



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 11, 2016

No. 111

Senate

The Senate met at 4 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of grace and glory, shine Your light on our dark paths. Teach us to not lean solely on our understanding but to look to You to direct us on life's journey. May we not limit ourselves by our anxieties, but by releasing the power of fervent prayer discover that Your peace will guard our hearts.

Surround our lawmakers with the shield of Your Divine favor, preparing them for whatever the days may bring. Infuse them with the confidence that comes from knowing that their times are in Your hands. Lift us all above the clouds of care and fear into the bright sunshine of Your great mercy and might.

And, Lord, comfort each person who has felt anguish from the Dallas tragedy. Lord, bring healing to our land.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The majority leader is recognized.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 1270

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I understand there is a bill at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1270) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

LEGISLATION BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, we have recently made progress on issues of importance to the American people. We have also seen some very regrettable decisions from our colleagues across the aisle. This week offers the opportunity for all of us and for our country to move forward. Every Senator will have a chance to advance important solutions on behalf of the American people this week, and some colleagues will have a chance to reconsider partisan mistakes that hurt our country. So let me explain.

This week, Democrats can reconsider their decision to block funding for the men and women serving and protecting

us overseas. These Americans selflessly and voluntarily put themselves in harm's way to help keep our country safe. They do not ask for much in return. What they do not deserve is for Democrats to filibuster the bill that supports them as part of some partisan political gain.

At a time when we face an array of terror threats around the globe, we cannot afford to play politics with the men and women serving and protecting us overseas. The bill Democrats are now filibustering respects the budget caps, was reported out of committee at the earliest point in more than a decade, and earned the support of every single Democrat in committee.

The top Democrat on the Defense Subcommittee said it "takes a responsible approach to protecting our country . . . [that honors] the bipartisan budget deal in place." That was the top Democrat on the Defense Subcommittee, and he warned colleagues not to "take chances when it comes to funding the men and women serving in forward positions."

Well, he was certainly right. There is no excuse for Democrats to continue blocking this bill. They will have another chance to make the right decision later this week.

This week, Democrats can reconsider their decision to block funding to fight Zika. Either Democrats believe Zika is a crisis that requires immediate action or they do not. Either Democrats think protecting pregnant women and babies from Zika today is more important or they think holding out for an earmark for their favorite partisan special interest group is more important.

Even though the administration has acknowledged they haven't spent the anti-Zika money already available to them, Republicans believe we ought to pass this bill now because this is indeed an emergency. Our friends across the aisle will have to decide if they feel the same way.

I would remind colleagues the rules don't allow for a conference report to

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4925

be amended, even from powerful Democratic special interest groups, and re-passing the same bill that went to conference, as some have naively suggested as political cover, will not put a bill on the President's desk. So I urge colleagues to work with us to pass this compromise Zika control and veterans' funding legislation and send it to the President for his signature, not block it and spend the summer explaining why a special interest group was more important than funding Zika control and our veterans.

This week, Senators can take decisive action to combat the heroin and prescription opioid abuse epidemic that is hitting nearly every State and community across America. Support for the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act conference report that passed the House last Friday seems to grow with each passing day. There are now more than 230 groups fighting this epidemic in their own communities that have come out in support, including the Detroit Recovery Project in Michigan, the Foundation for Recovery in Nevada, Central City Concern in Oregon, and Project Recovery in New Hampshire.

One of these groups is the Fraternal Order of Police. Here is what the group's president had to say about it.

The legislation provides treatment for those caught in the clutches of addiction or who also suffer from mental illness and also provides law enforcement with the necessary tools to prevent heroin and opioid deaths. . . . Too many lives have been lost to these drugs, and too many families have been torn apart. On behalf of more than 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I urge Congress to adopt the conference report.

That is from the Fraternal Order of Police.

Widespread support like this helps explain why the CARA conference report passed the House last week 407 to 5. Now it is the Senate's turn to act and send this critical comprehensive response to the President for his signature.

We know Senate Democrats and Senate Republicans already voted 94 to 1 to pass a very similar CARA bill. We know the Senate has provided more than twice as much funding for opioid-related issues as under the previous Senate majority. We also know there is a groundswell of support from so many corners for this CARA legislation that can help communities begin to heal from an epidemic sweeping the country. Quite simply, there is no excuse to block it.

I thank colleagues, like Senator PORTMAN, Senator AYOTTE, Senator GRASSLEY, and Senator ALEXANDER, who have worked ceaselessly to advance this issue. Our Democratic colleagues, like Senator WHITEHOUSE and Senator KLOBUCHAR, have worked hard on this bill as well. I know they are proud of their work, and I am sure they look forward to supporting this overwhelmingly popular piece of legislation. The outspokenness and leadership of all these Members and others on this

issue helped move the bill forward with the urgency this crisis demands.

