"

Let me ask the question that Miss Taylor asked one more time. What are we going to do if they stop policing? Who are you going to call?

These are the stories that should give us faith in law enforcement. While we certainly have issues that demand solutions—and I, too, have had some issues with law enforcement that I am going to share in my next speech on Wednesday. I will be giving three speeches. This is the first one. In the next one, I will talk about some of the issues that so many folks have experienced. I want to spend time on this, but this is a moment in time when we should stop the camera, create a frame. Let's focus on the fact that our law enforcement officers are true American heroes, period.

When you are looking for a hero, sometimes you look for athletes; maybe that is not the best place. You look for entertainers; maybe that is not the best place. You look at Congress—9 percent approval rating; that is probably not the right place. But our men and women who put on a law enforcement uniform—these folks are real American heroes.

In my State of South Carolina, officers like Greg Alia, who gave his life last year in Columbia, SC; officers like Allen Jacobs, who gave his life in Greenville, SC; and in Charleston, Joe Matuskovic, who was killed by a man shooting through a door—body slumps over, and my mentor, whom I have spoken about for so long, John Moniz's son—I call him a brother from another mother—was the first deputy on the scene and dragged the lifeless body of his friend, his colleague, from that door, trying to get that body completely out of harm's way.

To me, as I said a few seconds ago, Brian Moniz, sheriff's deputies, and police officers are our heroes, and we should focus on that for a moment. We must come together. We must find solutions. We must get to a point where the American family—our family—has a real conversation about the issues that divide us, the differences of our experiences, yet remain a single family with a single mission and make sure that every part of the American family feels valued.

I am starting tonight with our law enforcement, the part of the family we depend on, as Miss Taylor so perfectly stated. If we do have this necessary, painful conversation as an American family, we can say with a new freshness, "God bless America." We

July 11, 2016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S4947

California, the site designated by the United States Olympic Committee;

(2) expresses the sincere hope that the United States will be selected as the site for the 2024 Summer Olympic and Paralympic Games and pledges cooperation and support toward the successful fulfillment of those Games in the highest sense of the Olympic tradition; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the United States Olympic Committee and to the International Olympic Committee.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 44—RECOGNIZING THE SUNFLOWER AS THE FLOWER FOR MILITARY CAREGIVERS

Mr. BURR (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 44

Whereas military caregivers are nameless, courageous, giving individuals whose determination and sacrifices are rarely acknowledged and little-known outside of the military community;

Whereas a military caregiver provides support and medical care to a member of the uniformed services or veteran who suffers from a physical, mental, or emotional wound or injury;

Whereas military caregivers can include a father, mother, spouse, sibling, family member, loved one, or close friend of an injured member of the uniformed services or veteran;

Whereas since the first armed conflict of the United States, injured veterans have been cared for by family members and loved ones after returning home from combat;

Whereas since the Revolutionary War, military caregivers in the United States have tended to injured veterans as the veterans have recovered from seen and unseen wounds from combat operations;

Whereas military caregivers have shown time and time again, regardless of the conflict, that caring for those who return home is a part of the character of the United States;

Whereas many of the members of the uniformed services and veterans who served in Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation Iraqi Freedom—

(1) suffered wounds or injuries; and

(2) require assistance from a caregiver to complete either activities of daily living such as bathing, dressing, and feeding, or instrumental activities such as transportation, meal preparation, and health management;

Whereas, according to a study of military caregivers conducted by the RAND Corporation, more than 1,000,000 individuals serve as caregivers to veterans who served in Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation Iraqi Freedom;

Whereas the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-163; 124 Stat. 1130) facilitated a new program for access to health insurance, mental health services, caregiver training, and respite care by family caregivers of veterans who served in Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation Iraqi Freedom;

Whereas the adoration, loyalty, and longevity of military caregivers—

(1) endures through the hardships of extended hospital stays, multiple surgeries, and lifetimes of care; and

(2) helps create a fresh start that is hopeful even during difficult times;

Whereas the sunflower is a flower that symbolizes adoration, loyalty, and longevity; and

Whereas there is no more appropriate representation of the devotion and determination to overcome obstacles shown every day by military caregivers than the sunflower: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) honors military caregivers for service and sacrifice to the United States;

(2) encourages the people of the United States—

(A) to show support to military families; and

(B) to recognize the sacrifices endured by those families in service to the United States; and

(3) recognizes the sunflower as the flower for military caregivers.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 45—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO THE DISAPPROVAL OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF CERTAIN COMPANIES, TRADE ASSOCIATIONS, FOUNDATIONS, AND ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. CON. RES. 45

Whereas in the case of tobacco companies and allied organizations—

(1) according to peer-reviewed scientific research and Federal court findings, tobacco companies knew about the harmful health effects of their products; and

(2) contrary to the scientific findings of the tobacco companies and of others about the danger tobacco poses to human health, tobacco companies, directly and through their trade associations, and foundations—

(A) developed a sophisticated and deceitful campaign that funded think tanks and front groups, and paid public relations firms to deny, counter, and obfuscate peer-reviewed science; and

(B) used that misinformation campaign to mislead the public and cast doubt in order to protect their financial interest;

Whereas in the case of lead-related manufacturers and allied organizations—

(1) according to peer-reviewed scientific research and State court findings, the paint industry, gasoline manufacturers, and lead producers knew about the harmful health effects of lead in paint and other products throughout the 20th century; and

(2) contrary to the scientific findings of the paint industry, gasoline manufacturers, lead producers, and others about the danger lead poses to human health, those companies, directly and through their trade associations, and foundations—

(A) developed a sophisticated and deceitful campaign that funded think tanks and front groups, and paid public relations firms to deny, counter, and obfuscate peer-reviewed research; and

(B) used that misinformation campaign to mislead the public and cast doubt in order to protect their financial interest; and

Whereas in the case of fossil fuel companies and allied organizations—

(1) according to peer-reviewed scientific research and investigative reporting, fossil fuel companies have long known about cli-

mate change and the harmful climate effects of their products; and

(2) contrary to the scientific findings of the fossil fuel companies and of others about the danger fossil fuels pose to the climate, fossil fuel companies, directly and through their trade associations, and foundations—

(A) developed a sophisticated and deceitful campaign that funded think tanks and front groups, and paid public relations firms to deny, counter, and obfuscate peer-reviewed research; and

(B) used that misinformation campaign to mislead the public and cast doubt in order to protect their financial interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) disapproves of activities by certain corporations, trade associations, foundations, and organizations funded by those corporations—

(A) to deliberately mislead the public and undermine peer-reviewed scientific research about the dangers of their products; and

(B) to deliberately cast doubt on science in order to protect their financial interests; and

(2) urges fossil fuel companies and allied organizations to cooperate with active or future investigations into—

(A) their climate-change related activities;

(B) what they knew about climate change and when they knew that information;

(C) what they knew about the harmful effects of fossil fuels on the climate; and

(D) any activities to mislead the public about climate change.

NATIONAL AIRBORNE DAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 525, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 525) designating August 16, 2016, as "National Airborne Day."

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 525) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RECOGNIZING THE SUNFLOWER AS THE FLOWER FOR MILITARY CAREGIVERS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Con. Res. 44.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 44) recognizing the sunflower as the flower for military caregivers.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 44) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JULY 12, 2016

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, July 12; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 524, with the time until 12:30 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, we can expect the first rollcall votes to occur after the conference lunches tomorrow.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam 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 Senators MERKLEY and WHITEHOUSE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I have risen on several occasions to bring attention to the challenges confronting our "we the people" system of government that President Abraham Lincoln so eloquently described all

those years ago as one "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

I have talked about the powerful special interests working to corrupt the nature of our Republic, thanks to the unchecked wealth flowing into our political system because of the Supreme Court's series of misguided decisions in Buckley v. Valeo, Citizens United, and SpeechNow.org.

Today, I am honored to join with my colleagues from Minnesota, New Hampshire, and Connecticut—organized by my colleague from Rhode Island, who will be speaking in a moment—to show how these same special interests are using their vast wealth and resources to sway national policies and public debate to benefit their interests at the expense of the American people and turn our government into one of, by, and for a powerful special interest. There is no better example of what I mean than the debate surrounding one of the most critical issues facing our Nation and the world today: climate change.

Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan once famously stated that "everyone is entitled to his own opinion, but not to his own facts." Well, manmade climate change is a fact. Scientists, universities, and government agencies across the world have all said that manmade climate change is real, that it endangers our planet, and that we need to address it quickly if there is any hope for our future.

Back in 2005, 11 science academies from around the world—including Brazil, Italy, Japan, and Russia—signed a joint letter stating that "there is now strong evidence that significant global warming is occurring" and that "it is likely that most of the warming in recent decades can be attributed to human activities." Five years later, the Pentagon stated very directly that "the danger from climate change is real, urgent, and severe."

Fast-forward 5 more years to 2015, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science warned that "we face risks of abrupt, unpredictable and potentially irreversible changes" with potentially "massively disruptive consequences to societies and ecosystems."

The fact is, we don't really need to turn to our scientists or studies to know that climate change is real; we simply have to look at the world around us. We can see and feel it for ourselves. We saw it when 2014 became the hottest year on record, and then we saw it again in 2015 when 2015 became the hottest year on record. We see it as our forests come under assault from longer fire seasons and insect infestations because the winters are not cold enough to kill the pine beetles. We see it in our waters, our loss of snowpacks, as fishermen fish in ever smaller and warmer streams for trout and salmon, and our farmers face less water for irrigation. We see it in the oceans—oceans that are 30 percent more acidic today than they were before we started burn-

ing coal at the dawn of the Industrial Revolution. The acidic ocean is endangering our sea life, killing coral, and causing a real challenge for our shellfish. We see it in the droughts that hurt our farms and the increasingly powerful storms that regularly devastate communities, businesses, and people's lives.

Why, with all of this proof from the scientific community and with all of the proof and facts directly before our eyes, does such strong opposition remain to the effects of climate change? We know the answer. It is because a powerful, moneyed interest has spun a web of deceit, working for years and continuing to work to undermine mainstream, scientific research and deceive the American people about the dangers and causes of climate change.

These members are part of a special interest that have made their fortunes from fossil fuels. If they acknowledge the realities of climate change, it would suggest that their industry would have to dramatically change in a very short period of time. In fact, according to conventional science, we have to keep 80 percent of fossil fuels in the ground if we are to have any hope of keeping carbon emissions within a range that does not trigger catastrophic consequences. That is why, in the minds of this industry, it is better to lie to the American people than to risk their businesses and fortunes.

We have seen this movie before, when the tobacco industry lied to the American people for decades to discredit the emerging science and evidence that tobacco was killing millions of Americans. And now the fossil industrial complex is lying to the American people, but this time it is not just the health of Americans at risk, it is the health of the entire planet.

The Union of Concerned Scientists published a report last summer which showed that for decades the "fossil-industrial complex" knowingly worked to deceive the American public about the realities and risks of climate change. One of the main ways they do this is by funding third-party organizations like think tanks, advocacy groups that produce counter-climate research and make people question which facts and information they can trust. We know this is happening because various studies have revealed the incredible level of coordination between different groups and researchers who always see corporate funding and who all seem to work off the same scripts.

Justin Farrell, a sociologist at Yale University, authored a study last November that examined 20 years' worth of articles, policy papers, and transcripts from 4,500 individuals associated with 164 different groups known to be skeptical of climate change science. Comparing the work of those who had received this special interest corporate funding and those that had not, he found a clear, coordinated effort among the corporate-backed groups that cast

July 11, 2016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S4949

doubt on the idea that greater amounts of manmade carbon dioxide endangered our planet. Talking about his study, Farrell said that “this counter-movement produced messages aimed, at the very least, at creating ideological polarization through politicized tactics, and at the very most, at overtly refuting current scientific consensus with scientific findings of their own.”

We know these groups are backed by special interests. All we have to do is follow the money. That is how we know, for example, that between 1998 and 2015 ExxonMobil donated at least \$30 million to groups and organizations whose main purpose was to spread misleading information about climate change. It was discovered in paperwork connected to his paper between 2014 and 2015 alone that Peabody Energy funded at least \$332,000 through a subsidiary to groups and organizations involved in attacking climate science and clean energy policies.

As much as the fossil fuel companies have contributed to these efforts over the years, the titles of the masterminds and the kingpins of climate science denial rests with Charles and David Koch. These oil and coal baron brothers, whose estimated \$80 billion fortune comes from oil refineries and coal reserves in Texas, Alaska, Minnesota, and elsewhere, control roughly over 4,000 miles of pipeline. These are the same businessmen who have pledged that they and their network of contributors will have spent the better part of \$1 billion by the time the polls close on November 8 to try to influence the outcome of this year’s Presidential and congressional elections.

Since 1997, the Koch brothers have directly funneled \$88 million to think tanks and trade associations, advocacy groups, foundations, and academic and legal programs which deny the existence of climate change.

According to a 2013 study from Drexel University, they are effective at getting their friends to give their money as well. The study showed that most of the other largest contributors to the anti-climate science movement were associated with the Koch brothers. The foundation run by the DeVos family and Art Pope, a retail magnate from North Carolina, are a regular part of the Koch brothers’ donor network.

That same Drexel study also shows that as the public opinion about climate change has shifted in recent years, the sources of funding for many of these organizations has become untraceable. On paper, for instance, Koch affiliated foundations have pulled back significantly on visibly funding organizations that deny climate change. It just so happens that funding from other sources, such as Donors Trust, a donor-directed foundation where funders cannot be traced, has risen dramatically at the same time. The traceable funding of this network in DC has decreased, and the untraceable funding has increased. According to its Web site, Donors Trust

specializes in being untraceable. Our trust is for those “who wish to keep their charitable giving private, especially gifts funding sensitive or controversial issues. Know that your contributions to your DonorTrust account that have to be reported to the IRS will not become public information.”

In 2003, only about 3 percent of the denial movement came from Donors Trust, but by 2010, as the Drexel study shows, the foundation responsible for providing a quarter of “all traceable foundation funding used by organizations engaged in promoting systemic denial of climate change.”

The sources of the denial movement are being laundered so the American people do not have a direct vision of those responsible, but we know from all of this evidence who is responsible. Could it just be coincidence that at the same time the Koch brothers reduce their traceable donations to climate-denying science groups, the amount of untraceable money going to them increases dramatically? Yes, I suppose it is possible, but it would be a very large coincidence.

So we know that the Koch brothers have been prolific contributors to the climate change counter-movement over the years, and it is very safe to say that they are continuing to contribute anonymously to the cause of organizations like Donors Trust.

But what is the result of all of this? What has been the return on their investment?

We have seen report after report from groups like the Koch-funded and Koch-funded Cato Institute with titles like “Apocalypse Not: Science, Economics, and Environmentalism.” Or how about this one: “Climate of Fear: Why We Shouldn’t Worry About Global Warming.”

We know that a grant from the Charles G. Koch Charitable Foundation helped fund a nonpeer-reviewed study which claimed climate change doesn’t endanger polar bears.

Now, I do a tremendous number of townhalls—one in every county every year, 36 a year in Oregon—approaching 300 townhalls since I was elected into office. Many of these are in rural areas where people get a lot of their information—well, to put it simply—from web sources and emails and lists that are often directly driven through a right-wing propaganda machine. These are the types of things that the Koch brothers try to spread in order to undermine what is happening before our very eyes. When I talk to my rural townhalls about the challenge, I say: You know what; climate change is impacting you all most of all. It is attacking our forests and our fishing. It is attacking our farming.

I go through the evidence on the ground in the State of Oregon, and people start shaking their head. Yes, they are aware of the pine beetle. They are aware of the longer forest fire season. They have heard about the oyster industry in trouble because of the in-

creasing acidity of the Pacific Ocean. They are aware of how the Klamath Basin has suffered the three worst ever droughts in a 15-year period because the snowpack in the Cascades has changed so much over the last few decades, reducing the amount of irrigation water flowing in to the region and the amount of rain that is falling. They are aware of these things. So then they understand it, and they see the reality. Then there is a glimmer of understanding that the messages spun out by this vast web of denial is false and that they are on the front line. Rural America is on the front line.

Reports and studies funded by the Koch brothers muddy the waters of scientific fact, making it much harder for the average person to sort through and sift through the information that is available and to know what the real story is.

But where we see the Koch brothers’ and friends’ money paying off the most is the influence they are able to manifest here in Washington, DC. As we work to take on this challenge—the equivalent of an approaching meteor bent on destroying a good portion of the planet—as we work to take it on, they work to make sure we don’t take it on, undermining the legislation that is being put forward to incentivize a rapid transition from a fossil fuel economy to a renewable energy economy.

Obviously, an emphasis of pivoting from fossil fuels to renewable energy would undermine the value of the Koch brothers’ holdings. It would undermine the value of the fossil industrial complex. So they lie to the American people.

We see one substantial strategy after another. We know that the summer that cap and trade was being debated in 2009 and climate change started to become a focus of tea party rallies, a lot of that was organized by Americans for Prosperity—yet again a Koch-funded and Koch-funded organization.

The issue seeped into townhalls and public forums, with some members of the audiences planted at various events by groups like Americans for Prosperity to raise the issue. Anti-cap-and-trade members of Congress regularly quoted from a study by the Heritage Foundation, another Koch-funded organization. They predicted that the bill would add thousands of dollars to Americans’ energy bills and lead to devastating unemployment—claims thoroughly debunked by the Congressional Budget Office. But in the Koch brothers’ climate-denier, fossil-industrial complex world, facts don’t matter and that our planet is at risk doesn’t matter.

They even use piles of letters sent to Members of Congress that falsely claim to come from actual constituents. They worked to build pressure from outside groups, and eventually the Koch brothers and their allies won. The cap-and-trade bill never came up for a vote here in the Senate, even though it had passed the House. That was the

type of return on investment the Koch brothers sought. They wanted to use their money and their resources to stop legislation that could have helped the American people and the world begin to reverse recourse on the tragic direction we are headed.

That is not a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. That is a government against the people. That is, instead, a government of, by, and for a powerful special interest.

Every one of us here has a public responsibility to act on behalf of our Nation's national interests. We are stewards of the public trust. We are responsible for helping to guide the United States and helping the United States guide the entire community of nations into a future of greater well-being. To do that, we must take back our Republic from the special interests like the Koch brothers who are determined to corrupt our public bodies and our public debates for their own greedy self-interests. We must work together to restore the "we the people" government our Founding Fathers envisioned.

I am proud to come here to the floor to join my colleagues from Rhode Island, Minnesota, New Hampshire, and Connecticut. I particularly appreciate my colleague from Rhode Island for organizing this series of speeches to expose the special interests behind the anti-climate science forces and to ensure that, as President Lincoln so eloquently declared on those hallowed fields of Gettysburg, "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this Earth."

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I will be the final speaker tonight. The point that I want to make is that when we spend this time talking about the web of denial that sabotages America's ability to respond to the climate crisis, we don't just use this word rhetorically. We can go into the academic research and see the web depicted in peer-reviewed scientific research. We can see the means by which it operates—the climate change denial machine in academic research. We can hear about the think tanks that are used in this web of denial.

Constantine Boussalis of Trinity College and Dr. Travis Coan of the University of Exeter have examined more than 16,000 documents published between 1998 and 2013 by these 19 conservative think tanks. Their study demonstrated that in spite of the broken global heat records over the last decade, rising sea levels, and the accelerated melting of our polar ice sheets, these 19 conservative think tanks actually increased their attacks on climate science in recent years. These 19 think tanks, the authors tell us, "provide a multitude of services to the cause of climate change skepticism." These include offering material support and lending credibility to contrarian sci-

entists, sponsoring pseudoscientific climate change conferences, directly communicating contrarian viewpoints to politicians—which is how we get infected with that nonsense here—and disseminating skeptic viewpoints through a lackadaisical media that can be tricked into believing them—all, of course, while keeping the industry's hands hidden.

The American Enterprise Institute, Cato Institute, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Competitive Enterprise Institute, Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow, Citizens for a Sound Economy, Fraser Institute, Foundation for Research on Economics and the Environment, Heartland Institute—remember, they are the classic with the billboard comparing climate scientists to the Unabomber—the Heritage Foundation, Hoover Institution, Hudson Institute, Manhattan Institute, George C. Marshall Institute—it takes a lot of nerve to steal that man's name; George C. Marshall was an American hero—National Center for Policy Analysis, National Center for Public Policy Research, Pacific Research Institute, Reason Foundation, Science and Public Policy Institute are there to "provide a multitude of services to the cause of climate change skepticism."

Well, they are not alone. Harvard Professor Naomi Oreskes and her colleague Erik Conway from NASA and CalTech—no fools—have examined the long history of corporate-financed public relations efforts designed to sow confusion and skepticism about scientific research on topics like tobacco, acid rain, the ozone hole, and climate change. These are the schemes of the "Merchants of Doubt," the title of their book, and also the recent documentary film which, by the way, is playing in the Capitol tonight. Naomi Oreskes is actually here.

Then there is Justin Farrell of Yale University, about whom Senator Merkley just spoke. This is his diagram of the "web of denial" as a complex network of think tanks, foundations, public relation firms, trade associations, and other groups that are "overtly producing and promoting skepticism and doubt about scientific consensus on climate change."

Farrell describes the function of the network as, one, "the production of an alternative contrarian discourse," and, two, "to create ideological polarization around climate change."

That is right. The polarization that we see in this building and in this Chamber on this issue is a product created by this web of corporate-funded climate denial front groups. Congressional inaction is the sabotage their product has wrought in our democracy.

Here is how Dr. Farrell describes it: "Well-funded and well-organized contrarian campaigns are especially important for spreading skepticism or denial where scientific consensus exists—such as in the present case of global warming, or in historical

contrarian efforts to create doubt about the link between smoking and cancer."

These researchers and many more help map out an intricate interconnected web of denial that encompasses over 100 organizations, including trade associations, conservative think tanks, foundations, public relations firms, and plain old phony polluter front groups. Each of the front groups my colleagues and I will be calling out this week appear somewhere in the research of these individuals, and I thank them.

There are also groups at work exposing the web of denial. One group is American Bridge 21st Century, founded by David Brock, which has launched RealKochFacts.com to "highlight the truth about the Koch agenda and what it means for working families in states around the country." American Bridge last month reported on the 48 groups that signed a letter attacking the U.S. Virgin Islands attorney general for serving a subpoena on the Koch-funded Competitive Enterprise Institute. According to RealKochFacts, "43 of the . . . groups that signed on the letter defending climate change denial are Koch linked—and 28 of the other organizations are either Koch front groups or the beneficiaries of regular Koch funding," groups such as the James Madison Institute, the John Locke Foundation, and the American Legislative Exchange Council, which we will talk of tomorrow. The Kochs blow their dog whistle and the hounds appear. American Bridge exposed them.

Then there is ProPublica, a group founded by Paul Steiger, "an independent nonprofit newsroom that produces investigative journalism in the public interest." Their nonpartisan reporting helped shed light on some of the ways that the "dark money" flows through the Koch brothers network and into politics, providing the elections backstop to this web of denial.

Climate Nexus is an organization "dedicated to highlighting the wide-ranging impacts of climate change and clean energy in the United States." They recently released an analysis of 20 years of the Wall Street Journal's editorial opinion on climate change. They found "a consistent pattern that overwhelmingly ignores the science, champions doubt and denial of both the science and effectiveness of action, and leaves readers misinformed about the consensus of science and of the risks of the threat." Among their findings, of 201 Wall Street Journal editorials related to climate science or policy dating back to 1997, not one explicitly acknowledges that fossil fuels cause climate change; and of the 122 columns published since 1997, just 4 accept as fact that fossil fuels cause climate change or endorse any policy to reduce emissions. Between April 2015 and May 2016, as global heat records were falling every month, the Journal published 100 climate-related op-eds, columns, and

July 11, 2016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S4951

editorials, of which 96 failed “to acknowledge the link between human activity and climate change.”

Their report points out that “the **Wall Street Journal** consistently highlights voices of those with vested interests in fossil fuels . . . presenting only the dismissive side of the climate discussion,” and calls this “a failure of journalistic responsibility.”

Into this failure of journalistic responsibility by the **Wall Street Journal** editorial page has stepped in the Partnership for Responsible Growth, which is running a 12-part ad series in the **Wall Street Journal** right on the editorial page to bring “accurate mainstream climate science to the readers of this publication’s opinion pages.”

The first one reads: “Exxon’s CEO says fossil fuels are raising temperatures and sea levels. Why won’t the **Wall Street Journal**?”

Their second one: “Carbon dioxide traps heat on Earth. If we can agree on that, we can have a conversation.”

The third says: “The earth has warmed. And we did it.”

The fourth says: “What goes up doesn’t come down. CO₂ emissions stay in the atmosphere for centuries.”

The fifth says: “Your assets are at risk. Beware the carbon bubble. Climate change poses huge financial risks to investors.”

“The free market solution to climate change” was ad No. 6, and the free market solution to climate change is “a market-driven policy that conservatives and liberals can both embrace because it promotes growth, creates jobs, and makes U.S. companies more competitive.” In other words, it is a revenue-neutral carbon fee.

The one after that says: “The Pentagon sees climate change as a serious national security threat.” And they do. It turns up in the Quadrennial Defense Reviews, and it turns up in the speeches of the leaders of the different armed services. It turns up in our intelligence reports. If the Pentagon sees climate change as a serious national security threat, shouldn’t you?

The most recent one says this: “Like any problem, climate change has solutions.”

These straightforward, broadly accepted statements may be the first honest words about climate change on the **Wall Street Journal** editorial page, so thank you to the partnership for getting them there.

The **Union of Concerned Scientists** is another group working to expose this web of denial. It has as its mission to put “rigorous, independent science to work to solve our planet’s most pressing problems.” The **Union of Concerned Scientists** recently signed a letter with 30 other leading national scientific organizations telling us in no uncertain terms that “climate change is occurring, and rigorous scientific research concludes that the greenhouse gases emitted by human activities are the primary driver.”

For over a decade, the **Union of Concerned Scientists** has worked to defend

science and expose misinformation and manufactured uncertainty. They published articles on how **ExxonMobil** used the **Big Tobacco** denial playbook to promote misinformation and doubt on climate science.

The **Union of Concerned Scientists** also recently published information about how **Peabody** coal funneled money into climate denial groups from 2014 to 2015. It is the fossil fuel industry that is feeding the web of denial.

Greenpeace does great work to expose the web of denial. Last December, **Greenpeace UK** staff posed as consultants for fossil fuel companies. While pretending to work for fossil fuel companies, they approached climate skeptic professors. Both of the professors agreed to conceal the sources of the funding they were offered and to write reports in support of fossil fuel use in developing countries and the benefits of carbon dioxide. You wonder why I call them payroll scientists.

Greenpeace’s work also exposed **Donors Trust’s** role as a conduit anonymizing financial donations between fossil fuel companies and climate-denial organizations and other U.S. fossil fuel funding used to hire scientists to testify for hearings, reports, and other public communications on climate science. **Greenpeace** was the group that released the documents that showed that one of those hired payroll scientists had accepted over \$1.2 million from fossil fuel interests, including the **Charles G. Koch Foundation**, but didn’t report those sources of his funding.

ExxonSecrets is another **Greenpeace** project, which visually explains the network—the web of organizations, lobbyists, and paid-for scientists who are part of this web of denial.

The **Climate Investigations Center**, founded in 2014 by **Kert Davies**, is another organization that monitors this web of denial—corporations, front groups, trade associations, individuals—that delays or denies the implementation of sound legislative solutions to climate change. **Davies** is no stranger to the web of denial. He launched two programs at **Greenpeace**: **ExxonSecrets**, which I mentioned, and **PolluterWatch**, which calls out organizations and individuals funded by fossil fuel interests to sow doubt about the validity of climate science and sabotage reasonable climate policies.

I thank all these investigative groups for their work.

There are also authors who are picking apart the web of denial. The executive director of **Climate Nexus** is **Jeff Nesbit**. **Jeff** is the former Director of Legislative and Public Affairs at the **National Science Foundation** and was a communications official at the **White House** during the administration of President **George H.W. Bush**. He recently published an investigative book titled “**Poison Tea**” that examines, as the title implies, how **Big Oil** and **Big Tobacco** invented the tea party and captured the **GOP**.

As a consultant for the **Koch** brothers front group **Citizens for a Sound Economy**, **Nesbit** was there in the room when **Citizens for a Sound Economy**, to quote him, “proposed an unholy alliance.” Here is how he describes it:

Philip Morris money commingled with **Koch** money to create antitax front groups in a handful of states that would battle any tax that moved. It would make no difference what kind of tax—the front groups could battle cigarette excise taxes in the northeast and refined-oil fees at the coasts. Any tax for any purpose was bad—and these front groups would tackle them all, with **Philip Morris** and the **Kochs** behind them.

Nesbit’s book shines a spotlight on how **Rich Fink**, the former president of the **Charles G. Koch Charitable Foundation**, together with **Charles Koch** “forged a partnership and created the framework for successful action in the political realm,” with this web of denial at the heart of that framework.

In her recent book, “**Dark Money**,” **Jane Mayer** describes in depth the system by which fossil fuel interests use their wealth to sabotage the American political process. First, she describes, they pay intellectuals in universities who come up with ideas friendly to the fossil fuel industry. Then they pay think tanks to transform these ideas into “marketable policies.”

An environmental lawyer, **Mayer** quotes a 2010 article for the **New Yorker**:

You take corporate money and give it to a neutral-sounding think tank [which] hires people with pedigrees and academic degrees who put out credible-seeming studies. But they all coincide perfectly with the economy interests of their funders.

Ms. Mayer describes this system as creating what she called the “think tank as disguised political weapon.” From there, they go on to phony grassroots organizations to propagate the message. It is a big web, this web of denial.

Steve Coll is the dean of the **Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism**. He wrote the investigative book “**Private Empire: ExxonMobil and American Power**.” He reports **Lee Raymond**, chief executive of the company from 1993 to 2005, saying about **Exxon**, “I’m not a U.S. company, and I don’t make decisions based on what’s good for the U.S.” Gee, we hadn’t noticed.

Tellingly, **Coll** describes the influence environment of this web of denial and the fossil fuel industry role in it. This is a quote from his book:

This, increasingly, was the underlying structure of Washington policy debates: a kaleidoscope of overlapping and competing influence campaigns, some open, some conducted by front organizations, and some entirely clandestine. Strategists created layers of disguise, subtlety, and subterfuge—corporate-funded “grassroots” programs and purpose-built think tanks, as fingerprint-free as possible. In such an opaque and untrustworthy atmosphere, the ultimate advantage lay with any lobbyist whose goal was to manufacture confusion and perpetual controversy. On climate, this happened to be the oil industry’s position.

ExxonMobil, Coll reports, through its public affairs chief, “directed a network of allies and grantees in Washington who created havoc in the climate science debate.”

Which brings us to **Inside Climate News’s** series “**Exxon: The Road Not Taken**,” named a finalist for a 2016 Pulitzer Prize. Journalists Neela Banerjee, John Cushman, David Hasemyer, and Lisa Song compared what the fossil fuel giant knew about climate change—including results from its own cutting-edge research—with the falsehoods Exxon chose to sell to the public, usually through this web of denial. The series has surely honored the organization’s purpose “to cover the issues that aren’t being covered by the mainstream.”

On the Internet, Time Magazine recognized “**DeSmogBlog**,” which I mentioned, as one of the best blogs of 2011, describing it in these terms. Time Magazine said this:

Fossil-fuel companies have spent millions funding anti-global-warming think tanks, purposely creating a climate of doubt around the science. **DeSmogBlog** is the anecdote to the obfuscation.

In addition to its regular posts highlighting egregious examples of climate denial, **DeSmogBlog** also maintains a comprehensive disinformation research database to expose this web of denial.

The scholarship of all these academics, all these organizations, and all these authors—the detectives who are exposing the web of denial—has shined a bright light into its dark corners and eliminated its concerted effort to dupe the American public and sabotage climate action in America—all to protect the fossil fuel industry that funds it. It is sickening, but it is big.

The denial web is designed to be big and sophisticated enough that when you see its many parts, you are fooled into thinking it is not all the same beast, but it is—like the mythological Hydra, many heads, same beast. Professor Brulle likens what he called the climate countermovement to a stage

production. Here is how Professor Brulle described it:

Like a play on Broadway, the counter movement has stars in the spotlight—often prominent contrarian scientists or conservative politicians—but behind the stars is an organizational structure of directors, script writers and producers, in the form of conservative foundations. If you want to understand what’s driving this movement, you have to look at what’s going on behind the scenes.

The web of denial is what is behind the scenes. The web is so big because it has so much to protect. Remember, the International Monetary Fund has pegged the “effective subsidy” to the fossil fuel industry every year, just in the United States, at nearly \$700 billion. If you don’t like that number, you can do some math yourself. Just multiply the millions of tons of industry carbon emissions by the government’s own social cost of carbon. You still get to a huge subsidy.

The web is complex. It is organized into multiple levels. First, it cooks up polluter-friendly nonsense among academics that it funds in hundreds of universities. For its money, the web gets a little scholarly imprimatur to the propaganda. Then off that product goes to the think tanks that are the “disguised political weapon[s],” described by “Dark Money” author Jane Mayer, to be turned into policy. Then the AstroTurf organizations get cranked up to retail that polluter-friendly policy.

Let me wrap up with this observation. One thing needs to be absolutely clear about this web of denial. Truth is not their object. Truth is actually their adversary. The web has to mislead to be effective. It has to do what a **Koch** brothers operative described as the goal when this whole web was being developed. Here is what the **Koch** operative said:

It would be necessary [to] use ambiguous and misleading names, obscure the true agenda, and conceal the means of control.

Ambiguous and misleading names, obscure the true agenda, and conceal

the means of control that lead back to the fossil fuel industry. Welcome to the web of denial. Thank you to those who are working to expose it. It is a filthy thing in our democracy.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:35 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, July 12, 2016, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. TIMOTHY M. RAY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. MARK C. NOWLAND

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JERRY P. MARTINEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JERRY D. HARRIS, JR.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. PAUL M. NAKASONE

to sending our legislation to the President for his signature later this week.

UNITED STATES APPRECIATION FOR OLYMPIANS AND PARALYMPIANS BILL

Mr. President, I also wish to speak for just a moment, if I can today, about a bill that hopefully will pass the Senate later today as well.

In just a few weeks, our Olympic athletes will head to Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, for the 2016 Olympic games. The following month, America's Paralympic athletes will compete in the Rio Paralympic games. These athletes represent what is best about our country. They embody the timeless values of hard work, dedication, and sportsmanship.

Our Olympic and Paralympic athletes—and their families—have made innumerable sacrifices over the many years of training it takes to become a world-class competitor. Training is not cheap, and the vast majority of our amateur athletes put it all on the line without the help of sponsors or endorsement deals to subsidize their expenses.

Many of these athletes have spent virtually their entire lives training for this moment, and I have absolutely no doubt these brave young men and women will represent our Nation with great honor and distinction.

America's Olympic and Paralympic medal winners, in particular, will be greeted with much enthusiasm and great appreciation upon their return. Local communities across America will find ways to honor their returning hometown heroes. Unfortunately, one of the ways the Federal Government will welcome home our Olympic and Paralympic champions is by greeting them with a new tax bill. That is right. The Internal Revenue Service considers these medals to be income and will tax the value of any gold, silver, or bronze medal awarded in competition as well as any incentive award our athletes receive from the U.S. Olympic Committee.

I believe this tax penalty on our Olympic heroes is wrong, and that is why earlier this year I introduced S. 2650, the United States Appreciation for Olympians and Paralympians Act.

This legislation—introduced with Senators SCHUMER, GARDNER, GILLIBRAND, and ISAKSON—would ensure that America rewards the sacrifice and hard work of Team USA by exempting from Federal tax the medals and cash prizes they win at the Olympics and Paralympics.

I am pleased my legislation will pass the Senate later today, sending a strong signal to our athletes as they depart to the 2016 games that their Nation stands behind them. I urge the House of Representatives to take up and pass this legislation before the House adjourns for the August recess.

America's Olympic and Paralympic athletes deserve not only our admiration and respect but also a tax system that acknowledges the many years of training and sacrifice they have en-

ured. Because training for the Olympics is not considered a business enterprise, our athletes cannot deduct the substantial costs they incur over the years as they prepare to represent America on the world stage.

Most countries not only compensate their athletes but also subsidize their training expenses with taxpayer dollars. Our athletes make considerable financial sacrifices to train for the Olympics and Paralympics and as amateurs receive no compensation for their training. The very least we can do is ensure they don't receive a tax penalty when they successfully represent our Nation in the highest level of athletic competition.

Simply put, when it comes to our victorious Olympic and Paralympic athletes, we should celebrate their achievements rather than tax their success.

CONGRATULATING PAIGE MCPHERSON

Mr. President, I would also like to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations and best wishes to one of Team USA's shining stars; that is, South Dakota's own Paige McPherson.

Paige grew up in Sturgis, SD, graduating from Black Hills Classical Christian Academy in 2009. She will be competing in Taekwondo at the Rio games and will be striving for her second medal in a row, after claiming a bronze medal at the London Olympic Games in 2012.

I know Paige will represent America—and South Dakota—with great distinction next month, as will all of our Olympic and Paralympic competitors.

I wish to thank the original cosponsors of my legislation, whom I mentioned earlier, as well as Finance Committee Chairman HATCH and Senators SULLIVAN and MORAN for their support. I look forward to seeing our legislation enacted into law this year, and I wish all of our Olympians and Paralympians the very best of luck in Rio.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:53 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

ENERGY POLICY MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2015—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2:30 p.m. will be controlled by the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER, or her designee; the time from 2:30 p.m. to 3 p.m. will be controlled by the majority; and the time from 3 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. will be controlled by the two managers.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 15 minutes.

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

TRAGEDY OF VIOLENCE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I stand here as one of the two Senators from the largest State in the Union to recognize that there is a hole in the heart of America today as we cope with the tragedy of violence on all sides. I am working on comprehensive remarks because I am doing it more, in a way, for myself, and those are not prepared right now, but right now I want to send my deepest condolences to those who are suffering, who have lost loved ones, be those loved ones police officers or community members, and for that matter, so many Americans, so many American families who suffer losses because of violence every day. It is critical that we address this issue. I compliment the voices on all sides—the voices of compassion, reason, and love—and I hope I can add my voice to their voices.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. President, what several of us are doing on another topic is calling attention to the web of denial that is being peddled in our Nation by special interests and their think tanks and organizations that are working to undermine peer-reviewed climate science. Their goal is to create uncertainty and to delay action on the biggest environmental and public health threat we face today.

Climate change is real, human activities are the primary cause, and the warming planet poses a significant threat to our people and to our environment. That is not my opinion. I am the first one to say I am not a scientist. I rely on scientists, and 97 percent of them have said that climate change is real and human activity is the primary cause.

The level of scientific certainty on manmade climate change is about the same as the consensus among top scientists that cigarettes are deadly, but some of you may remember that up until the late 1990s, the tobacco industry scoffed at the best available science proving that tobacco is addictive and causes cancer. No one in today's world would argue with the fact that tobacco is addictive and causes cancer. In the 1990s, there was a campaign of denial, just as there is for climate change now. Year after year, the tobacco industry attacked the science that showed the link between cigarettes and the threat to human health, as well as the Surgeon General's warning that nicotine was as addictive as heroin and cocaine. Let me share a few of the statements made by or on behalf of the tobacco industry.

In 1970, the Tobacco Institute advertised that the scientific finding that proved a connection between cigarette smoking and lung cancer was wrong. They said: "The Tobacco Institute does not—and the public should not—accept these claims at face value."

In 1971, Joseph Cullman, the chairman of Philip Morris, said: "We do not

July 12, 2016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S4969

believe cigarettes are hazardous; we don't accept that."

In 1988, a lobbyist from the Tobacco Institute submitted written testimony for a congressional hearing stating: "In sum, there is no medical or scientific basis for viewing cigarette smoking as an 'addiction.' The effort to disparage cigarette smoking as an 'addiction' can only detract from our society's attempt to meet its serious drug problem." That was what the cigarette companies said.

At congressional hearings in 1994, executives from the seven biggest tobacco companies testified that they believed nicotine was not addictive. Do you remember the picture of them swearing to that fact?

A tobacco industry doctor said: "The proposed addiction warning and the assumption upon which it is founded are based neither in science nor fact and will have unintended harmful results." This is the tobacco company doctor saying that if you warn people, it will have unintended harmful results. Sure—for his bosses, the tobacco companies, who are paying his salary.

In 1998, Walker Merryman, vice president and chief spokesman for the Tobacco Institute, said: "We don't believe it has ever been established that smoking is the cause of disease."

The reason I spent so much time going through that painful history is that a lot of people died of cancer because the tobacco companies and their think tanks would not tell the truth to the American people. That is why a lot of people died.

At the end of the day, the tobacco companies failed, but there are so many bodies out there because of their heavily funded propaganda campaign. When the people knew the truth, America's smoking dropped from 42 percent in 1964 to 15 percent in 2015. To anybody out there who is still addicted, I pray God that they will get help. There are very few things where we know the cause and effect. We know the cause and effect of smoking—it is not good.