This week, Senators can take action to improve security and consumer protections for airline travelers. Recent terror attacks across the globe only emphasize the importance of securing our airports. The bipartisan, bicameral aviation agreement aims to achieve that by enhancing security in prescreening areas, increasing measures to address cyber security threats, improving vetting for airline employees, and tightening security standards for flights coming into the United States. Not only will it increase safety and security, but it also includes a number of consumer protection provisions, such as refunds for lost or delayed baggage, as well as improvements for travelers with disabilities and for parents traveling with small children. We expect the House to pass this agreement tonight, and then the Senate will have a chance to send a bill to the President's desk this week.

Also, this week, Senators can take another important step toward modernizing America's energy policies. The Senate will have an opportunity to go to conference with the House to work toward an agreement on the Energy Policy Modernization Act. This reform bill, which passed the Senate in April, represents the first broad energy legislation moved through the Senate since the Bush administration. It aims to bring our aging policies and infrastructure in line with current and future demands. Going to conference on this measure would put us one step closer to arriving at a final bill and sending it to the President's desk.

With cooperation this week, the Senate will have several opportunities to advance serious solutions that can make a difference for the American people. From doing the right thing by our veterans, to protecting pregnant women and babies from Zika, to combating the opioid and heroin epidemic; from keeping airline travelers safe, to modernizing America's energy policies, there is a lot we can get done. There are issues that should be priorities for us all. I would encourage colleagues on both sides to work together to advance each of these solutions in the coming days.

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2016—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the conference report accompanying S. 524.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the conference report to accompany S. 524, which will be stated by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 524), having met, have agreed that the Senate re-

cede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment and the House agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of July 6, 2016.)

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the conference report to accompany S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

Mitch McConnell, James M. Inhofe, Pat Roberts, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Chuck Grassley, John Cornyn, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven, Kelly Ayotte, John McCain, Rob Portman, John Barrasso, Lamar Alexander, Richard Burr, John Thune, Orrin G. Hatch.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived with respect to the cloture motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2577 and the conference report be agreed to with no intervening action or debate.

That must be the wrong one. Sorry about that. Madam President, it is sure good we have staff around; isn't it?

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 5243

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 5243, which is at the desk; that all after the enacting clause be stricken; that the substitute amendment, which is the text of the Blunt-Murray amendment to provide \$1.1 billion in funding for Zika, be agreed to; that there be up to 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, Republican Senators are prepared to pass the conference report and send it to the President's desk for signature today.

The Democratic leader has asked for the Senate to pass legislation providing \$1.1 billion in immediate funding to combat Zika. In fact, the conference report before us provides exactly that—\$1.1 billion in immediate funding to combat Zika. Passing the House-passed conference report is the only way to get this critical funding before September.

This is a conference report. The House has already passed it. It is not amendable. The Senate should act now. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 2577

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2577 and the conference report be agreed to with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I will give a longer presentation in just a minute or two, but I do want to say this: The consent I ask has the approval of 89 Senators here in the Senate, Democrats and Republicans. Only 11 have not voted in the affirmative. It doesn't seem too outrageous to suggest that the House send this back to us as it is.

What the Republican leader is asking has very little support over here that is not partisan in nature. He is proposing a completely partisan conference report riddled with poison pill riders. It is one of the worst conference reports I have ever seen in this body. The report is truly nonsensical. It restricts funding for Planned Parenthood—the very place women rely on for care to prevent the spread of Zika and get contraceptives.

It is ridiculous to try to pass a conference report that runs counter to common sense, so I object to the Republican leader's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Democratic leader.

MILCON-VA AND ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING BILL

Mr. REID. Madam President, carrying on, this week the Republican leader will continue with the pointless approach that has been a hallmark of his time as leader—bringing another failed partisan bill back before the Senate for a revote. The Republican leader will force yet another failed vote on this cynical Zika conference report.

The Republican agreement on the MILCON-VA-Zika conference report is a disgrace. It is a mockery of how Congress should treat an emergency. Remember, we passed a bill out of here—89 votes. It wasn't everything we wanted. It was a compromise. Instead of \$1.9 billion, it was \$1.1 billion. But we agreed to that. Democrats and Republicans agreed to that. It went to the House, and we thought we were home

free, but little did we realize we were dealing with the same problems Speaker Boehner dealt with for a long time until he was forced to leave. It seems that RYAN, who was going to bring a new voice to the House, has not been able to do so. I know he has tried.

I repeat, it is a mockery of how Congress should treat an emergency. What does it do? It restricts funding for birth control provided by Planned Parenthood. It exempts pesticide spraying from the Clean Water Act. It cuts veterans funding by \$500 million below the Senate bill. It cuts Ebola funding by \$107 million. It rescinds \$543 million from ObamaCare that simply would fall, like that, with raising a point of order. It strikes a prohibition on displaying the Confederate flag that was in the House bill. Why would the Republican leader waste his time on this? The conference report is going nowhere. The Senate will not pass this Republican conference report and President Obama will not sign it into law.

Democrats were willing to negotiate, willing to compromise. I told the Republican leader to give us something to work with. I feel we have given him something to work with. I feel it is reasonable.