Investigative reporting has clearly shown that those who led the fight against health warnings on tobacco have been involved in the climate denial movement from the beginning. Just as Big Tobacco denied that smoking was dangerous to people's health, Big Oil and other special interests have tried to undermine scientists' warnings about harmful climate pollution by claiming that climate change does not exist.

So we had Big Tobacco spreading the big lie that smoking was non-addictive—they even said at one point that it was good for you—and Big Oil telling us that there is no climate change, that it is a hoax. But if we look at the 97 percent of scientists, what have they told us we are going to see? Higher temperatures, more extreme weather, severe droughts, increased wildfires, decreasing polar ice, and rising sea levels. That is what 97 percent of the scientists said would happen. Guess what. It is happening.

Don't take my word for it. Let me give specifics. Mr. President, 2015 was the hottest year on record. Every month of this year continues to set records. Sea levels are rising many times faster than they have in the last 2,800 years. The 2015 wildfire season was the costliest on record, with \$1.71 billion spent. California, my fantastic home State, is suffering from its worst drought in modern history, and scientists are predicting megadroughts. Rising temperatures are expected to worsen air quality and threaten public health.

The American public sees what is happening, and they understand the need to act. Seventy-one percent of Americans supported the historic Paris agreement to address climate change by reducing harmful carbon pollution. A March 2016 Gallup Poll shows that 64 percent of Americans—the highest percentage since 2008—are worried about climate change. Gallup also found that between 2009 and 2015, a decline in public concern about climate change was linked to a well-publicized campaign of misinformation about climate science.

The fossil fuel industry took a page right out of the tobacco company's playbook, supporting a network of organizations that create a false sense of uncertainty. So let me tell you that I have joined my colleagues on a resolution condemning the effort by the fossil fuel industry to discredit climate science, just as the tobacco industry worked to discredit science that proved tobacco causes cancer.

I want to work with my colleagues to call attention to this web of denial. There are organizations out there—they have beautiful names. They are funded by ExxonMobil, they are funded by the Koch brothers, and organizations like DonorsTrust, which hides the identities of funders and was called the Dark Money ATM in the press. Dark money is a good description because the deep pockets of Big Oil and other special interests have been misleading the American people for many years.

As I close my presentation, I want to talk to you briefly about three organizations based in my home State: the Reason Foundation, the Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy, and the Hoover Institution. These three organizations have been involved in efforts to undermine climate science.

The Reason Foundation has been churning out materials to raise uncertainty. The Hoover Institution, which is affiliated with Stanford University—which has so many wonderful things to commend it, but in my opinion not this—has been identified by the researchers as part of the climate countermovement. I have great respect for the work former Secretary of State Charles Shulz and others are doing at Hoover. However, I have to point out many articles published under Hoover's name have created uncertainty about climate science, trying to undermine the need for action.

The third organization is Pacific Research Institute, which is a free market think tank that published a number of anti-climate science materials, including the "Almanac of Environmental Trends." Just last month, 31 major scientific organizations basically said there is strong evidence that ongoing climate change is having broad negative impacts on society, including natural resources, the global economy, and human health.

For the United States, climate change impacts include greater threats of extreme weather, sea level rise, increased risk of regional water scarcity, heat waves, wildfires, disturbance of biological systems. We expect to see this increase. This is what the real scientists are saying, the ones who care about our people, our environment. They don't get their paychecks from Big Oil and those who stand to lose if we turn to clean energy.

So the scientists who work for that money from the Koch brothers, this is what they say: The world is warming far less quickly than we thought. A little warming will also extend growing seasons. Now consider the dire prediction regarding global warming and think of climate like golf. It is easy to see where the ball has landed but difficult to construct a model to predict with much confidence where the next ball will land.

We have many other comments by these sham groups that are funded by Big Oil, by the special interests, just like the tobacco industry had think tanks that supported them. You know, fool me once, OK. Fool me again, I am going to find out. We know about these organizations.

ExxonMobil gave a total of \$381,000 to Reason; \$295,000 to Hoover; \$615,000 to the Pacific Research Institute—ExxonMobil. Foundations associated with the Koch brothers provided more than \$1 million to the Reason Foundation and to the Pacific Research Institute. So we know what is going on here, but there is good news. The American people are not asleep at the wheel. They understand what happened with Big Tobacco. They understand the phony science that was put forward by Big Tobacco. Thanks to the leadership of my colleague SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, who has done an extraordinary job—he knows the truth. He knows the truth that these organizations are puppets of the big fossil fuel industry. You know what. They are going to be found out.

The people already do not, in any way, support them. That is why I am optimistic and came to the floor today. The truth will have its day. The people understand. They look out the window and they know.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy for 30 minutes with the Senators from Montana, North Carolina, and Iowa.

shall be turned over to the trustees of the fund provided for in Section 4 (b) hereof, to be used for the purpose stated therein.

11. Supervisors

With respect to questions affecting the employment and bargaining status of foremen, supervisors, technical and clerical workers employed in the bituminous mining industry, the Coal Mines Administrator will be guided by the decisions and procedure laid down by the National Labor Relations Board.

12. Safety

Nothing herein shall operate to nullify existing state statutes, but this Agreement is intended to supplement the aforesaid statutes in the interest of increased mine safety.

13. Retroactive Wage Provisions

The wage provisions of this Agreement shall be retroactive to May 22, 1946.

14. Effective Date

This Agreement is effective as of May 29, 1946, subject to approval of appropriate Government agencies.

Signed at Washington, D.C. on this 29th day of May, 1946.

J. A. KRUG,
Coal Mines Administrator.
JOHN L. LEWIS,
President, United Mine Workers
of America.

Mr. MANCHIN. I believe the Secretary of the Interior and the White House were representatives of the Federal Government back in 1946, just as they are today.

Second, my colleague from Wyoming stated: I worry about the claim that we are helping all coal miners with this proposal.

West Virginia coal miners—union and nonunion—continue to suffer from the devastating effects of the ongoing coal bankruptcies.

Senator, we are willing to help all miners. We truly are. Anybody who has been devastated in this downturn, if you will, of the industry, but we are focusing this particular effort on the United Mine Workers of America.

They try to make this: Well, you are picking union over nonunion. We are not picking union over nonunion. The agreement was made with the UMWA because everybody working in the mines during that period of time belonged to the UMWA. So we have to protect that promise that was made in that Executive order that was signed and made 70 years ago. So I invite the Presiding Officer and all of my colleagues to help us find a way to move forward and help put this to rest.

Also, Senator ENZI stated he wants America to remain financially solvent. Well, there is no one who wants that more than I do. I understand that if you can't get your financial house in order you can't do anything else.

In fact, let me tell you what happens if we do not pass the Miners Protection Act. The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, which we have in place, will shoulder the burden of the outstanding liabilities. In a January letter to Congressman MCKINLEY from West Virginia, one of my colleagues on the other side, the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation con-

firmed that if the UMWA becomes insolvent, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation of America will actually have to assume billions of dollars in liabilities causing negative ripple effects for many more and for the financial insolvency of our country.

Passing the Miners Protection Act now means covering \$3.5 billion in health and pension benefits. If we do not enact this law, the pension liability alone will carry a pricetag of over \$6 billion. So, along with my good friend from Wyoming, Senator ENZI, I do care about making prudent decisions. That is a savings of \$2.5 billion if we pass this legislation—\$2.5 billion in saving to the taxpayers.

The Miners Protection Act is important to my home State of West Virginia because West Virginia has more retired union miners than any other State in the Nation. Out of the 90,594 retired United Mine Workers in the country in 2014, more than 27,000 still live in my State.

I will say this. As to a lot of the devastation we have seen with the floods we have had in West Virginia over the last couple of weeks, it was horrific what happened. Every one of those little communities was a coal mining community that got hit. So you just add more tragedy on top of the already devastating tragedy that we have.

But the impact is going to be felt in every State in the Union, including Wyoming. In fact, the Miners Protection Act will help over 900 health beneficiaries and over 2,000 pension beneficiaries in the State of Wyoming. So I would just ask: What do my colleague who opposes this legislation or any of my colleagues who might not be for this legislation expect the widows and pensioners to do? First of all, they have an executive order by the President of the United States in 1946, over 70 years ago. On top of that, this pension plan was solvent and sound until 2008. It wasn't their fault the crash happened. The greed of Wall Street took down so many pension plans.

Most of these widows are making \$550 a month. That is their pension—\$550 a month. So we are not talking about large amounts of money, but if they lose that, it means the difference of whether they do certain things out of necessity. What do they give up? How do you explain to them that a 70-year-old commitment is now going to go unanswered? We didn't care. We didn't mean it.

It is our responsibility to keep the promise to our miners who answered the call whenever their country needed them. So I ask Senator ENZI and all my colleagues to work with me to keep our promise to these miners. Let us sit down and work together and make sure we all agree on the facts.

I have always said this, and it has been said to me many times, we are all entitled to our opinions. We are just not entitled to our own facts. So the facts are very clear here. This is not only a promise, it is a commitment and

a responsibility we have to the United Mine Workers of America and all those people who gave us the greatest country on Earth, gave us the greatest amount of abundant energy—reliable, affordable, and dependable. There is a transition going on now, and we are working through this transition, but the bottom line is that to walk away from an obligation and a commitment we made 70 years ago, which helped us be the superpower of the world and the country we are today, would be a gross neglect of our responsibilities and an injustice to the United Mine Workers of America, the widows, and the families who still depend on this. We have a responsibility to oblige and make sure we take care of them.

With that, I hope the Chair will help me in moving forward on this. We hope to get a vote in September. We were promised a vote in the first part of September, when we come back, and that is one we are counting on to carry this forward. I am hoping we will have our colleagues supporting this.

With that, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I come to the floor today to speak on the issue of climate change. Before I do, I would like to read a quote.

What is a conservative after all but one who conserves, one who is committed to protecting and holding close the things by which we live . . . and we want to protect and conserve the land on which we live—our countryside, our rivers and mountains, our plains and meadows and forests. This is what we leave to our children. And our great moral responsibility is to leave it to them either as we found it or better than we found it.

These are the words of President Ronald Reagan, and I agree with those words. Climate change is one of the greatest threats to our planet Earth. When I look at my beautiful grandkids, I feel a moral responsibility to leave this world as well as I found it or even better.

We can't continue to ignore the problem of climate change. How will future generations judge us if we deny the reality of climate change and say that it is just too hard to do something that might leave them a safer, cleaner, better world? I don't think they will look on us kindly. Future generations actually count on us.

Climate change is no longer debatable. The facts are in. Climate change is real, and it is not some distant threat. From Hurricane Katrina to Superstorm Sandy, from severe flooding on the Mississippi River in 2011 in Illinois to the historic low water levels

July 12, 2016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S4979

just 1 year later and to the devastating drought and wildfires that are searing the West Coast, extreme weather is the new normal.

So why are there still so many in the Chamber who deny the threat of climate change, not to mention failing to do anything to solve the problem? I have said on the floor before, and I will say again, that there is only one major political party in the world today that denies climate change, only one—the Republican Party of the United States of America.

Well, part of the reason is because for decades the fossil fuel industry and those who cater to them have tried to blur this debate, to blur the science, to create divisions among us, instead of looking for what we have in common to try to solve this problem rationally and reasonably.

Make no mistake, there is a deliberate campaign, financed by the fossil fuel industry—a campaign that uses the pseudoscience of manufactured doubt. It is coordinated. I have seen the likes of it before.

In 2006, the major tobacco companies in the United States were found guilty of “a massive 50-year scheme to defraud the public.” Decades before, tobacco company research had already shown that tobacco was truly harmful and addictive. Instead of letting science and the moral imperative behind it promote public health, the companies launched an extensive campaign sowing seeds of doubt about the dangers of tobacco.

I know about this firsthand. I was a Member of the House of Representatives about 27 years ago. I introduced a bill to ban smoking on airplanes. It was opposed by the tobacco lobby, and the leadership in both political parties—Democratic and Republican elected leaders in the House of Representatives—opposed me. We called it for a vote, and to the amazement of everyone, it passed. It turns out Members of Congress are the largest frequent flyer club in the world, and they knew how outrageous it was to suggest there were smoking and nonsmoking sections on an airplane.

I led that initiative to ban smoking on airplanes, and I was joined by the late Senator Frank Lautenberg who took up the cause in the Senate, and 26 years ago we banned smoking. It made a difference. We had to fight the tobacco lobby all the way. They denied that nicotine was addictive. They denied there was a linkage between tobacco and cancer. They created a pseudoscience. They paid scientists to come up with theories that said tobacco really wasn't that dangerous.

Well, sadly, we are seeing that same thing today when it comes to climate change. Just as the tobacco industry created a campaign of manufactured doubt to protect their financial interests and profits, a web of fossil fuel industry groups, aided and abetted by one of the very groups that resisted anti-smoking laws, are behind this web of climate denial.

A 1998 **American Petroleum Institute, or API**, memo has become public. I just read it on my computer upstairs. At the time, the **American Petroleum Institute** consisted of a dozen lobbyists, think tank members, and public relations gurus. Science wasn't on their side in 1998, so the group decided that misleading the public about the reality of climate change—sowing seeds of doubt about whether there was really climate change underway—was the best way to go. The 1998 **API memo** claimed that “victory,” in their words, would be achieved when “uncertainties” about the science became part of the public's perception.

In the year 2000, influential Republican pollster Frank Luntz prepared a playbook for those who wanted to create doubt in the public's mind about climate change. Mr. Luntz wrote:

Should the public come to believe that the scientific issues are settled, their views about global warming will change accordingly. Therefore, you need to continue to make the lack of scientific certainty a primary issue in the debate.

So what is taking place right now with the effort of the fossil fuel industry is a deliberate campaign to mislead the American public.

Sadly, this web of denial that started in 1998 is alive and well today. Just last year, at an **ExxonMobil**-sponsored meeting of the notorious **American Legislative Exchange Council**, the president of the **Heartland Institute** stated:

There is no scientific consensus on the human role in climate change. There is no need to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and no point in attempting to do so.

This quote is in direct opposition to Earth scientists in one of the world's most highly respected Earth science organizations—the **American Geophysical Union, or AGU**.

This spring, a group of 254 Earth scientists cited these lies in a letter as one of the many reasons why the **American Geophysical Union** should decline to accept **ExxonMobil's** financial sponsorship of their group. The Earth scientists also made clear that **ExxonMobil** distributed scientifically false and misleading information, are members in or financially support other climate-denying organizations, and donated to climate-denying politicians and past misinformation campaigns.

ExxonMobil is not alone in spending money to influence elections and affect environmental policy. The oil and gas industry pours millions of dollars into election campaigns every year. In the 2012 election cycle, energy and natural resource corporations, their employees, and industry super PACs spent more than \$147 million to make sure the right people were elected in congressional seats, in Senate seats, and in the Presidential campaign. During the current election cycle, they have already spent more than \$101 million, and they will likely contribute millions more in the 4 months remaining. Experts esti-

mate that, in total, candidates, political parties, and interest groups, including those funded by companies such as **ExxonMobil**, may spend up to \$10 billion on Federal campaigns in 2016—\$10 billion.

A poll conducted by the New York Times last year found that 84 percent of Americans believe money has too much influence in American political campaigns. They are right. Our campaign finance system is a mess. America needs a system to elect its candidates that rewards those with good ideas and principles, not just the person who is the most talented in raising money.

I reintroduced a bill last year called the **Fair Elections Now Act**. This legislation would establish a voluntary, small-donor public financing system for Senate campaigns. We would finally break the back of Big Money's control over the American political system. The **Fair Elections Now Act** can't solve all the problems facing us, but the bill would allow us to fight back against deep-pocketed special interests by dramatically changing the way campaigns are funded, encouraging small donors and matches for those small donations.

As we grapple with important issues like climate change, we have to recognize the influence of money in our political system and why one major political party in the world today still denies climate change. Until we embrace campaign finance reform and ensure that politicians do not feel beholden to special interests like the oil and gas industry, climate-denying politicians will continue to prevent us from taking action.

It is unconscionable that some very powerful people put their profits ahead of the future of the planet we live on, but we know it is true. If we don't act on climate change, there is no backup plan.

Let me end on a hopeful note. When Pope Francis came to Washington, DC, last September, he called for action on addressing climate change and global warming. The Pope said:

All is not lost. Human beings, while capable of the worst, are also capable of rising above themselves, choosing again what is good, and making a new start.

Pope Francis is right. Let's not run away from our responsibility in the Senate or in life to our children and our grandchildren. Let's work toward solving the real challenges of climate change with both political parties. It is not too late to make a new start, to do the right thing, and to protect this planet that we call home.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, we all want safety, security, health and well-being for all of our fellow Americans. But it sometimes seems impossible for us to agree on how best to achieve them. So when Congress comes together to find solutions to an urgent crisis facing the country, we should

Commission made more than 200 recommendations to improve the criminal justice system, including creating the 9-1-1 emergency system that is so ingrained in our society today.

Our country has changed significantly over the last 50 years, and another top-to-bottom review of our criminal justice system is long overdue. In fact, the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, which was created after the troubling situation in Ferguson, strongly recommended the creation of a national commission to evaluate the entire criminal justice system.

The National Criminal Justice Commission that my legislation creates will shine a light on the whole scope of our criminal justice system, including police and community relations, our grand jury system, the right to counsel in misdemeanor cases, the lack of speedy trials, and the struggles ex-offenders face in finding housing, employment, and support services after leaving prison.

This Commission is one critical piece of a larger puzzle. We must also take swift action on our justice system, such as sentencing reform. The Commission also has the support of a wide range of groups, including the Fraternal Order of Police, the NAACP, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Urban League, and many other law enforcement and civil rights groups.

The National Criminal Justice Commission is vital to understanding the reforms and best practices that we need to reduce crime, help law enforcement do their jobs safely and effectively, protect our communities, and build a justice system that works for every American. These problems are not easy, and there are no quick answers. It is going to require all of us working together to make these vital changes a reality, but together we can achieve the promise of this great country—justice for every American, no matter who you are, where you live, or how much money you may have in your pocket.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I hate conspiracy theories. I believe most of the suspicious, confusing, frustrating, or unknowable things in the world are the way they are not because there are 12 people in a room wringing their hands trying to figure out how to trick all of us but because the world is complicated, often unfair, sometimes illogical, and we all operate with incomplete information. So even as a climate hawk, I came to the idea of an organized misinformation campaign with real hesitation. I didn't want to be that guy who believes there is an evil empire that lies for a living. But here is the thing: I have studied this, and I have learned that there really is an organized, well-financed disinformation

and misinformation campaign on the subject of climate change. It is straight out of a bad movie about politics, complete with PR guys, dark campaign money, fake scientists, politicians in the mix, and a weakened media. It is like Raymond Tusk actually exists.

I rise today to join my colleagues in combating a pervasive and highly damaging campaign of misinformation, disinformation, and outright lies. For decades, the same hired guns that tried to convince the American people that there was no link between smoking and lung cancer have been following the same playbook on manmade climate change. They want to sow doubt where no doubt exists. Just like the tobacco companies profited from denial, so too have the fossil fuel companies profited by propping up front groups and sham think tanks that try to convince us that the science on climate change isn't settled and that no consensus exists between mainstream scientists, but of course that is not true.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science said:

The science linking human activities to climate change is analogous to the science linking smoking to lung and cardiovascular diseases. Physicians, cardiovascular scientists, public health experts, and others all agree that smoking causes cancer, and this consensus among the health community has convinced most Americans that the health risks from smoking are real. A similar consensus now exists among climate scientists, a consensus that maintains climate change is happening and human activity is the cause.

It is worth pausing here to make two basic points. The first is one I mentioned earlier, and that is that the same techniques which were used to block science and prevent action on tobacco are now being deployed to prevent action on climate. That stands to reason. If you are looking for public relations techniques to essentially mislead the public so you can squeeze additional years and decades of profitability, then you would be wise to use the techniques, methods, and procedures that worked in the past, so that sort of stands to reason. It shocks the conscience, but it shouldn't shock us that this is happening. The really shocking part is this. Of course they would use the same techniques to mislead the public regardless of the issue, but the real shock is that it is literally the same people. It is not the same type of person or the same category of person, it is the same human beings and the same professionals. They are the same PR firms, and they have replicated the machinery of the Tobacco Institute, sharing processes, procedures, personnel, and funding sources. But just as we did against Big Tobacco, we are going to win the war of ideas against Big Oil and Big Coal.

The truth is on our side, but the truth is not guaranteed to come out. We actually have to expose their ecosystem of misinformation to make real progress on climate, and so for a moment I will talk a little bit about the

media, which has played an unfortunate role.

Generally speaking, people in the U.S. media like to get "both sides of the story" just to be fair, which under many circumstances works just fine. After all, the definition of a bad story in a lot of reporters' minds is to be one-sided. What happens when one side of the story is factual and the other side is a house of cards? Many in the media still report it as though, on the one hand, scientists say climate change is real, and on the other hand, some say it is not. To be fair, this has improved over the last year or so, but that was the foundational weakness of the American media—their credulity when reporting on deniers—that the climate denial apparatus took full advantage of.

There are not two sides to every issue. Sometimes there are just facts on one side and bull on the other. We don't argue about the existence of gravity or whether the Earth is round or, thankfully, whether smoking causes lung cancer. We have known since the 19th century that carbon dioxide traps heat much like a greenhouse. We know that burning fossil fuels releases stored carbon into the atmosphere. We have seen the evidence of increasing temperatures and rising sea levels for decades. The correlation between levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and global temperatures is absolutely undeniable. To deny the reality of manmade climate change in this context requires willful ignorance.

How is this happening? Academics from Yale and Drexel Universities, among others, have researched and exposed the many sources of dark money that are fueling the climate denial machine. My colleagues are speaking today—and spoke yesterday as well—about some of the greatest offenders, and I will focus my remarks on just two. One is a small organization that most people haven't heard of, and another is an organization that I think a lot of people who work in politics have heard of. The first is the Center for Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, and the other is the Heartland Institute.

The Center for Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change is a family project out of Tempe, AZ, that claims that global warming will be beneficial to humanity. The center does not disclose funding information because they believe doing so would bias the way people perceive their purpose and publications, and that may be the only thing they say that is true.

Transparency is crucial in the world of science because it allows the scientific community and the general public to determine whether there might be a conflict of interest. In this instance, there is a conflict of interest. We know that at the very least, ExxonMobil and Peabody coal have given significant sums of money to the center. When two companies with a

July 12, 2016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S4983

long history of climate denial are paying you to deny the scientific consensus on climate change, it is fair to point out that something smells a little fishy.

Better known than the Center for Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change is the Heartland Institute, which gained national attention after putting up a billboard comparing those who believed in manmade global warming to the Unabomber, Ted Kaczynski. This tasteless stunt rightfully cost Heartland \$825,000 in corporate donations, but Heartland still receives millions of dollars a year from fossil fuel companies and others with a vested interest in continuing the status quo. They still have an outside impact in the national conversation by insinuating that the science on climate change is not settled.

Not surprisingly, Heartland follows the tobacco playbook to a T. Their reliance on dark money means that Heartland's funding is notoriously difficult to track. According to the watchdog group Conservative Transparency, Heartland has received more than \$14 million from the Koch-initiated Donors Trust and Donors Capital groups, which shield donors' identities. We know that ExxonMobil has contributed at least \$675,000 since 1998, and the Union of Concerned Scientists found that 40 percent of those funds were specifically designated for climate change projects. The money from these organizations, among others, allowed Heartland to publish nearly 3,000 documents toward climate change skepticism between 1998 and 2013. Heartland also organizes gatherings of climate skeptics and defends fossil fuel funding experts who continue to deny the reality of the changing climate we are already seeing today. We have seen this movie before.

What is happening this week is historic. We are no longer going to allow these front groups to pose as on-the-level think tanks. We have a moral obligation to not only solve this problem but to also fix our politics. We should all be making decisions about how best to solve this problem.

Let's have this great debate. Let the two major political parties have an argument about the best way to tackle climate change because this isn't just a climate thing at this point, this is an integrity thing.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

(The remarks of Mr. GARDNER pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 526 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Minnesota.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues to expose those who continue to deny the science of climate change and try to deceive the American people. This is important because climate change is an existen-

tial threat to our planet and to future generations. By denying climate science and lobbying against efforts to address climate change, these deniers are subjecting the planet and everybody on it to great risk.

Climate change will have significant adverse impacts on all of our States, including my State of Minnesota. Just look at our agriculture sector, which is responsible for one out of every five jobs in Minnesota. Warmer temperatures and more intensive droughts are going to negatively impact this important rural economic engine. In fact, a recent study estimates that with no adaptation efforts against climate change, Midwest crop production could decrease by more than 60 percent by the end of the century.

Climate change will also impact our waters, and that is important to my State—the Land of 10,000 Lakes—which includes Lake Superior. Lake Superior alone contains about 10 percent of the world's fresh surface water, and it is warming by two degrees per decade. Because of this warming, we are seeing more evaporation and lower water levels in the lake. Plus, rising temperatures allow for more favorable conditions for invasive species and hazardous algal blooms. Warmer temperatures could also have severe consequences for fish like walleye pike and trout that are so important to Minnesota fisheries and ecosystems.

And let's not forget the threat of climate change to our forests. As in our lakes, warmer temperatures elevate the threat of invasive species such as the emerald ash borer and gypsy moth that are rapidly changing the composition of our forests—or the bark beetle in Colorado, the State the Presiding Officer represents. They destroy trees and cost economies and money and jobs.

So we can see that climate change poses a very serious threat to Minnesota and to our country. I believe it is the defining issue of our generation—an issue that demands immediate action. But, unfortunately, there are some groups that have been trying to prevent action. These groups have spent many millions of dollars muddying the water, distorting the science, deceiving the American people, and, ultimately, delaying the response that we desperately need.

Over the last two days, my colleagues have come to the floor to expose this web of denial—the extensive network of groups and individuals who are spreading lies about climate change—and I am here today to expose one of the worst actors of all: the Heritage Foundation.

The Heritage Foundation is a right-wing ideological organization known for advocating for discriminatory social and economic policy—things like attacking voting rights, privatizing Social Security, and favoring tax breaks for the rich to the detriment of the middle class. They are also a mouthpiece for climate denial.

If you go to the Heritage Foundation web site, you will find that it says that climate change is “used too often as a vehicle to advance special interests and politically driven agendas.” That is rich, coming from an ideological organization devoted to promoting a partisan agenda. No one can deny that.

The Heritage Foundation is notorious for trying to undermine the science on climate change. Their favorite claim is that “the only consensus over the threat of climate change that seems to exist these days is that there is no consensus.”

Even as recently as April, a report that the Heritage Foundation issued referred to climate scientists as “a field that is a mere few decades old” and that “no overwhelming consensus exists among climatologists.”

While these statements may grab headlines, they are utterly false.

Climate change science actually dates back to the 1800s—before Henry Ford sold his first car, before Thomas Edison invented the light bulb, and even before the first oil well was drilled in the United States. In 1824, French scientist Joseph Fourier proposed that the atmosphere keeps the Earth warm—what we know today as the greenhouse effect.

In 1859, an Irish scientist, John Tyndall, attributed this warming to several gases, including carbon dioxide. In 1896, a Swedish scientist, Svante Arrhenius published the first calculation of global warming from human emissions of carbon dioxide. In the more than 100 years since, scientists all around the world have studied, debated, and researched different aspects of the issue.

So when staff from the Heritage Foundation, none of whom actually have advanced scientific degrees, write a report that claims climate science is a new field that has little scientific consensus, they are ignoring the nearly 200 years of research—a scientific body of research that has led to 97 percent of climate scientists agreeing that humans are causing global warming.

But every now and then, even the Heritage Foundation admits that climate change is in fact real. But when they admit it, they pretend that climate change isn't a big deal and that it is not worth our time to combat it. In 2010, a senior policy analyst at the Heritage Foundation—with a degree in law, not climate science, mind you—declared that “none of the scary stuff about global warming is true, and what is true about global warming, what the science actually tells us about man's role in changing the climate, is far from terrifying.”

Now all of this science denial and false propaganda might not be such a big deal if climate change wasn't such a serious problem, but when you look at the scope of the problem you quickly realize how the Heritage Foundation is acting in an incredibly and deliberately irresponsible way.

Last year, I traveled to the climate change conference in Paris and met

with a delegation of leaders from Bangladesh, a country that has contributed little to industrial air pollution but is one of the most vulnerable to the negative impacts of climate change. It is estimated that unless we act, rising sea levels will inundate 17 percent of Bangladesh, displacing about 18 million people in this low-lying nation by the end of this century. Even now, rising sea levels are impacting Bangladesh through salt water intrusion, reducing agricultural yields and ruining drinking water supplies. It is already having a profound effect.

We are talking about a very poor country that doesn't have the resources to deal with climate change. Bangladeshis will be uprooted and turned into climate refugees without a home. I would bet these individuals would disagree with the Heritage Foundation that the impacts of climate change are "far from terrifying."

If you think the Syrian refugee crisis is difficult to deal with, just think of the magnitude of what we will see if we do not address climate change. For a lawyer at the Heritage Foundation to make this claim is not only irresponsible but, frankly, dangerous to the welfare of people around the world.

These are just a few examples of the falsehoods that the Heritage Foundation spreads about climate change. If I had the time, I could go on for hours—maybe, even, days—quoting more of those lies. In fact, from 1998 to 2013, the Heritage Foundation published more than 1,600 documents contributing to climate skepticism, and they have published many more since. So I think we can say the Heritage Foundation is deliberate and unwavering in its fraud and deceit.

One might ask: Why would the Heritage Foundation work to deceive the American people in such a way? What do they get out of it?

Well, I will tell you. It is because they are being paid to do so by self-interested fossil fuel companies like ExxonMobil and people with major investments in fossil fuel companies, like the Koch brothers. Perhaps you have heard of them. The Heritage Foundation's work to espouse lies and prevent action on climate change directly benefits the bottom line of the companies and brothers who are funding them. We know this because over the past two decades ExxonMobil donated nearly \$1 million to the Heritage Foundation; and the Koch brothers, the owners of the fossil fuel conglomerate Koch Industries, contributed nearly \$6 million. These companies and brothers are worried that if people knew what their products were doing to the planet, they would stop buying their products or transition to other renewable energy or public policy would drive the markets away from their products. So in order to protect their bottom line, they set out to misinform the public. That is what they do for a living, and Heritage and many other similar organizations, are helping them to spread their false-

hoods. That is what they do at the Heritage Foundation for a living.

The money paid to Heritage goes to supposed experts whose jobs are to release thousands of bogus reports about climate change. These experts are not climate scientists. They are lawyers and economists serving as puppets for the fossil fuel industry. These same so-called experts publish op-eds and do interviews in media outlets around the country—talk radio—helping to spread disinformation or misinformation or what we sometimes call lies. They also brief Congress and serve as trusted authorities for staff in many Republican offices. So it shouldn't surprise us that my Republican colleagues deny climate change when they rely on these experts.

Despite the best efforts of the Koch brothers, the Heritage Foundation, and other deniers, people around the country are not fooled. In Minnesota we are seeing changes to our crops, lakes, and forests. Instead of sticking their heads in the sand, Minnesotans are taking action.

In 2007, under a Republican Governor, my home State established a renewable energy standard to produce 25 percent of our power from renewable sources by 2025. That same year, Minnesota passed an energy efficiency standard to require utilities to become a little more efficient every year. To top things off, Minnesota established an aggressive goal to reduce greenhouse gases 80 percent by 2050. These are the kinds of policies that we need to combat climate change, and these are also the kinds of policies that the Heritage Foundation is fighting tooth and nail to prevent.

It is not just the Minnesota legislature that is taking action. Minnesota businesses also recognize the importance of fighting climate change. Last year I joined Dave MacLennan, the CEO of Cargill, in penning an op-ed in the Minneapolis StarTribune to highlight the threat of climate change to agriculture, especially considering that global population will reach 9 billion by midcentury. As the CEO of a food company focused on agriculture, Dave is concerned about what climate change is going to do to our food supply. He is not alone. We have businesses all over our State that are installing wind turbines and solar panels and manufacturing cutting-edge energy efficiency technologies.

Minnesotans aren't fooled by the Heritage Foundation. On the contrary, to them, climate change represents a Sputnik moment—an opportunity to rise to the challenge and defeat that threat. In response to Sputnik, we ended up not just winning the space race and sending a man to the moon, we did all sorts of good things for the American economy and society.

We did it before, and we can do it again. By rising to the challenge of climate change, we will not just clean our air, but also drive innovation and create jobs, and not only in the clean energy sector.

I have two grandchildren, and I am expecting my third later this year. God willing, they will live through this century and into the next, and in 50 years I don't want my grandson Joe to turn to me and say: Grandpa, you were in the Senate, and you knew about the severity of climate change. Why didn't you do anything to stop it? And also, why are you still alive? You are 115 years old.

I will say it was all investments we made in our age. I want my grandson to know that when we had the opportunity to put the planet on a safer path, we seized the moment.

So let's not allow the Heritage Foundation and all of these different members of this web to slow us down. Let's not let the selfish motivations of shadowy donors with ties to the fossil fuel industry prevent us from making the planet a safer and more habitable place for our children, our grandchildren, and future generations.

It really is time to stand up to ignorance and denial. It is time for all of us on both sides of the aisle to do what is right for future generations.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at 11 a.m., Wednesday, July 13, the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the conference report to accompany S. 524. I further ask that following the cloture vote, the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany H.R. 636, the FAA bill; that the majority leader or his designee be recognized to make a motion to concur in the House amendments to the Senate amendments; and that the time until 1:45 p.m. be equally divided between the leaders or their designees. I ask that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the motion to concur in the House amendments to the Senate amendments with no intervening action or debate and that all time allocated for consideration of H.R. 636 count postcloture on S. 524, if cloture is invoked.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. For the information of all Senators, the cloture vote on the CARA conference report will occur at 11 a.m. tomorrow, with the vote on the FAA bill scheduled at 1:45 p.m. Senators should expect a vote on adoption of the CARA conference report during tomorrow's session.

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

ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I come as a Senator, but actually I come wearing two different hats right now—two more hats aside from being a Senator. One of them is a teacher. I still teach at the LSU Medical School and have for the last 30 years, so I decided to do

to bring Federal resources, in partnership with local resources, to bring relief to those affected. We bring that flexibility in the use of funds while retaining accountability.

We call this the Public Health Emergency Response and Accountability Act, and we anticipate entering this in very soon. Senator SCHATZ has been wonderful to work with in terms of this aspect of what we are doing.

So there are two issues. The \$1.2 billion that we should release now, that would immediately go—it is not a perfect bill, but we have to prevent more cases of these children who are tragically born with microcephaly, as well as more deaths, like the woman who recently died in Utah. Then, No. 2, we need to have the response and accountability act, which gets rid of this process we struggle through in order to release those funds to bring the relief we need.

Let me summarize by saying this: This is a baby with microcephaly. I think there have been three children born in the United States already—not conceived here but born here—who have microcephaly. This child's life is limited. She will most likely die at an early age, with severe neurological deficits. If you just want to look at it in a dollars-and-cents approach, this child will be a ward of the State for the entirety of her life and will cost the Federal taxpayer millions of dollars.

We have already had these babies born in Puerto Rico, New Jersey, and Hawaii. There are two pregnant women in Illinois who tested positive for Zika, and we had a death in Utah and Puerto Rico—not children but adults. The question is, Will the Senate work to stop this? And again, if you are watching and you wish, you can scan this barcode, you can download this presentation.

Let me finish by saying this. I just said the Senate should work to stop the spread of Zika. You can do something. We are a representative democracy and we respond to you, the people, and if we don't, by golly, you should vote us out. So I am asking you, if you are watching at home and you think there needs to be a response quickly and efficiently and effectively to combat the spread of Zika, you can either barcode this or not, but whatever you do, call your Senator. Ask your Senator—ask her or him—to support efforts to stop the spread of Zika, to release the \$1.2 billion, and to also support the bill Senator SCHATZ and I are putting forward, the Public Health Emergency Response and Accountability Fund.

Ultimately, we answer to you, the people. That is a good thing. I ask you to perhaps use this tool to help us, to encourage us to answer to you, as we should.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues from the Senate

Climate Action Task Force on the floor to bring attention to the well-funded network of organizations that are deliberately misleading the public on climate change. My colleagues have called them the web of denial. We all gathered on the floor yesterday and today to bring attention to these political front groups that are acting as major roadblocks to the actions we must take as a nation and as a global community to address the difficult and disruptive but absolute and unequivocal scientific reality of climate change.

This web of denial is made up of dozens of organizations propped up by dark money. These political front groups for wealthy and self-interested donors like the Koch brothers—you may have heard of them—peddle bogus theories that climate change isn't real or, at the very least, the American public should doubt the overwhelming scientific evidence and fear what might happen if we enact policies that move us toward cleaner energy solutions. These organizations are promoting policies that are completely counterproductive at a time when we urgently need to take decisive action to combat climate change and to protect the health of our children and future generations.

As many of my constituents know well, climate change has already had a very real and costly impact in my home State of New Mexico, as it has across our Nation and around the world. In New Mexico, we are already seeing more extreme and prolonged drought conditions, larger wildfires, shrinking forests, and increased flooding. This is the reality now, not some far-off date in the future, and the longer we wait to act, the more difficult and the more expensive the solutions will be.

That is why the fictitious narratives spun by this web of denial and their organizations are so dangerous and why we, as policymakers, need to stand and refute their lies. We need to disclose who they really are and discredit their campaigns.

I am focusing this evening on the American Legislative Exchange Council, or ALEC. ALEC is an organization made up of State legislators across the Nation, and ALEC claims that nearly one-quarter of our country's State legislators are affiliated with the organization. ALEC calls itself a nonpartisan organization that promotes an exchange of ideas to help create State-based policies that promote economic growth.

Sounds like motherhood and apple pie, doesn't it? But when you take a look at who is behind ALEC's operations and you take a look at the types of policy they are pushing in State capitols across this Nation, you get a sense for their real agenda, and you can tell they are part of the coordinated and well-funded campaign to peddle doubt and skepticism about the settled science of climate change.

ALEC has been described as "a dating service between politicians at the

State level, local elected politicians, and many of America's biggest companies." ALEC writes "model policy"—thousands of cookie cutter, anti-conservation bills that legislators can introduce under their own name, in their own States, in hopes of turning them into law.

Specifically, in the area of energy policy, ALEC pushes a concerted legislative agenda that is in line with the rest of the Koch network to promote climate skepticism and roll back laws that protect clean air and water. ALEC's "model bills" read like they were written by the biggest polluters in our country because they probably were.

There are resolutions condemning the Clean Power Plan, calling for States to withdraw from regional climate initiatives and to reconsider national environmental standards such as rules that reduce ozone pollution—and, I might add, save lives. ALEC also pushes bills that call for repealing renewable fuel standards that are moving our electric grid toward cleaner energy sources.

ALEC has also written model resolutions that call for selling off or turning over public lands, such as our national forests in Western States like New Mexico and across our country. The current ALEC State chair in my home State of New Mexico introduced legislation at the Roundhouse in recent years called the Transfer of Public Land Act, which would call on the Federal Government to turn our public lands over to State management.

The only way Western States like mine could foot the bill for administering America's public lands would be to raise taxes dramatically or—and this is much more likely—sell off large expanses to developers and other private interests. Over time, it would mean public lands that New Mexicans go to every summer to hike and camp and barbecue with their families, the national forests where they go to chase elk and mule deer during hunting season would be closed off behind no trespassing signs.

I have long believed public lands are an equalizer in America, where access to public lands ensure you don't need to be a millionaire to enjoy the great outdoors or to introduce your family, your children to hunting and fishing and hiking. This land-grab idea is just as ludicrous as denying climate change, just as detached from reality, and similarly comes at the expense of our public health and protection of our public lands and resources.

Frankly, you don't have to do a deep-dive investigation to figure out what is going on. The so-called policy experts and leaders that make up ALEC's board of directors are on the record as climate skeptics. ALEC's CEO, Lisa Nelson, said: "I don't know the science on that," when she was asked if CO₂ emissions are the primary driver of climate change. Texas State representative Phil King, the national board

July 12, 2016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S4987

chair for ALEC in 2015, said: “I think the global warming theory is bad science.” And Connecticut State representative John Piscopo, ALEC’s national board chairman in 2013, said: “The public has been hoodwinked. . . . I have serious doubts about whether [climate change] is manmade.”

We all know the reason ALEC’s members and leaders say things like this and promote these kinds of bills. It is because so much of the funding for ALEC’s operations comes from sources other than membership dues. Over 98 percent of ALEC’s revenues comes from corporations and trade groups and corporate foundations. That is how ALEC works, by sewing uninformed seeds of doubt to move the needle at the State and local level toward anti-science, anti-climate action policies that benefit their funders’ bottom line.

ALEC is just one piece of a large web of similar dark money organizations that promote climate skepticism and are dangerous fronts for corporate interests to deliberately mislead the public and influence lawmakers. To see just one other recent example of this in my home State of New Mexico, I would like to take a moment to look at a letter to the editor published last week in the Las Cruces Sun-News by the Environmental Policy Alliance.

This is another one of those web-of-denial political front groups. In the letter to the editor, they claim that conservation and monument designations are really “federal land grabs” and the work of “radical environmental groups” trying to stop economic development. These “radical groups” and “green decoys” are, according to the letter, such dangerous groups as Trout Unlimited, the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, the Izaak Walton League, and Backcountry Hunters & Anglers, groups that all stand up for the interests of sportsmen and hunters and anglers—certainly not what most of my constituents would consider radical.

A close look shows who the real decoy is. The Environmental Policy Alliance is funded by the Western Fuels Association, another organization in the web of denial, and it is a pet project of lobbyist Rick Berman, who has also led deceptive public campaigns on behalf of cigarette and alcohol companies and now dirty energy. This organization doesn’t care about the best way to manage our publicly owned lands or preserving the ability of Americans—no matter what their stake in life is, how much money they make—to experience our country’s rich outdoor heritage. Instead, the Environmental Policy Alliance wants to put our public lands up for sale so the corporate elite can develop them for their own use and their own profit.

The Environmental Policy Alliance has published similar letters in dozens of small to midsized city newspapers all across our country in recent years—canned letters with no connection to local sentiment.

The reality is, the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monument in Southern New Mexico, which this group has slandered, serves as a national example of community-driven, landscape-scale conservation. In fact, independent polling shows overwhelming local support for this monument, and I am proud of my close work with the region’s diverse coalition and stakeholders that worked so hard for so many years to make that monument a reality.

Two years into the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks designation, local businesses in the Las Cruces area are attracting major tourism dollars and economic benefits. The Lonely Planet guidebook has named Southern New Mexico as a top 10 “Best in the U.S.” for 2016 destination, and highlights the national monument as a reason to visit.

The tax revenues of the town of Mesilla have jumped over 20 percent since the monument’s creation, and Las Cruces’ lodgers tax revenues are up since 2015, in part because of new conferences and meetings attracted to the area by the monument.

You can see how out of touch these groups are that want to instead sell off this public land. The organizations that make up this web of denial are promoting dishonest and deceptive campaigns that frankly run directly counter to the public interest.

At a time when we desperately need to move our State and national energy and conservation policies forward, we should be taking the overwhelming and indisputable scientific fact of climate change seriously, and we should make smart and forward-looking investments in the sustainable, low-carbon fuels of the future.

I am convinced advances in energy efficiency and generation and transmission of clean power offer us a roadmap that not only allows us to combat climate change but to do it in a way that will create thousands of new jobs and much needed economic activity in New Mexico and all across our country.

That is the reality, just like climate change. Climate change is not theoretical. It is one of those stubborn facts that doesn’t go away just because we choose to ignore it or if we listen to the company line from self-interested Koch donor networks and organizations like ALEC.

I think it is time to call these “Astroturf” groups out for who they really are and, frankly, who they really answer to. More importantly, it is time to take action on the moral challenge of our time—addressing climate change—so that our children can inherit the future they truly deserve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues in speaking out against what I believe is the misleading and dangerous campaign of some in the fossil fuel industry to un-

dermine this Nation’s efforts to combat global climate change.

The science on climate change is beyond rational dispute. Climate change is real. It is a clear and present threat to our planet, and it must be addressed robustly and urgently.

Scientists have proven unequivocally that CO₂ and other greenhouse gases we release into the atmosphere when we burn fossil fuels act to trap heat and form an invisible blanket to warm the planet. Over the last century, the Earth’s average temperature has continued to rise, with 9 of the 10 warmest years on record occurring since the year 2000.

True to form, 2015 was the Earth’s warmest year on record. Rising global temperatures have led to extreme changes in weather events and in our environment. No country is insulated and no State is insulated from the escalating effects of climate change.

In the United States, we are seeing it in this every region of the country, and we are witnessing its effects very dramatically in my State of New Hampshire. Rising temperatures are affecting our tourism, our outdoor recreation, and our agriculture industries. We are experiencing an onset of negative health impacts and increases of insect-borne diseases—Lyme disease is one—all of which can be tied to the effects of climate change.

In the United States and throughout the world, people acknowledge that global warming is an existential threat that requires immediate action to slow its pace and mitigate its effects, even while those climate deniers are still out there, making noise.

According to the Pew Research Center, two-thirds of all Americans acknowledge that climate change is real and that action must be taken to address it. But there are some, an extreme but influential minority, who argue that climate change is a hoax; that it lacks scientific consensus; that the changes we observe are not due to CO₂ and other greenhouse gas emissions, but they are due instead to variations in the sun or cosmic rays; and that policies to limit greenhouse gas emissions will ruin our economy.

Not surprisingly, these climate deniers are not scientists, though they may pretend to be. They are front groups funded by the fossil fuel industry, generally, and the Koch brothers, in particular. These front groups are paid to spin a web of denial wrapped in ideology with the aim of purposely deceiving the public about the dangers of climate change. This is deceitful and it is wrong, and we are here on the floor this afternoon to call out these groups by name so that the public knows what to watch for and there is some transparency about what is being said.

One of those groups is the Competitive Enterprise Institute, or CEI, based in Washington, DC. This group describes itself as “a public policy organization committed to advancing the principles of free enterprise and limited government.” But if we look more

closely, we find that CEI is not an independent organization. It is funded by powerful corporations designed to spread untruths and disinformation on behalf of its corporate sponsors.

In recent years, CEI has taken up the issue of climate change. It has been outspoken in disputing scientific evidence that human-produced greenhouse gas emissions are driving global warming.

Some may recognize CEI not for its work on climate denial but for its prominent role in misleading the public about the scientific evidence linking smoking to lung cancer and heart disease. Legal documents from major tobacco companies exposed the fact that CEI received more than \$800,000 from Philip Morris to launch coordinated media campaigns to attack the Food and Drug Administration's efforts to regulate tobacco.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a series of these documents be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WRO EFFORTS

Beginning last fall, the assistance of the Washington Legal Foundation, Citizens for a Sound Economy and the Competitiveness Enterprise Institute was sought to define the FDA as an agency out of control and one failing to live up to its Congressional mandate regarding regulation of drugs and medical devices.

Beginning in December, those groups conducted an aggressive media campaign toward those goals, incorporating the issuance of policy papers, conducting symposia, filing petitions with FDA and taking other steps to keep the public and media focus on the agency.

On the legislative front, a group of southern Democrats began negotiating with the White House early this year on behalf of the industry seeking to eliminate any role for the FDA in the regulation of tobacco.

The quid pro quo in these negotiations would be voluntary concessions on the part of the industry on the issue of youth access to cigarettes. Leading the negotiations were Sen. Wendell Ford and Rep. L.F. Payne. After nearly eight months of discussion, the WH rejected the compromise.

Beginning in January, members of Congress—at the urging of several outside groups including Citizens for a Sound Economy—began taking a much closer look at the FDA appropriations request. That scrutiny led to the successful effort to eliminate \$300 million sought by FDA to consolidate its offices in a new federal campus, by any measure a major setback for Kessler.

Meanwhile, Congress also was scrutinizing the regular appropriations and voted to freeze the agency's budget, effectively decreasing the level of funding for next year when adjusted for inflation.

Language was inserted in that legislation to restrict Kessler's authority to assign employees to various projects and a list of questions was submitted to Kessler regarding his investigation into tobacco, including what resources and personnel were being devoted to the effort.

Congress has not been satisfied with his responses to date, raising the issue of whether Kessler has been evasive or even engaged in obstruction of Congress in this area.

Congress also initiated a series of oversight hearings regarding the agency, con-

ducted in the House by Rep. Thomas Bliley and in the Senate by Sen. Nancy Kassebaum. Those hearings focused on whether the FDA was fulfilling its mission and included several demands by Congress for documents and deposition.

At the Senate oversight hearing, former FDA Commissioner Charlie Edwards testified, raising further questions of whether the FDA was acting legally and responsibly in pursuing a course that would lead to tobacco regulation.

As a result of the growing focus on FDA from inside and outside Congress and the groundwork laid through the oversight and investigations committee work, legislation to reform the FDA was proposed earlier this year and is expected to be formally introduced in September. A key provision in the reform legislation will be to restrict FDA's regulatory authority.

The House Agriculture Committee also requested that Kessler supply all documents he was using in consideration of his tobacco regulations. Kessler has resisted, and that effort continues.

In recognition that Kessler ultimately would play some regulatory role regarding tobacco, an aggressive campaign was conducted over the past six months to educate members of Congress and their staffs regarding the issue of regulation.

One result of that campaign was a July 15 press bipartisan press conference led by Reps. L.F. Payne and Richard Burr as a result of media reports that Kessler had sent his regulatory proposal to the White House. Participants circulated Dear Colleague letters throughout Congress and submitted Op-Ed pieces to their hometown newspapers challenging the need for FDA regulation.

Also, as a result of those education efforts, delegations of elected officials met with White House officials in an effort to derail federal intervention in tobacco regulation.

The groundwork that has been laid legislatively has been designed to create a receptive atmosphere in Congress for legislation that will be introduced to eliminate FDA's role in tobacco regulation. The timing and specifics of such legislation are under consideration.

Efforts in Congress also were made to identify unlikely allies—those who generally are more concerned with the politics of regulation rather than the substance—and resulted in meetings with the WH with Sen. Chris Dodd and Rep. Dick Gephardt. Labor also presented opposition to Kessler's role in regulation.

Recognizing that legislators weren't the only point of White House access, a conference of tobacco growers held this summer focused on the ramifications of FDA regulation. Both Sen. Ford and Rep. Payne spoke to growers, and efforts continue to mobilize the agricultural community in opposition to the proposed regulation.

The support of Administration political advisors was enlisted to discuss the ramifications of FDA regulation, and those efforts also continue.

STATE ACTIVITIES

Efforts focused primarily on defining the issue of youth smoking as one that properly should be addressed at the state and local level, rather than having FDA intervene with any regulatory scheme.

In all 50 states, the stated goal was to endorse or pass reasonable marketing laws which stop minors from purchasing cigarettes, with a minimum of government interference in the marketing of the cigarettes to adult smokers.

State elected officials also were contacted to intervene with the White House to stress the point that there was no need for FDA

regulation. In addition to the states' rights issues, economic and political arguments were incorporated in the discussions with Administration officials.

Support of the American Legislative Exchange Council—a public/private consortium of conservative state legislators—took a stand against FDA regulation, as did the Southern Legislative Congerence, a group affiliated with the Council of State Governments.

Meetings were held with the Southland Corp., one of the nation's largest cigarette retailers, and with the Food Marketing Institute and National Association of Convenience Stores to brief those groups on potential adverse impacts of FDA regulation and to enlist their opposition.

A working group was formed by the Tobacco Institute to bring together industry representatives and the retail and wholesale trade communities to join together and work toward the common goal of compliance with laws prohibiting sales of tobacco products to minors. Much of the focus centered on employee education regarding underage sales. Covington and Burling also was given the assignment of drafting appropriate state legislation that could be used as a model in state legislatures.

A blueprint was established to enable the company to contact and mobilize legislative and retail association allies to participate in the 90-day comment period once the Kessler regulations were released and to support appropriate Congressional action on the issue.

Third-party spokespeople were identified in each state to address the issues of FDA regulation with local media, and a state elected official in each state has been identified to enlist his or her colleagues in upcoming legislative sessions on youth access issues.

INTERNAL ACTIVITIES/MEDIA RELATIONS

Work began last year to formulate a PM program that would address the issue of youth access, with a decision made in December to hold those proposals in abeyance.

Company employees and outside consultants involved in the issue were formally assigned roles as the FDA response team, and efforts began in January to incorporate the various elements into a comprehensive program addressing all conceivable actions that could be taken by the Clinton Administration or the FDA regarding tobacco regulation.

These efforts encompassed both public affairs campaigns and potential legal filings. Press releases, statements, fact sheets, video news releases, background video and other materials necessary to convey the company's position were drafted and taped for each of the options considered.

PM representatives with scientific credentials were assigned the task of meeting with various "think tanks" to discuss the issue of FDA regulation and generate guest editorials and comments to the media.

Those team members who were identified as taking a public role in PM's response were given media/communications training, focusing on the effective delivery of company messages.

In late spring, the proposed youth access program was resurrected and the company subsequently announced Action Against Access, incorporating voluntary and proposed legislative steps to address the issue of youth smoking.

The announcement of AAA was made at a New York press conference and was accompanied by an aggressive media outreach campaign, including the use of VNRs, background video feeds, letters to elected officials and coordination with third-party allies.

July 12, 2016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S4989

In early July, those involved in the FDA working group participated in a simulation geared to measure company response to an announcement by the FDA of full or partial regulation of tobacco.

That exercise envisioned several different actions Kessler could take on tobacco regulation, and measured the company's response to an FDA announcement. Based on the results of that exercise, the action plan was fine-tuned to deal with various options Kessler was believed to have available.

By the time of Kessler's announcement of regulatory intent, the company mobilized to battle the Administration proposal on both the legal and public affairs fronts.

A lawsuit was filed as soon as the FDA notice of intent to regulate was published in the Federal Register, and two hours before President Clinton's afternoon press conference announcing the action, PM held a press conference to announce the lawsuit and register its objections to the FDA action.

By the time Clinton made his announcement, a video news release and background video was fed by way of satellite to television news departments throughout the country, and satellite time was booked to provide those stations an opportunity to interview PM spokespersons for local broadcasts.

With assistance from Burson-Marsteller, PM press kits were sent to all major Washington-area media in anticipation of stories generated by those reporters.

While World Regulatory Affairs was dealing with the public affairs aspects of the FDA announcement, the Washington Relations Office mobilized its plans to reach legislative supporters in Washington and in key southern states to mount criticism of the President's decision.

All materials disseminated to the press also were circulated on Capitol Hill to provide legislators with the PM's position and rationale for filing suit. With information in hand, several southern legislators were able to react and respond quickly to media inquiries.

The PM briefings on Kessler's actions extended to conservative columnists and think tanks, enabling them to provide third-party views of the Administration's action.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. CEI lobbied politicians, conducted symposia, and published policy papers and op-eds with titles such as "Safety Is a Relative Thing for Cars: Why Not for Cigarettes?" CEI's then-policy analyst, Alexander Volokh, even went so far as to describe the act of smoking as a civic duty.

As the documents that we have just submitted for the record detail, CEI's mission was to portray the FDA as "an agency out of control and one failing to live up to its congressional mandate." For a time, CEI was successful. Congress took a closer look at FDA's appropriations requests, and lawmakers slashed agency funding and passed language to restrict FDA's authority to regulate tobacco. In fact, at one oversight hearing, Members of Congress even questioned whether the FDA was acting legally and responsibly in pursuing a course that would lead to tobacco regulation.

If this sounds like *deja vu*, that is because it is. CEI and other front groups are using the same playbook, the same tactics to deny climate change that they used to deny a link between tobacco use and fatal disease. CEI is now

on a new mission to confuse and mislead the public on climate change. It is financing and directing ad hoc groups like the so-called Cooler Heads Coalition, which claims that global warming is a myth and that many scientists are skeptical of climate change. CEI has also produced two television ads that allege that the polar ice caps are thickening, not shrinking, and that CO₂ emissions are good for the environment.

CEI's ads sound more like something that Saturday Night Live might come up with. For instance, this is their tagline about CO₂:

They call it pollution. We call it life.

Of course, we all know that CO₂ is necessary for plant growth. But what that ad fails to mention is that too much CO₂ in the atmosphere can cause global temperatures to rise, and that there is more of it in the atmosphere today than at any time during the last 420,000 years. So there is more carbon, more CO₂ in the atmosphere than at any time during the last 420,000 years.

Just as in the case of Big Tobacco, one need only to look at who funds CEI to see how they determine their messaging. We have a chart here to show where their funding comes from. I would just point out that this is data all compiled from publicly available records. We see ExxonMobil Foundation. Then we see the Koch family and their foundation. Then we see Philip Morris. So there is significant funding from people who have an agenda about climate change.

My staff has determined that between 1985 and 2015, CEI has received almost \$15 million from rightwing organizations like the Donors Trust and the Dunn's Foundation for the Advancement of Right Thinking. CEI has also received more than \$2 million, as we see here, from ExxonMobil, and more than \$1 million from the Koch foundations and the Koch brothers personally. The strong ties between CEI's message denying climate change and the interests of coal, oil, and gas companies are clear and obvious. So it seems that while CEI has changed its client, it is still in the exact same business of selling lies and selling out the health and the future of ordinary Americans.

Another industry front group I wanted to talk about this afternoon has been exceptionally loud in denying climate change. It is the so-called Energy & Environment Legal Institute, or E&E Legal. E&E Legal has several different aliases—the American Tradition Institute, George Mason Environmental Law Clinic, and Free Market Environmental Law Clinic—but its MO is one and the same. Like CEI, E&E Legal has a core mission of discrediting climate science and dismantling regulations that protect the environment. However, instead of rolling out ad campaigns, E&E Legal has a different approach. Its specialty is harassing individual climate scientists and researchers with the aim of per-

suading the public that human-caused global warming is a scientific fraud. Of course, the group's lawsuits are frivolous and baseless. But this doesn't matter because the entire point of the lawsuits is to disrupt important academic research that may help us anticipate, avoid, or mitigate the impacts of global warming.

Once again, if we look at the funding behind E&E Legal, we understand exactly why this group is attacking climate scientists and their work. E&E Legal does not publicly disclose its donors. We have seen that before. However, bankruptcy proceedings have identified that the group is funded by Arch Coal and Peabody Energy, and that E&E's senior lawyer has received funds directly from Alpha Natural Resources. These are some of the largest coal producers in the United States. It is shameful and dishonorable that these coal companies are funding the harassment and intimidation of scientists. They are putting profits ahead of people, and their disinformation threatens the scientific inquiry and transparency we need in order to make smart climate policy decisions to protect our Earth.

In conclusion, big corporations are using organizations that claim to be independent to spread misleading messages to the American people, knowing that people would be quick to discount these messages if they actually knew they were coming directly from coal companies and from Koch Industries. This campaign of disinformation and propaganda endangers the health, environment, and economic well-being of people in the United States and across the world. That is why Senators who acknowledge the science of climate change, Senators who understand the urgency of action to combat climate change are speaking up this afternoon and for many days to come.

By coming to the floor, we want to expose groups like CEI and E&E Legal for what they are—front groups whose role is to spin a web of denial. By championing clean energy policies, we want to ensure that the United States reduces its dependence on fossil fuels while creating millions of jobs to support our economy in alternative energy and green energy sources.

By supporting our country's leadership in negotiating the international climate agreement concluded last year in Paris, we are doing our part to slow global warming and help poorer nations most affected by it. This is just the beginning. We will continue to come to the floor to advocate for policies to reduce carbon emissions, to strengthen our economy, and to protect our environment.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I join many of my colleagues here in encouraging the Senate to continue working on solutions to protect our planet from the growing threats of climate change.

First, I would like to thank Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE for his leadership and tireless work on these issues. We both represent the great State of Rhode Island, the Ocean State, and I am lucky to have such a strong partner to work with to improve the health of our oceans and fight sea level rise, beach erosion, and ocean warming and acidification. I am proud to work alongside him as we respond to the serious challenges of climate change. Indeed, he is the leader in this effort in the Senate, throughout my State, and throughout the country. I applaud his commitment to this endeavor and his efforts to organize all of us to come here and to speak out on this growing danger.

We are already shouldering the costs of climate change as Americans, and these costs are increasing. Climate change is driving severe drought and wildfires in the West, larger and more frequent floods in the Midwest, and sea level rise and greater storm damage along our coasts. Vulnerable populations, like children with asthma and the elderly, are suffering from higher levels of smog in our cities and longer and more severe heat waves. Farmers and ranchers are struggling with crop and livestock losses from drought. Increasingly, acidic oceans are harming shellfish populations and threatening fisheries. Communities are struggling to pay for infrastructure damaged by fires, more extreme storms, and coastal erosion.

In the face of this evidence, as my colleagues have all pointed out, there is a systematic and organized effort to discredit, dismiss it, ignore it, but Americans are sensing dramatically the effects in their own lives, and they understand this.

One area I think is important to emphasize is that climate change is not just a local issue or an issue that is associated with domestic policy. It has profound national security ramifications. Indeed, to the military, climate change acts as a threat multiplier, exacerbating threats in already unstable regions of the world. Climate change creates chokepoints for oil distribution lines and exacerbates our dependence on foreign oil to fuel ships, tanks, aircraft, and tactical vehicles.

To protect our national security, we must take action based on scientific evidence presented by our Nation's best climate scientists. Such experts have overwhelmingly warned us that the increasingly warmer temperatures will mean oppressive heat in already hot areas. This translates not only to geopolitical issues, but it translates down to the individual soldier. For our infantry personnel, this means carrying several pounds of additional gear across dry and arid regions. And supplying these troops with fuel and water is becoming a difficult challenge for our military leaders. Warmer temperatures also lead to glacial melt, causing sea level rise and ocean acidification, affecting our seafaring vessels and air-

craft carriers, and increasing the complexity for our Navy.

One of the more interesting moments I had on the Committee on Armed Services was to listen several years ago to an admiral describe to me that transit to the Arctic Ocean will become commonplace in just a few years. To someone who was brought up in the 1950s and 1960s and served in the military in the 1970s, that seemed completely implausible, but that is happening. Yet there are groups that are organized that are trying to make that disappear.

It is not disappearing for our military. They have to cope with it, plan for it, and, indeed, ensure that our security is protected from the ramifications.

In national security, decisions are made by a careful evaluation of risk. Given the preponderance of scientific evidence, it only makes sense that we address the major risks caused by climate change. National security and foreign policy leaders across the political spectrum issued a statement last year urging the highest levels of American government and business to take domestic and international action to fight climate change. These are the national security experts. They are a bipartisan group of Americans who have dedicated their lives to this Nation. They are not a self-interested group of people who are profiting from a certain position. They include former Secretaries of Defense, Chuck Hagel, William Cohen, and Leon Panetta; Secretaries of State Madeleine Albright and George Shultz; National Security Advisors Zbigniew Brzezinski and Robert "Bud" McFarlane; Senators Olympia Snowe, Carl Levin, and Richard Lugar; New Jersey Governor and Chair of the 9/11 Commission Thomas Kean; and retired U.S. Army Chief of Staff, GEN Gordon R. Sullivan. These and many others agree that climate change is a threat to national security and have called for U.S. leadership in the global effort to tackle the urgent and complex problem of climate change. And yet, even these wise and selfless Americans are being dismissed, if you will, by the organized effort to undercut scientific evidence.

We took steps and have taken steps. Last December, in Paris, we took a step forward with an international agreement. More than 150 countries pledged to develop plans to tackle climate change domestically, including countries once reluctant to act, such as China and India. American leadership has been the key to getting these countries on board and agreeing to do their fair share. These countries are also acting because it is in their self-interest to do so—for their own health and for their national security.

It is clear that no country can avoid the impacts of climate change, and no country can meet this challenge alone. As a nation that has contributed more than a quarter of all global carbon pollution, it is our responsibility to lead,

not to deny. As a nation already feeling the effects and costs of climate change, it is also in our national interest to do so. As we have seen time and again, other countries would join us if America leads the way—not by denial but by dedication to pragmatic solutions that can be achieved.

American companies must also do a better job in addressing climate change. It is not enough just for America's government and military to take action; the private sector also needs to step up to the plate. Companies need to be transparent and provide fuller disclosure of the impacts their industries have on our climate and environment and must take full responsibility for their actions. Some companies have improved their sustainability practices and have made strides to inform consumers about their carbon footprint, and more need to join them. In fact, many companies concluded it is in their economic self-interest to do so, not just in the national or public interest to do so.

Information about the risks posed by climate change is also something that is critical to investors, some of whom are demanding greater disclosures. For example, Allianz Global Investors, which is a global diversified active investment management with nearly \$500 billion in assets under manager has specifically called for "achieving better disclosure of the effects of carbon costs on the Oil & Gas companies." This is why I have introduced legislation to enhance climate-related disclosures by publicly-traded companies to ensure that these companies are providing investors with the information necessary to make informed investment decisions.

These companies not only have an obligation, as we all do, to the greater welfare of the country and indeed the world, but they owe a very direct and fiduciary responsibility to their investors. Many of these companies have information—I would suspect at least—that should be disclosed, and we have to ensure that they do this so that the market operates appropriately.

It is not just about broad statements of protecting the climate. It is not just about feeling good. It is about making concrete information available to the public, to investors, to the country as a whole—not to deny, obfuscate, or ignore this information.

I urge my colleagues to support legislation that protects our air, water, natural resources, and environment. The health of our oceans and environment must be preserved for now and for future generations. Indeed, in this effort, I can think of no one who is taking a more forceful and constructive role than my colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE. Again, I salute him.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, as ranking member on the Subcommittee on Space, Science and Competitiveness, I

July 12, 2016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S4991

know how important it is for our country to invest in scientific research and to make informed decisions based on those findings.

Sound science has played a critical role in the United States' becoming a leader in fields like space exploration, medical research, advanced manufacturing, and other high-tech industries. So when 97 percent of scientists in a particular field agree on a serious problem, it is wise for our policymakers to listen.

The scientific community is sounding the alarm about the urgent need to address the causes of global climate change. Scientists here in the United States and across the world overwhelmingly agree that the weight of evidence is clear: Global temperatures are rising, dramatic changes in weather and climate have accompanied this warming, and humans are largely responsible due to our emissions of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere.

Military leaders, doctors, economists, and biologists are among the experts warning us about global climate change and the fact that it is major threat to national security, public health, our economy, and our natural resources.

Unfortunately, powerful special interests, led by some organizations and companies in the fossil fuel industry, are deliberately spreading false information about climate change to influence public opinion and to muddle the truth. The strategy to confuse the public about climate change science and delay policy action has many parallels to the strategy used by Big Tobacco to mislead the public about scientific evidence linking smoking to lung cancer and heart disease.

The corporations spreading disinformation on climate change are the very same interests that have the most to gain financially by stopping meaningful action to reduce greenhouse gases, protect our clean air, and address global warming for future generations.

The Koch brothers are a prime example of this fact. Charles and David Koch made their vast fortunes from owning companies that profit from a range of dirty industries. Much of their wealth is funneled into activist groups that produce questionable information and the spin necessary to support their own interests. The web of denial they have created is a threat to sound science-based decisionmaking.

While some big polluters seek to confuse and cloud the judgment of decisionmakers and the public, the American people continue to suffer the consequences of our dependence on fossil fuels. These consequences are not just limited to rising global temperatures. The people of Michigan are paying for the costs of coal and oil pollution in many ways, but I would like to focus on just a couple of them.

A few years ago, three-story, high piles of petroleum coke, or pet coke, lined the banks of the Detroit River in

the open air. Pet coke is essentially the industrial byproduct that is produced during the oil refining process. These particular piles were owned by Koch Carbon, a company controlled by the Koch brothers.

Usually pet coke is shipped off to other countries, where it is burned as fuel, worsening terrible air quality problems in places like China and contributing to global climate change. In this case, the banks of the Detroit River were being treated as a dumping ground to store these mountains of pet coke. The wind would blow the pet coke dust everywhere, including into the homes and lungs of those living in the neighborhoods nearby. It was even documented blowing across the river into Windsor, Ontario.

Not only was the air being contaminated, the pet coke was fouling the Great Lakes, a source of drinking water for nearly 40 million people. When it rained, pollution would run off from the piles into the Detroit River, which is part of the Great Lakes system.

I joined residents in Detroit to call for these pet coke piles to be moved, and only through a community-wide effort were they eventually successful. I have also introduced legislation to study the health and environmental impacts of this pet coke but, unfortunately, this same area of Detroit that has had to deal with mountains of particulate matter blowing into the air already had the distinction of having some of the worst air quality in the Nation.

Research shows that exposure to air pollution at a young age can lead to health problems like asthma, and air pollution can worsen asthma symptoms. Detroit has the highest rate of asthma in young children among the 18 largest cities in the United States. Over 12 percent of Detroit children have asthma; the national rate is around 8 percent.

Most air pollution comes from burning of fossil fuels, and parts of Detroit are dealing with high pollutant levels as a result. I wrote a letter, along with Senator STABENOW, calling for a plan to reduce sulfur dioxide levels in Southwest Detroit and comply with Federal clean air standards. The Michigan Department of Environmental Quality finally just submitted their plan to comply—over a year past the initial deadline.

These examples in Detroit show how protecting clean air and clean water are often environmental justice issues. Those that are most affected by pollution are often from low-income and minority households. Addressing climate change will also improve the air quality of these affected areas.

While these communities bear the brunt of fossil fuel pollution, the Koch brothers and others pour hundreds of millions and even billions of dollars into activities to avoid regulation of their dirty industries. One of the tactics that powerful corporate industries

use is to bankroll numerous front groups to spread misinformation. The idea behind this strategy is to use seemingly independent organizations, such as think tanks, to deliver misleading messages that the public might rightfully dismiss if they had heard them directly from industry.

They have calculated that it is better for business to mislead the American public, rather than acknowledge the scientific evidence and their role in climate change and join the effort to combat this growing threat to our planet. It is a page taken right out of Big Tobacco's playbook. By creating their own scientific studies and policy papers from a network of surrogates, it gives the appearance that there is a legitimate debate over the fundamentals of climate change science.

One example is the Cato Institute. For years, the organization has received funding from fossil fuel interests such as ExxonMobil and the Koch family. At the same time, Cato spreads climate skepticism. Over a span of 15 years, the Cato Institute published 773,000 words and 768 documents expressing climate skepticism.

The web of denial is intended to manufacture doubt among the American public in order to delay action, but the spending efforts by the same corporations also specifically target elected officials and other key decisionmakers to prevent meaningful action on global warming.

The Koch brothers have poured vast sums of money into election ads, lobbying efforts, and campaign donations often funneled through other organizations to hide the source of the funding. As a result, I have heard many climate myths repeated in the Halls of Congress that were carefully crafted by the network of climate denial front groups.

Late last year, the Senate Subcommittee on Space, Science, and Competitiveness held a hearing that was specifically designed to cast doubt on the scientific evidence of climate change. The witness panel was stacked by the majority with prominent climate deniers. As the ranking member, the one witness I was able to invite was RADM David Titley, who, as the U.S. Navy's chief meteorologist, initiated and led the Navy's task force on climate change. At the hearing, Dr. Titley outlined how climate change is a serious threat to national security. Admiral Titley explained that the military makes decisions based on known information and calculations of risk. Often they must act on less than perfect intelligence, but they understand risks and will take action to prevent threats when given the chance. The admiral applied this to the broad agreement among climate scientists, saying that any military commander would take action "in a heartbeat" if there was a consensus among 97 percent of the intelligence community about a particular scenario. In fact, the military has already started taking action

to anticipate vulnerabilities and mitigate the impacts related to climate change.

The brightest, most experienced minds in our U.S. military realize that reliance on fossil fuel leaves our troops and citizens exposed to more risks at home, as well as abroad. Unfortunately, Congress has not been as quick to act. Efforts to pass meaningful legislation to address climate change have been blocked. Existing administrative efforts to reduce admissions or invest in clean energy have also been repeatedly attacked.

We can and must pass legislative solutions to address global climate change. Transitioning away from fossil fuels and investing in renewable energy will create sustainable jobs and good-paying jobs here in the United States. Taking bold action on climate change will strengthen our public health, economy, and national security.

We must wake up and realize that those attempting to mislead and confuse must not be successful. I am confident that we will overcome this web of denial and use peer-reviewed, sound scientific information to guide our decisionmaking in order to create a resilient future for our children and grandchildren.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES
CHIEF PETTY OFFICER ADAM BROWN

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the Senate will pass legislation renaming Post Office 620 Central Avenue in Hot Springs National Park after CPO Adam Brown.

I have visited that post office many times as a child, as a Congressman, and as a Senator. I can't say there is all that much remarkable about it, but it will be remarkable after this law is passed.

I didn't know Adam Brown, but Adam was about my age. Adam was a great warrior and a hero. Three years ago on Memorial Day in Hot Springs, a gentleman came up to me after I spoke and handed me a book titled "Fearless" by Eric William. It is a New York Times bestseller. It tells the story of Adam Brown. That title captures his spirit. He was fearless, relentless, and also a joyful and Godly man. As a child in Hot Springs, he was the one who always lined up to hit the biggest kid in football. He would jump off a bridge into the local lake and jump out of trucks. Adam was an all-American boy.

During his teenaged years, Adam succumbed to addiction. He began to drink, started to use marijuana, became addicted to cocaine, and that led to many crimes. At one point, he had 16 outstanding felonies.

Larry and his mother Janice didn't know what to do, so they told the sheriff where he was, and he was arrested. Adam went to Teen Challenge, a Christian ministry dedicated to helping youth overcome addiction. Through his faith in God, love of his parents, and

the love of his wife Kelly, he was able to fight back his addiction, although he continued to struggle with it.

With the help of a good recruiter and out of a sense of deep and abiding patriotism for his country, Adam cleaned up his life by enlisting in the Navy. He didn't just enlist to do any job, though, he enlisted to be a Navy SEAL. It entails some of the hardest training our military has. Adam, of course, got his golden trident and went on to display the same kind of fearlessness and relentlessness but also the same joyfulness that so many people in Hot Springs and in Arkansas had known.

As anyone who has been in the military knows, there are always some guys in the unit who are downers, looking on the dark side of things, wondering what was going to go wrong next, and Adam was the antidote to that. He always looked on the bright side, always had a sunny outlook, and always had a helpful word for a friend or buddy. He was always ready to help the unit accomplish the mission.

Adam went through multiple deployments as a Navy SEAL, and there was never any quit in him. In 2003, he was injured in a simulation round during a training exercise with a miniature paint ball that the military uses. Somehow it got underneath his eye protection and hit him in the eye, and as a result he lost his eye, but, as he always did, he looked on the bright side. He got a glass eye with an Arkansas Razorback on it, and he would put on a pirate patch and play pirate with his two little kids, Nathan and Savannah. It didn't stop him from continuing to deploy as a Navy SEAL.

He was later involved in a multicar accident while deployed. His hand was crushed and three fingers were severed. The doctors were able to reattach it, but it could no longer be used. Of course, he was eligible to leave the military because of his combat injury, but he didn't do that. He learned to shoot with the other hand and use his other eye when shooting. In fact, he went on to become a member of SEAL Team Six, the most elite element of the Navy SEAL community.

He continued to deploy and fight but also showed deep compassion. In Afghanistan, he noticed that many of the poor, little Afghan children didn't even have shoes on their feet on the darkest, coldest days of winter, so he arranged for a local pastor in his community to send shoes that he could give to them.

On March 17, 2010, Adam was on a mission high up in the mountains in Afghanistan. His unit came under intense enemy fire. Adam helped to save the lives of his fellow SEALs, taking multiple rounds himself, and he ultimately perished as a result of his wounds. Adam received a hero's welcome in Hot Springs, where he rests today.

Adam's story is about faith, redemption, service, and love. When little boys and little girls drive by that post office in Hot Springs in the future, I hope

they ask their parents who Adam Brown was. I hope their parents can tell them his story and inspire them with his example.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak, along with a number of my colleagues, about groups that have spun a web of denial and to fight back against the regressive, fallacious, and dangerous rhetoric of climate change deniers. They would disavow the overwhelming evidence of one of our most significant environmental crises. It is not only a quality-of-life challenge, it is a national security crisis in our world today.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I know from our military leaders how seriously they take this crisis, which is causing droughts as well as unrest, and the challenges it creates when our military needs to access certain parts of the world. Those consequences are among the national security threats that climate change raises, and deniers do no great service to our national defense.

Connecticut knows firsthand the visible impacts of climate change because we see the mammoth storms that threaten to become the new normal in our world, causing rising tides, destroying homes, literally changing the nature of our shoreline and impacting our quality of life.

No one State can address climate change effectively, and that is why we need the Nation to act together and why climate change denial is so dangerous to our national security, not only in military terms but also in the very real terms of how we conduct our lives in this country. We need a coordinated, comprehensive approach, and yet some groups would have you believe that no action is necessary—none at all. They say that any measures are a waste of time and resources. They say that any measures to stop food supplies from disappearing, forest fires from spreading, and storms from raging are simply unnecessary. They have no evidence to support their claims, but, indeed, they have to distort the evidence that exists even to make those claims.

Just last year, we discovered that Exxon projects into its planning a model that it described for itself as "too murky to warrant action." They planned for themselves but not for the people, including their own customers. They would be ready for climate change but would make sure that no one else could be by adopting a model and making it their business model—or part of it—that implicitly, internally, they felt they could not reveal publicly.

Some groups have adopted more covert efforts to sabotage science. The American Legislative Exchange Council, better known by its acronym

ALEC, denies that its policy denied climate change. ALEC commits to fighting science in the shadows because it has no facts to bring into the sun. Indeed, its proposed bill, the Environmental Literacy Improvement Act—a very innocuous bill—actually seeks to serve as a stamp of approval on teaching climate change denial in science classrooms.

These tactics exist because when groups like ALEC or Americans for Prosperity stand ready to deny the truth, some part of our people will believe it.

One leader of the Americans for Prosperity group, when asked about the science of climate change, responded: “I don’t even want to argue the point. To me, it’s not that important.”

This web of denial has consequences. It delays and distorts common awareness and consciousness about the truth and the need to act.

One of my colleagues compared this web of denial to actions of tobacco companies decades ago denying that smoking and tobacco could cause cancer or heart disease or any of the other serious illnesses that tobacco use causes, in addition to the lifetime addiction to nicotine that inevitably was a consequence to so many people who believed those tobacco companies. That web of denial was similar to this one. The tobacco companies knew the truth. They denied it. These deniers also know the truth. Our purpose in being here today is to make sure the American people know it as well.

Groups like ALEC and Americans for Prosperity may receive support from the economic interests that have a stake in hiding the truth, but ultimately the American people need to know it, they need to act on it, and they need to appreciate the motives and interests of the web of denial that is spun so artfully and relentlessly by these groups and the special interests that underlie them and support them.

I wish to thank my colleagues who have come to the floor today, particularly Senator WHITEHOUSE, who has been so instrumental in organizing this group.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator Arkansas.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE TOM EMBERTON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a good friend and mentor of mine who is receiving a great honor from his alma mater of Western Kentucky University. Judge

Tom Emberton, former chief judge of the Kentucky Court of Appeals and a man with a long career of renowned service, will be honored as a member of WKU’s Hall of Distinguished Alumni this October. It is the highest award the university can bestow upon an alumnus.

Judge Emberton recalls that his great aunt began the family tradition of attending WKU, and his mother attended also. Tom met his wife at WKU, and their two children and all but one of their grandchildren attended as well.

Tom was an active member of the WKU community during his time on campus. He was named business manager of the College Heights Herald, elected president of his sophomore and junior classes, and president of his fraternity. He temporarily interrupted his studies to serve in the U.S. Air Force, where he was part of the Strategic Air Command under Gen. Curtis LeMay.

After graduation in 1958, Tom began a long history of public service to the people of Kentucky. In 1965, he was elected county attorney. In 1967, he worked on the winning campaign for Louie Nunn for Governor, the first Republican Governor to be elected in the Bluegrass State in 20 years. After the campaign, Governor Nunn asked Tom to serve as his chief administrative aide.

Tom then became the Republican nominee for Governor himself in 1971. I remember the campaign well, as I worked on it for Tom. I had left my position as a legislative aide here in the U.S. Senate for Kentucky Senator Marlow Cook to go back to Kentucky to work for Tom’s campaign because I believed in him and in what he could do for the Commonwealth. Unfortunately, Tom did not win that race, but he certainly emerged from it as a man who had earned admiration and respect around the State. We all knew great things were in store for Tom.

Tom continued to practice law in Barren and Metcalfe counties. Then in the late 1980s, he was appointed by then-Governor Wallace Wilkinson to the Kentucky Court of Appeals. He was reelected to that panel repeatedly and had a long and distinguished career, capped off by being elected chief judge by his fellow judges after several years of service. He held that chief judge slot until his retirement from the bench in 2004.

To this day, Tom is still active in his community with many volunteer and philanthropic activities. He is also an avid reader, and I know one of his favorite places to relax is in his office surrounded by books.

Western Kentucky University has certainly made the right choice in selecting Judge Tom Emberton as a distinguished alumni. My friend Tom is highly deserving of this honor, and I am sure his family is very proud of him and all he has accomplished. I know my U.S. Senate colleagues join me in congratulating Judge Emberton for this recognition and wishing him the very best in his future life endeavors.

Mr. President, area publication the Herald News recently published an article detailing Judge Emberton’s life and career. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Herald News, June 29, 2016]

JUDGE EMBERTON HONORED BY WKU
(By Shirley Mayrand)

Every couple of years we’re reminded of why we’re so proud of Judge Tom Emberton. In 2014 he received the Jim C. Coleman Community Service Award, and in October he will join WKU’s Hall of Distinguished Alumni during WKU’s 2016 Homecomings Celebration at the Sloan Convention Center. It brings back some fond memories.

“Western has always been a part of my life,” Tom said, “even from a small first grader. My mother went to Western.” His mom finished a year of college and then got a teaching job at a Monroe County school where they lived at the time. Tom recalls how she told him as a first grader he could continue to have fun when he got to Western.

The family moved to Metcalfe County right after World War II ended and Tom graduated from Edmonson High School. He attended one semester at Western before going into the U.S. Air Force where he was part of the Strategic Air Command under General Curtis LeMay. “His mission,” Tom explained, “was that if Russia could get an atomic bomb off in this country, that we could respond to that in 15 minutes.”

In 1955, Tom returned home to resume his education at Western. He credits his great aunt with starting the family tradition of attending WKU. She enrolled in 1909, just three years after it opened. (H.H. Cherry purchased full ownership of the school in 1899 and the Southern Normal School part of the institution became Western Kentucky State Normal School in 1906.)

Tom met his wife, Julia there, their two children attended and all but one of their grandchildren.

Tom believes that his active role at WKU was what earned him the honor of being selected for the Hall of Distinguished Alumni. As a student he was named business manager of the College Heights Herald, elected president of his sophomore and junior classes and president of his fraternity.

Continuing on to the University of Louisville to pursue a law degree, he continued student leadership activities. He was the president of the Delta Theta Phi fraternity and president of the Student Bar Association. “It’s those things that the alumni association looked at to see what you’d done, rather than just walk into class.” Tom got his law degree in 1962 and was elected as county attorney in 1965.

In 1967, Tom was tapped by Louis Nunn to assist in his campaign for governor. When Nunn won the election he asked Tom to move to Frankfort and be his chief administrative aide. At that time a governor could only serve one four-year term. Tom’s own bid for the governorship ended after winning the Republican primary, and he returned to the farm at Cave Ridge to practice law in Barren and Metcalfe counties, where he brought Jim C. Coleman in as a law partner.

Around 1976, Tom opened the Southern Mineral coal mine in Hyden (Lesley County), KY. Coal was very lucrative at the time, but within a few years the bottom dropped out and he returned to law once again.

Over his long, successful career, his greatest satisfaction came while serving as a Kentucky Court of Appeals Judge. He was first

The clerk will report the bill by title. The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2650) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any prizes or awards won in competition in the Olympic Games or the Paralympic Games.

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

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and that the papers be held at the desk.

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

The bill (S. 2650) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2650

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 “United States Appreciation for Olympians and Paralympians Act”.

SEC. 2. OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC MEDALS AND USOC PRIZE MONEY EXCLUDED FROM GROSS INCOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 74 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) EXCEPTION FOR OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC MEDALS AND PRIZES.—Gross income shall not include the value of any medal awarded in, or any prize money received from the United States Olympic Committee on account of, competition in the Olympic Games or Paralympic Games.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to prizes and awards received after December 31, 2015.

NATIONAL LOBSTER DAY

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 513 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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. 513) designating September 25, 2016 as “National Lobster Day.”

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

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 513) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 28, 2016, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

COMMENDING THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ON THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT OF THE TENNESSEE RIVER SYSTEM

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 528, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 528) commending the Tennessee Valley Authority on the 80th anniversary of the unified development of the Tennessee River system.

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

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 528) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 13, 2016

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, July 13; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 524, with the time until 11 a.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COTTON. 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 Senators MARKEY and WHITEHOUSE.

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

The Senator from Massachusetts.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, it is summer. It is supposed to be hot, but if last month felt hotter than past summers, you are right. Last week the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency, or NOAA, said the United States

experienced its warmest June on record ever. Already this year there have been eight weather-related and climate-related disasters that each caused at least \$1 billion in damage. Globally, it was found that 2015 was the hottest year on record, and so far this year is on track to beat last year. We can’t even hold the record for a year—2016 has been as hot as Pokemon GO—and anyone watching the Senate floor tonight who is younger than 31 has never experienced in their life a month where the temperature was below the 20th century average.

That last happened in February of 1985. Ronald Reagan was starting his second term as President, and “Beverly Hills Cop” was the No. 1 film at the box office. If you went to the movies that month, you probably saw a trailer for what would be that summer’s blockbuster, “Back to the Future.”

Well, that future is here. Temperatures are increasing, sea levels are rising, rainfall is more extreme, and the oceans are more acidic. Why is that? It is mostly because of carbon dioxide pollution that is released from the extraction and burning of fossil fuel. Virtually all climate scientists agree that the climate is changing and that human interference with the climate is now the driving force of that change. Thanks to excellent investigative reporting at Inside Climate News and other news outlets, we now know that as far back as the 1970s, Exxon and the other oil companies were following the latest developments in climate science and Exxon was undertaking its own research on the impact of carbon pollution on the climate.

The top leadership of Exxon was warned in July of 1977 by its senior scientist James Black: “In the first place there is general scientific agreement that the most likely manner in which mankind is influencing the global climate is through carbon dioxide release from the burning of fossil fuels.”

That is from 1977 to Exxon from its own scientists. A year later in 1978, that same scientist once again told senior management: “Present thinking holds that man has a time window of 5 to 10 years before the need for hard decisions regarding changes in energy strategies that might become critical.”

Ten years later in 1988, a memo laid out Exxon’s position, which included these three points: No. 1, emphasize the uncertainty in scientific conclusions regarding the potential enhanced greenhouse gas effect; No. 2, urge a balanced scientific approach; and No. 3, resist the overstatement and sensationalization of potential greenhouse effects which could lead to economic development of nonfossil fuel resources.

Exxon knew full well back then the impact of carbon dioxide on the climate and what that could mean to their businesses. Exxon, the Koch brothers, Peabody Energy, and other individuals and businesses whose profits might suffer under rules to reduce

carbon pollution have had a vested interest in stopping climate action for decades.

That is why Congress still hasn't sent comprehensive climate legislation to the President. More than 50 years ago, in a special message to Congress on pollution, President Lyndon Johnson noted that "the increase in carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels has altered the composition of the global atmosphere." Since then, the scientific evidence and observation of climate changes already underway have continued to mount.

But even as the science has become overwhelming, climate policies have gotten trapped in a web of denial. During the last 2 days, we have heard many of my colleagues talk about the many strands of this web of denial. Like a real spiderweb, it is hard to see this web unless the light catches it in just the right way. So this evening I am going to shine a light on a few threads of this web.

At the heart of this web is denial. That is where you find the **George C. Marshall Institute**, whose attacks on the science of the so-called nuclear winter consequence of nuclear war and its opposition to the nuclear freeze movement expanded over the years to include anti-climate change efforts. The institute was named after the U.S. Army Chief of Staff during World War II who then became Secretary of State. He helped to rebuild Europe and won the Nobel Peace Prize for what is now called the Marshall Plan. Given Marshall's view of the need to address hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos, it seems likely that if he were alive today, he would agree that national security experts see that climate change is a security threat to the United States. Marshall himself would likely support efforts like the Green Climate Fund to ensure that the poorest countries in the world have the resources necessary to overcome the challenges climate change pose to their economic development. He would likely support American leadership of global climate efforts to ensure that all countries are taking action to address climate change.

But the institute that carries the George Marshall name has countered international climate science and action every step of the way. When the **Marshall Institute** first expanded into environmental policy in the 1980s, the environment and climate change had bipartisan support. In the 1988 election, George Herbert Walker Bush pledged to meet the "greenhouse effect with the White House effect." Increasingly, world scientists were raising concerns about carbon pollution. In 1990, the first assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, or IPCC, detailed what the fossil fuel companies already knew—that carbon pollution released from burning fossil fuels was causing the Earth to warm. The very business model of the fossil fuel industry was altering the planet.

So while the scientific community was sounding the alarm, it has now been revealed that Big Oil and fossil fuel companies conspired to mute that alarm, and the Marshall Institute soon became a critical part of their climate denial web.

Mind you, we are not talking about the original George C. Marshall. He would have had no part of this. This is just the abscending of his name and having it placed above an institute—the **Marshall Institute**—which is now disseminating this bad science. That is what has happened.

In 1989, this **Marshall Institute** published a report on climate change casting doubt on the impact of carbon pollution and spinning a core component of the web of denial. As Washington insiders, the institute's report was read by the White House, shared by media outlets, and became a so-called side of a new public debate on climate change. The **Marshall Institute** turned debating climate change into a game, and the science became a political football. It was exactly what they wanted. By dividing climate science into sides, pitting each one against the other, they had found a foothold for doubt and a reason to delay climate action.

Still, the first Bush administration signed and the Senate ratified the historic United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in 1992. The goal of the treaty was to reduce atmospheric greenhouse gas emissions and prevent "dangerous anthropogenic interference with Earth's climate system." But it took another 23 years, until 2015, for the countries of the world to agree on a global solution in Paris last December.

That 1989 **Marshall Institute** report, funded by the fossil fuel industry, was an especially sticky strand of this web of denial. Since then, the tactic of casting doubt on climate science has been used time and again by the **Marshall Institute** and other organizations to delay policies that could hurt the profits of oil, coal, and petro-polluters like the **Kochs**. This is what Senator WHITEHOUSE has led all of us in trying to bring out here to the Senate floor—that there is a web, and the web goes back to money, and that money is the profits that are made by the coal, the gas, and the oil industries. Those millions of dollars that the **Marshall Institute** has received from **Exxon** and the **Koch-connected foundation** over the years have allowed the web of denial to grow.

The **Marshall Institute** misinformation campaign doesn't just come in the form of reports. Their chairman, **William Happer**, has testified in front of Congress multiple times espousing climate denialism and perpetuating the self-serving interests of the fossil fuel industry and the **Kochs**. He may be an accomplished physicist, but Dr. Happer's views on climate science have been routinely debunked.

When I was chairman on the Select Committee on Energy Independence

and Global Warming, in the House of Representatives, I heard Dr. Happer use the theatrics of a CO₂ meter as proof that climate change doesn't exist. He advocated for the government to support an "alternative hypothesis" and to support his alternative hypothesis, which was nothing more than the denial of climate change. Just last year, while the climate talks in Paris were underway, Dr. Happer testified before the Senate Commerce Committee, continuing to spread doubt. But this past May, William Happer was a signatory on a misleading, full-page ad in the New York Times. The ad, placed by another thread in the web of deceit, the **Competitive Enterprise Institute**, attacked the reasonable efforts of New York attorney general Eric Schneiderman and a coalition of other attorneys general united for clean power who are investigating more than 100 businesses, nonprofits, and private individuals to see if they misled the public about climate change.

But the **Marshall Institute's** efforts alone were not enough. So they helped form the cynically named **Global Climate Coalition** in 1989, shortly after the formation of the IPCC at the U.N. to fight climate change.

The **Marshall Institute** CEO, William O'Keefe, a former lobbyist for **Exxon**, chaired the coalition that included members of manufacturing, automotive, oil and gas, mining and chemical industries, and the **U.S. Chamber of Commerce**. They invested in denial and delay to allow business as usual to continue. But climate science and international climate efforts continued to advance after the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change came into force.

Of course, the fossil fuel coalition's concern continued to increase. As the IPCC worked on its second report in the early 1990s, it decided to include a chapter entitled Detection of Climate Change and Attribution of Causes. It became clear that the world's climate scientists were examining the considerable collection of climate observations and research to see what they could say about human influence on the climate.

So the **Global Climate Coalition** sprang into action to influence what the IPCC might say about the human influence on climate.

At a November 1995 session to finalize the text of the IPCC report, alongside Saudi Arabian and Kuwaiti representatives, the **Global Climate Coalition** weighed in heavily against the chapter focused on the detection and causes of climate change. After a flurry of negotiations and additional objections, the IPCC agreed that the amassed climate observations "now point toward a discernable human influence on global climate."

The world's climate scientists, the government representatives had now acknowledged that humans were altering the climate. So the calls for climate action got louder, and the effort

July 12, 2016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S5013

to extend the 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and draft what would become the Kyoto Protocol in 1997 increased. But in an effort to silence the calls to action, the investment in the web of denial grew.

The **Global Climate Coalition** spent more than \$13 million opposing the Kyoto Protocol. Between 1994 and 1997, they spent \$1 million every year downplaying the threat of climate change.

Ultimately, this broad coalition collapsed as their business interests and the impact of climate change on their profits changed. The Global Climate Coalition closed its doors in 2002, but the web of denial was already stretching to find new places to grow. Those threads have since expanded with the careful cultivation and collusion by the fossil fuel industry and the petrol polluters.

We know that the **Koch** brothers, **Exxon**, and other major donors have invested millions of dollars into organizations that actively work to discredit climate change and oppose climate legislation. Those organizations pressure elected officials to take increasingly extreme stances with specific reference and focus on the members of the Republican Party.

During President George W. Bush's first campaign in 2000, he promised to fight climate change by limiting greenhouse gas emissions. But in 2001, he pulled the United States out of the Kyoto Protocol. In 2005, his Vice President, Dick Cheney, helped pass an energy bill that included massive subsidies and tax breaks for the fossil fuel industry.

As recently as 2008, the Republican Presidential nominee, Senator JOHN McCAIN, recognized the science of climate change and supported action. This was an era that has now passed. The web of denial has firmly trapped this issue in the Republican Party in such a way that no action is possible at all. But even in the face of the millions of dollars pumped into the denial machine, the House of Representatives was able to overcome it in 2009.

The Waxman-Markey bill passed the House just over 7 years ago. It was the only comprehensive climate change legislation ever to pass a Chamber of Congress. It has been reported that the oil and gas industry, including the **Koch** brothers and **ExxonMobil**, spent \$175 million and hired more than 800 lobbyists in 2009 to kill the Waxman-Markey bill. Let me give those numbers again: \$175 million and 800 lobbyists to kill a bill that would have put a clamp on the increase in greenhouse gas emissions in the United States.

They saw any action on climate, especially legislation, as a threat to their bottom line. But Members of the House knew better. They saw that Waxman-Markey was good for our environment, good for our economy, good for America. A Congressional budget analysis found that Waxman-Markey would

have reduced the Federal deficit and cost the average American household less than 50 cents per day. An analysis of the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy found that Americans would save about as much as CBO's cost estimates from energy efficiency policies in the bill that CBO did not take into account.

With an outstretched arm to lift them into the clean energy future, the bill included more than \$200 million for the coal industry, \$200 billion to capture carbon and to sequester it. Seven years ago, we gave the fossil fuel industry a choice: legislation or regulation.

But **Exxon** opposed the bill. The **Koch** brothers opposed the bill. **Peabody** coal opposed the bill, except for the parts that helped the coal industry. Rather than change their current business model, centered on pumping more CO₂ into the atmosphere, they fought attempts to change the law. Now, 7 years later, **Peabody** coal has filed for bankruptcy. We are continuing to untangle the **Koch** brothers' web of denial.

The **Koch** brothers have lied to the American people for decades about climate change. They have also lied to their own employees. When Waxman-Markey was being debated, the **Koch** Industries newsletter published an article attacking the climate change legislation and encouraging employees to check out specific Web sites for more information. The listed Web sites were funded by the **Koch** brothers. They sent their employees to other parts of the web of denial. When a Republican tries to stand up and publicly support climate action, the **Koch** brothers' "spidy sense" goes off and their web of denial springs into action. They mobilize, they target, they attack every Republican who stands against their business plan. **Koch** money floods primary campaigns to ensure that their self-serving lies trump in every election.

The oil and coal industry will not stop their efforts because now the presumptive nominee of the Republican Party is a climate denier. But their obstruction and climate denial tactics are as bogus as a degree from Trump University. Trump says he wants an "all of the above" energy agenda, but we know he is really running on an "oil above all" platform. But the **Koch** brothers are now bigger than the Republican Party.

The **Kochs** have built upon the tactics practiced by the tobacco industry generations ago in its campaign to discredit the science linking smoking with increased risks of lung cancer. The **Kochs'** goal is to discredit the science itself. How successful are they? Donald Trump has said that if he is President, he is going to abolish the Environmental Protection Agency of the United States—abolish it. I guess he assumes that Americans think that the air is too clean, the water is too clean, the soil is too clean, the rivers are too clean in the United States, and that we can afford to abolish the Environmental Protection Agency of our country.

This is the world that the **Koch** brothers have forgotten. Their mission has always been to create doubt across America on climate science. They fund attempts to counter the fact that climate change is a threat to our national security and to our public health. Their funding attempts to counter the fact that action to combat climate change is feasible and necessary and will create American jobs. They fund the web of denial to serve their own interests to make billions in profits at the expense of America's health, America's safety.

But for someone who is focused on protecting the poor and the vulnerable of this world—that person understands the threat presented by climate change. I have in my hand Pope Francis's encyclical on climate change, "Laudato si'," subtitled "On the Care for our Common Home." The Pope is a chemistry teacher. That is what he did before he became Pope. When he came to Washington, DC, last year, he spoke to Congress and delivered his sermon on the Hill. He said that the planet is dangerously warming and that the science is settled. He said that human beings are a significant contributor to the dangerous warming of the planet. He said that since humans are contributing to the problem, we have a moral obligation to do something about it.

When the rest of the world looked up, they saw red, white, and blue CO₂. Since the United States has historically been the largest contributor of carbon pollution, we must be the leader in working to reduce our own pollution.

As soon as the Pope spoke out urging action on climate change, the well-oiled climate denial machine shifted into high gear. The **Acton Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty** is another strand of the web of denial. Between 1990 and 2014, the **Acton Institute** received millions from **Donors Trust** or **Donors Capital Fund**, the **Koch-funded** dark money ATM, as well as money from the **Koch families** and from **Exxon**.

Reverend **Sirico**, the founder and president of the **Acton Institute**, testified in front of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee just last year. Reverend **Sirico** claims that the Catholic Church does not have expertise in science and should stick to matters of faith and morals. Well, here is the irony. A lack of expertise surely has not stopped Senate Republicans from blocking any and all climate change legislation.

Informed by the scientific evidence, the Pope made a clear moral case to act on climate and to act now. The Pope's comments came from the heart and from his belief in our ability to act collectively. It is just common sense that when you learn something is dangerous for you, for your health and for our Earth—and especially, as the Pope said to us, its impact on the poorest people on our planet, those who will be most severely harmed by climate

change—we have a moral obligation to stop that harm.

There is no doubt that fossil fuels forever changed our society, but pointing to the benefits from them does not take away the harm they cause or the urgency to transition to clean energy now. Many of those who oppose action on climate invoke the importance of preserving the free market.

As an example, consider the **Lexington Institute**, an organization funded by **ExxonMobil** and those pushing so-called free market solutions. The **Lexington Institute**—and may I add, the **Lexington Institute** is in Virginia; it is not in Lexington, MA, where the shot heard round the world was fired. No, this is just, again, absconding with a name and placing it upon an institution to try to give it the veneer of credibility. Of course, beneath the veneer is just more veneer. There is nothing. There is no science. There is nothing that backs up the arguments which they are making.

So the **Lexington Institute** claims that renewables need to be able to compete with fossil fuels without Federal subsidies, but the real truth is, the fossil fuel industry has never succeeded in the free market alone. Its success is built on more than a century's worth of tax breaks and subsidies.

The **Lexington Institute** sheds these crocodile tears about how much they care about the free market, but for 100 years they missed the fact that the oil, the coal, the gas, and the nuclear industries were all subsidized by the Federal Government. It is only when wind and solar show up that all of a sudden they become greatly concerned about the fact the free market is being distorted. Well, by giving tax breaks to wind and solar, of course, we are just making it a level playing field so they get the same kind of breaks all of these other industries have received for 100 or more years.

The subsidies for the fossil fuel industry top more than \$7.5 billion annually. You got that? It is \$7.5 billion per year. These tax breaks go back 100 years. Multiply that by 100, and then the crocodile tears start getting shed over something we do for wind or solar or fuel cells, biomass, geothermal?

There is no need for fossil fuel CEOs to come to Congress to justify the support for long-established subsidies, which they have always been getting. They do not even come up to defend it. They get it automatically—the extension of their tax breaks. The oil and gas industry have the Federal subsidies, coal has Federal subsidies, nuclear has Federal subsidies. What has happened every year, when we try to extend subsidies for renewable energy—for wind and solar—for even just 1 year, it is the end of the world as we know it in the capitalist system.

Just last year, the **Koch** brothers wrote a letter to every single Member of Congress urging them to oppose the tax breaks for wind and solar, and of course they cited “the free market.”

Because even though billions of dollars in Federal subsidies have benefited their companies for years and years, they have never come up here to say: Oh, take them away. It makes my company feel unclean. Oh no, they took those billions every single year. It is only when wind and solar step up and say: Well, how about us? We are clean. We don't pollute. We are what the younger generation wants to see us investing in as the technologies of the 21st century. Then they get morally offended. Then their free market principles start to get offended.

So the **Lexington Institute**, citing the free market, has fought the extension of renewable tax credits for wind and solar, but unlike the battle of Lexington that started the American Revolution, this Lexington is trying to stop a renewables revolution. Economic growth and climate action go together. We can have a country with clean air and water and clean energy and a strong economy. History continues to prove that the benefits of environmental regulation are enormous and beyond just financial.

Recently, we have seen global economic growth hand in hand with no increase in energy-related carbon pollution. We are seeing GDP go up but not carbon pollution. And in Massachusetts, since the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative started in 2009—the real Lexington revolution, the one in Massachusetts—we have seen powerplant greenhouse gas emissions go down 34 percent while Massachusetts' gross domestic product increased 25 percent.

So we are left with a really simple question: Why do fossil fuel companies continue to get Federal subsidies, but we do not extend them to clean energy? The answer is this: **Koch**, **Exxon**, the **Marshall Institute**, the **Global Climate Coalition**, the **Acton Institute**, the **Lexington Institute**, and their partners in the web of denial. Millions of dollars are spent to deceive and to mislead all in the name of self-interest and profit.

The **Global Climate Coalition** collapsed more than a decade ago. The **Marshall Institute** broke up last year, and its climate denial arm morphed into the **CO₂ Coalition**. Exxon is now publicizing their support for a carbon tax that they began espousing in 2009. The **American Petroleum Institute** is reportedly rethinking its messaging on climate. The threads of the web of denial are breaking and weakening, and the more light we shine on it—especially light fueled by the power of the Sun—the sooner it will fall apart.

We are in the midst of a clean energy revolution. The United States has a massive reserve of untapped renewable energy. Our reserves are so massive that just a small fraction could power our entire country. The question is no longer if we can power our country with renewable energy, it is when and it is how. We will make the transition to 100 percent renewable energy before the year 2050 if we keep the right policies on the books, and I believe we are going to meet that goal.

In the last 10 years, we have seen a dramatic expansion of renewable energy in our country. Just as the Pilgrims harnessed the wind to sail across the ocean to Plymouth Rock, we too can power our economy. Our current capacity is 74,000 megawatts of wind, and we have 14,000 more megawatts of wind waiting now to be deployed in our country. U.S. solar capacity is now more than 27,000 megawatts. Over 25 percent of this capacity was added in 2015 alone. We are projected to double that capacity by the end of this year.

Megawatts are hard to understand. Simply put, by the end of this year, we should have enough wind and solar energy to power over 25 million homes. That is one-fifth of all American homes.

We must continue to untangle ourselves from the **Koch** brothers' web of denial sewn by lies and doubt. The science is overwhelming. Climate change is real. Carbon pollution is accelerating the warming, and right now American cities and towns are preparing for an uncertain future in a world with a changing climate and rising seas. While the Senate has yet to knock out all of these old cobwebs of climate denial that are holding back action, we know, if we focus on the future, we cannot continue to have these decisions of today be borne by generations yet to come.

We must focus on resiliency and clean energy and what we are going to do to leave the world better off for future generations. No matter what lies and information the climate deniers try to peddle, the facts are with us, the moral authority is with us, the economic opportunities are with us.

We have a chance to create a clean energy revolution that increases jobs as it cuts pollution. This is job creation that is good for all of creation. We must take the climate deniers and their fossil fuel funders to task for their obstinate, obdurate, oblivious opposition to the clean energy to battle climate change.

Here is where we are. By the end of 2016, there will be 400,000 people employed in the United States in the wind and solar industries and 65,000—65,000—coal miners. By the year 2020, at the current pace, there will be 600,000 people employed in the wind and solar industry.

Half of all new electricity on the planet last year came from renewable electricity. This is a revolution, and it is a revolution we cannot allow to be derailed because we will be employing people, giving them the jobs they want, which will make it possible for us to save this planet.

I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for organizing all of the Members over the last 2 days to come out on the floor to make this case about this web of denial, which is at the core of what has been blocking this Senate from taking the actions necessary to deploy the technologies, to create the jobs which can save the planet by deploying

July 12, 2016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S5015

these technologies all across the planet.

I thank the Senator from Rhode Island once again for his incredibly great and historic leadership, and I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, it is an honor for me to follow Senator MARKEY, who has battled so long and so effectively in this struggle against such odds, and I think we both feel the tide has turned, things are going our way, but we have to hurry because nature is unforgiving. As the Pope said: God forgives, mankind forgives sometimes, but nature never forgives. You slap her and she will slap you back. And we have given nature one hell of a slap with climate change.

When I was here yesterday, I was pointing to the web of denial and pointing out that the web of denial has to mislead to be effective. That is what it is—a tool to mislead. I pointed out what a Koch brothers operative described as its goal when this whole web was being developed. This was the quote: “It would be necessary [to] use ambiguous and misleading names, obscure the true agenda, and conceal the means of control.”

Well, if you are looking for ambiguous and misleading names that can obscure the true agenda and conceal the means of control, one tactic would be to exploit our Founding Fathers—to seize their names and use them to lend authority and gravitas to the deception, in the same way that using the names of Lord Acton, the famous historian, or George C. Marshall, the hero of World War II, accomplished that task. In this case, the names are Franklin, Madison, and Jefferson, and they are joined by the philosopher John Locke.

Let’s start with the so-called Franklin Center for Government and Public Integrity, which has a nice little silhouette of Ben Franklin on its logo. It was established in 2009. It says it “supports and trains investigative journalists to advance transparency, accountability, and fiscal responsibility in local government, and to spotlight free-market, pro-liberty solutions to difficult policy challenges.”

According to “DeSmogBlog,” the Franklin Center was launched and funded by a conservative think tank that encouraged grassroots activism, which is the now defunct Sam Adams Alliance.

Oh no, another bogus organization exploiting the name of yet another Founding Father. There is a little pattern here.

Jeff Nesbitt, whom I spoke about yesterday, wrote this about the Franklin Center in his book “Poison Tea: How Big Oil and Big Tobacco Invented the Tea Party and Captured the GOP.”

At the start of 2008, the Franklin Center for Government and Public Integrity had a budget of zero dollars. Its legal home was a taffy shop in Medora, North Dakota. By 2009,

the Franklin Center’s budget had jumped to \$2.4 million, according to IRS tax records. That is a spectacular leap for a nonprofit, especially in Medora, North Dakota. It was almost as if someone wished to utilize the charter concept of the Franklin Center, developing individual but interlinked news centers across the United States that would all promote the same messages—for other purposes and therefore infused it with a mountain of funding and network support.

Let’s dig into the Franklin Center’s connections to groups and funders in this web of denial.

According to “DeSmogBlog,” the Franklin Center’s director of donor development comes out of the Charles G. Koch Foundation—wow. Its senior vice president in charge of strategic initiatives comes out of the Koch brothers’ Americans for Prosperity. The founding board member who set it up helped run, oh, Americans for Prosperity in North Dakota. According to Media Matters for America, the Franklin Center’s coalitions coordinator and its chief of staff also came out of, oh, Americans for Prosperity. Not surprisingly, the Pew Research Center’s Project for Excellence in Journalism ranked the Franklin Center Watchdog.org group as “highly ideological.” It is clear they have a bias at the Franklin Center to sow doubt regarding human-caused climate change. It is no surprise, considering where their staff and money comes from.

Here is the stuff they say. In 2015, a vice president for research and resident scholar at the John Locke Foundation—more on them shortly—wrote in the Franklin Center-affiliated Carolina Journal that “global warming is not about data points” so much as it has been “a trick pulled by global warming alarmists over the last decade.” There is a responsible view.

In 2014, a staff reporter for the Franklin Center’s Watchdog.org, wrote: “I continue to contend that ‘climate change’ is a meaningless phrase because the climate obviously changes . . . [but] is useful for political activism. . . .”

In 2011, its outlet, the Hawaii Reporter, wrote: “Hard-nosed physical evidence of man-made global warming has yet to be provided by the promoters of warming, even after a nominal \$80 billion have been spent in the attempt to do so.”

The Nieman Foundation for Journalism at Harvard has looked at the Franklin Center and describes it as “at the forefront of an effort to blur the distinction between statehouse reporting and political advocacy.” A former Reuters chief White House correspondent describes the Franklin Center’s state Watchdog.org as “delivering political propaganda dressed up as journalism.”

Let’s follow the money. The Franklin Center’s top donor in 2011, as reported by the nonprofit Media Matters for America and the Center for Public Integrity, was, guess what, the rightwing’s “dark money ATM,” DonorsTrust. It was set up by whom?

Oh, right, the Koch brothers. Over \$6 million, or roughly 95 percent of the Franklin Center’s revenue that year came through this organization, whose sole purpose is to hide the identity of the real donors. That is why it exists. According to data collected by the Conservative Transparency Project, between 2009 and 2014, the Franklin Center received over \$31 million from DonorsTrust and its related Donors Capital Fund. We don’t know who the hidden donors are because that is why they set up the DonorsTrust thing, but a clue of who they might be comes from the reported donors—like the rightwing Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, founded, according to the Center for Media and Democracy’s SourceWatch, by “one of the original charter members of the far rightwing John Birch Society.” Another John Birch Society board member was Fred Koch, the father of Charles and David Koch. Dr. Brulle’s research indicates that the Bradley Foundation between 2003 and 2010 gave almost \$30 million to these organizations that he tracks in this web of denial—\$30 million.

Then there is the Dunn’s Foundation for the Advancement of Right Thinking, a Florida-based grant-making foundation that Dr. Brulle’s research again shows between 2003 and 2010 gave \$13.7 million into this web of denial organizations.

Then there is the Searle Freedom Trust, which, according to the Center for Media and Democracy’s SourceWatch, has also funded Americans for Prosperity—guess what; the Koch group—the American Enterprise Institute, ALEC—the front group—the Heartland Institute—those classics who compared climate change believers to the Unabomber—and the State Policy Network. Dr. Brulle’s research, again, indicates that Searle gave \$21.7 million to this web of denial groups that he tracks.

Another donor, of course, to the Franklin Institute is the Charles G. Koch Charitable Foundation. That one is self-explanatory. So if we look at what is going on at the Franklin Center, we will see Koch people, Koch money, and Koch buddies.

Then there is the so-called James Madison Institute, a libertarian think tank with a long history of trying to undermine climate science and renewable energy policy. Yale Professor Justin Farrell lists the James Madison Institute among the organizations he tracks contributing to the polarization of climate change debate. The Heartland Institute’s—yes, that wonderful Unabomber group—senior fellow for environmental policy is on the James Madison Institute’s research advisory council. It is such a web of connections.

According to research by the American Bridge Project, the Madison Institute received over \$1.4 million in direct donations from Koch-affiliated groups. Between 2003 and 2013, they received funding from the John Templeton

Foundation, which “tries to encourage the integration of religious beliefs and free-market principles into the classroom,” according to the Center for Media and Democracy’s SourceWatch. Mother Jones reported in 2011 that Charles Koch recognized the Templeton Foundation for having donated over \$1 million to Koch-related causes, and Dr. Brulle’s research shows that Templeton gave more than \$20 million to this web of denial organization he tracks.

Dunn’s Foundation for the Advancement of Right Thinking turns up again—Franklin, now Madison. The same foundation that gave \$13.7 million to these climate change countermovement organizations also gave to the Madison one.

Of course, again, the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation gave to the Franklin Center and gave to the Madison Center to the tune of almost \$30 million into the climate denial web.

The James Madison Institute is also a member of the State Policy Network. The State Policy Network, according to the Center for Media and Democracy’s SourceWatch, is an “\$83 million right-wing empire” that has received money from a Koch family foundation, and, of course, the identity-scrubbing DonorsTrust and Donors Capital—which, by the way, are the big green diamond here at the center of this web.

According to the “DeSmogBlog” examination of the Madison Institute, it opposed the Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade legislation, and in 2009 issued a plea to policymakers in Florida—the State that is going fastest under water because of sea level rise—to stop any action on climate change following the so-called Climategate scandal. After six thorough investigations looked at Climategate, true, there was no scandal at all, but it would appear that the Institute neither rescinded its plea nor set the record straight.

This institute actively fights renewable energy policies in Florida. An institute report co-written by a senior fellow at the Heartland Institute—again, the connection, Madison Institute to Heartland Institute and Heartland Institute to the billboard that compared climate scientists to the Unabomber—opposed a proposed solar constitutional amendment. Well, they weren’t alone. According to news reports, Florida’s power companies were contributing big money to a political committee fighting that solar amendment, including over \$1 million from Florida Power and Light, \$1 million from Duke Energy, over \$800,000 from Tampa Electric Company, and \$640,000 from Gulf Power. Well, guess what. The president and CEO of Gulf Power was then on the board of, oh, the James Madison Institute.

Then we move on to John Locke, who gives us a twofor. First, there is the Locke Institute. It is named for the philosopher John Locke, who, with Montesquieu, are the two major philosophical influences of the Founding Fa-

thers. It is listed as one of Dr. Justin Farrell’s organizations contributing to the polarization of climate change debate and “overtly producing and promoting skepticism and doubt about scientific consensus on climate change.”

The institute has been involved in defending the tobacco industry and has on its academic advisory council a political scientist from the Global Warming Policy Foundation, a high-profile UK climate denier group.

There is also a John Locke Foundation, which describes itself as “an independent, non-profit think tank that would work for truth, for freedom, and for the future of North Carolina.” It is one of the blue dots here on Professor Brulle’s denial web diagram. Dr. Farrell, too, has the foundation on his list of climate change denier and countermovement organizations. Yes, it is a member of the Koch-funded State Policy Network, of course, and it is funded significantly by a North Carolina billionaire by the name of Art Pope, who, according to Indy Week, is “one of the most trusted members of the Koch’s elite circle: He has been a regular invitee to the Koch’s secretive, semiannual gathering of the major right-wing donors and activists,” and he is a “valuable junior partner in many key Koch operations.”

The foundation center database shows that between 2003 and 2013, the John Locke Foundation received over \$21 million from the John William Pope Foundation—which is named after Art Pope’s father—and over \$60,000 from the Charles Koch Foundation. It gets so cozy between everyone here. According to a 2014 Washington Post profile of Art Pope, he has poured over \$30 million through his family’s foundation into the Koch front group Americans for Prosperity—all of whose members, you remember, went over to the Franklin Institute. Professor Brulle has put the John William Pope Foundation at over \$20 million of total foundation funding to this climate change denial web. Dr. Brulle cites the John Locke Foundation as having received 3 percent of the total income distributed within the climate change countermovement between 2003 and 2010.

An article in Facing South calls the John Locke Foundation “one of the most outspoken voices of climate denial in North Carolina, claiming that global warming is a ‘pseudoscientific fraud.’” According to research done by Greenpeace, the foundation stated in a 2005 policy brief that “a greenhouse gas reduction policy would have only costs and no benefits.” In 2005, the foundation released a public policy statement entitled “Global Warming Policy: NC Should Do Nothing,” whose author wrote similar climate denial pieces in the Franklin Center-affiliated Carolina Journal. It is hard to keep track of all these crisscrossings.

In 2007, the foundation released a policy report entitled “A North Carolina Citizen’s Guide to Global Warming,”

whose author, according to Facing South, was a visiting scholar at the, yes, Koch-backed American Enterprise Institute. This report falsely declared that consensus on climate change does not exist, and declared: “The greatest threat we face from climate change is the danger of rushing into foolish and costly policies driven by ill-founded climate change hysteria.”

Art Pope figures in Jane Mayer’s book “Dark Money” as “a charter member of the Koch network” and a “longtime friend and ally, [who] shared Charles [Koch’s] passion for free-market philosophy.” Mayer writes that Pope was a regular at the Kochs’ secret planning summits and “served on the board of the Koch’s main public advocacy group”—wait for it—“Americans for Prosperity, as he had on its predecessor, Citizens for a Sound Economy.” Mayer adds: “Pope’s role in his home state of North Carolina was in many respects a state-sized version of the Kochs’ role nationally.”

Other Locke Foundation funders identified by Conservative Transparency Project between 1995 and 2014 include the Searle Freedom Trust, which, according to Center for Media and Democracy’s SourceWatch, has also funded, yes, Americans for Prosperity, and the American Enterprise Institute, and ALEC—which we have talked about and sponsors the State Policy Network—and, of course, we can’t go without the Heartland Institute, with their wonderful Unabomber billboard.

Dr. Brulle’s research indicates that the Searle Trust gave over \$20 million to these groups between 2003 and 2010. Donors Capital Fund—this big spider at the center of the web here—is a donor to the John Locke Foundation, and, of course, the Charles G. Koch Charitable Foundation. The John Locke Foundation is a member of the State Policy Network, that “\$83 million right-wing empire” funded by a Koch family foundation and the identity-launderers Donors Trust and Donors Capital.

That brings us to the so-called Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy. By the way, it is fair to say that yet again when we move from Franklin to Madison, these foundations end up showing Koch people, Koch money, and Koch buddies. The Thomas Jefferson Institute is a public policy foundation and, yes, another member of the State Policy Network, the \$83 million right-wing empire.

By the way, the Center for Media and Democracy’s in-depth investigation of the State Policy Network shows how the network and its member think tanks are all interconnected to ALEC and to the Koch brothers. But that is for another speech.

According to “DeSmogBlog,” many of the Jefferson Institute studies are authored by an operative of the Heritage Foundation, the group that Senator FRANKEN spoke about earlier this evening, and the Energy and Environment Legal Institute—two groups that are both on this web.

July 12, 2016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S5017

The Thomas Jefferson Institute prominently displays a statue of Jefferson on its Web page and claims to be a nonpartisan supporter of “environmental stewardship,” but the institute is an outspoken critic of the President’s Clean Power Plan and renewable sources of energy and actively sows doubt about climate science. The institute is right here on Professor Brulle’s web of climate change countermovement organizations.

According to data compiled by the Conservative Transparency project between 1998 and 2014, the Jefferson Institute received funding from the following entities in the denial web: first, of course, is the identity-laundering **Donors Trust and Donors Capital Fund**. Then there is the **Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation**, which, as we recall, also supported the **Franklin Center** and the **Madison Institute** and links to the **Koch** brothers through the far-rightwing **John Birch Society**. Remember, they were at almost \$30 million into climate denial organizations in those years between 2003 and 2010. And then there is the **William E. Simon Foundation**, whose current president is also a senior fellow at the rightwing **Manhattan Institute**, a member of the **Grant Advisory Committee** of the **Searle Freedom Trust**, and a past member of the **Board of Overseers** of the **Hoover Institution**. It is quite a web indeed.

The **Jefferson Institute’s** director was quoted in 2007 as saying: “When it comes to global warming, I’m a skeptic because the conclusions about the cause of the apparent warming stand on the shoulders of incredibly uncertain data and models.” Tell that to **NOAA** and **NASA** and every single one

of our National Labs and see how far you get. Tell that to your home State university and see how far you get.

In 2008, he wrote about climate change for the **Jefferson Journal**, a commentary forum of the **Jefferson Institute**, that “greenhouse gas reduction goals . . . are both unachievable and irrelevant” and assured “there will be no climate catastrophe due to CO₂ because either the science is wrong or we will use geoengineering.”

In 2011, he wrote two pieces for the **Jefferson Journal** opposing wind power, contending that—you are not going to believe this, but here is the quote—“wind is not affordable and it is not clean” and that wind power “has no sensible place in a 21st century civilization.” Tell that to our friend Senator **GRASSLEY**, whose State gets a third of its power from wind energy.

Franklin, Jefferson, Madison, Locke—these are great names put on the front of very shady **Koch**-funded front groups in the web of denial, and the organizations share several common features: First, they all propagate what by any reasonable standard is preposterous nonsense and masquerade it as science and independent opinion. Second, they all get massive funding from fossil fuel interests and always line up obediently with those interests. Third, they interlock. The interlocking is almost too complicated to track—in staff, in board members, in funding sources—but it all traces back to fossil fuel money. And, of course, they all mask themselves behind the names of great men from history who would recoil to discover their names and reputations being put to such discreditable use. Who needs to hide behind names like that? I submit it is people

who are up to no good and don’t want to be caught out for who they really are.

Let me conclude by thanking the many Senators who have participated in this effort to put a little bit of a spotlight on a very phony web of denial that is operating actively in our democracy to distort and disturb its proper operation and to sabotage America’s ability to respond in a responsible way to the climate crisis. They include our leader **HARRY REID**, **BEN CARDIN**, **CHRIS COONS**, **TIM KAINE**, **ELIZABETH WARREN**, **CHUCK SCHUMER**, **TOM UDALL**, **JEFF MERKLEY**, **BARBARA BOXER**, **DICK DURBIN**, **BRIAN SCHATZ**, **AL FRANKEN**, **MARTIN HEINRICH**, my senior Senator **JACK REED**, **JEANNE SHAHEEN**, **GARY PETERS**, **DICK BLUMENTHAL**, and **ED MARKEY**. I am honored to participate in this effort with them.

With that, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 8:27 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 13, 2016, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 12, 2016:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CAROLE SCHWARTZ RENDON, OF OHIO, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.