Instead of wasting time, we should be responding to the real Zika emergency that is now in the United States. It is not just in Puerto Rico; it is on the mainland. I know the number of people affected with Zika is increasing every day. According to the Centers for Disease Control, nearly 3,700 people in the United States and territories have Zika. As of right now, 599 pregnant women have shown evidence of the infection. Seven babies have been born with birth defects caused by Zika. These babies were born in the United States. There is a path toward a bipartisan solution to combating this terrible virus if Republicans are willing to take it.

Two months ago, the Senate passed a bipartisan compromise to address the Zika crisis. As I have indicated previously, we didn't like that. We believed, as we still do, that \$1.1 billion is not enough and will shortchange what scientists, doctors, and public health officials need to fight Zika. But we still voted for the bill because it was a step in the right direction. And, as I have indicated now for the third time, it passed with 89 votes.

The Senate bill, while imperfect, was not riddled with the vexatious provisions in the Republican conference report that I have enumerated. The Senate Zika legislation would save lives. We need to get to this soon. We need to send it to the President. The only way to do that is to pass the Senate compromise as a stand-alone bill. That is precisely what we Democrats are proposing. It is too bad that the House says we can't do that unless we have a Confederate flag flying over veterans cemeteries, stop people from going to Planned Parenthood, adversely affect

EPA with the Clean Water Act, take money from Ebola, which everyone says we need to stay on top of that, and take \$500 million away from veterans for processing claims.

The Senate should take up and pass the Zika compromise as a stand-alone bill. If we send it to the House, if the Speaker would bring up the legislation today, if he would let the Democrats vote, it would pass overwhelmingly. But he doesn't do that. He is still following the disgraced Hastert rule, and we need not say more about that other than to remind everybody that he is now in prison—the man whose name is affixed to that.

TRAGEDY IN DALLAS

Madam President, a couple of other things. Last Thursday night, a peaceful protest for justice in Dallas, TX, erupted into violence as a sniper ambushed law enforcement officers. Five police officers and two civilians were killed, murdered, and nine were wounded—seven police officers and two civilians. We grieve with the victims, their families, and the brave men and women who serve the people of Dallas, TX. We thank the police and first responders whose timely action prevented further loss of life.

It is insufficient to say that we as a nation are saddened by this attack. It is more than that. We are devastated. We are aghast at this sickening violence perpetrated on innocent police officers who were on duty to protect and to serve. There is no justification for this senseless, evil act.

This shooting rampage ran counter to the message conveyed by the peaceful demonstrators in Dallas. The people at the Dallas march were demonstrating for an end to violence. They were calling for no more of the brutality and hostility that have taken the lives of Americans of all backgrounds but disproportionately people of color. That message should not be lost, particularly in the aftermath of the two fatal shootings last week in Louisiana and Minnesota.

Last Tuesday, Alton Sterling, a 37-year-old Black man from Baton Rouge, LA, was pinned down by two police officers and then shot and killed. The next day, on the outskirts of St. Paul, MN, a 32-year-old school cafeteria supervisor named Philando Castile was pulled over for a broken taillight. The police officer killed Castile when he reached for his license as his fiancée and her 4-year-old daughter sat in the car and watched.

We are saddened by this loss of life, but our condolences mean nothing if this epidemic of violence persists. Our words are worthless if we don't do something to stop this violence.

The Black community is grieving over the disproportionate number of deaths of their young men. How would you explain all these deaths? How would you explain this violence to your children—Tamir Rice, a 12-year-old boy in Cleveland killed by police for holding a BB gun, or Freddie Gray in Baltimore, or Eric Garner in New York, or

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 masquerade 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.

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 policed 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.

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.

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

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 Texit, 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 pseudoscientific 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 is it 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.

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

midnight. I am sure some of my colleagues were hoping nobody saw it. But this is not like an anomaly. As a matter of fact, this was the fourth time the minority leader led my colleagues on the other side of the aisle into filibustering the Defense appropriations bill that funds our troops and keeps our Nation safe. Let me repeat that. This bill has been filibustered not once, not twice, not three times but four times in the last year.

This is the bill the minority leader likes to filibuster more than anything, and this is despite the fact that when this bill came out of the Committee on Appropriations, it had huge bipartisan support. I think only three members of the committee voted against it. This year it came out of the committee unanimously.

So what does this bill do? We just talked about the threats that everybody agrees exist. I will just cover a few of the highlights. First, and very importantly, it is actually consistent with the bipartisan budget agreement of 2015. So any discussion of how it is not fitting what we agreed to is not true. It is consistent with that.

Readiness. We all know we need readiness for our military. It funds \$212 billion in terms of base operations and maintenance accounts, training—enormously important—and shipbuilding. A significant portion goes to shipbuilding to make sure we have a strong navy. It is similar with regard to aircraft procurement to have a strong Air Force—significant billions of dollars of funding for our Air Force. It even has, for the first time, funding for an icebreaker, which more and more of my colleagues in the Congress are recognizing as critical to our national security.

Missile defense. With the growing threat from North Korea and Iran, there is significant funding for missile defense and the National Guard and Reserve equipment account. The Presiding Officer has been a leader in the National Guard and Reserve. There is almost \$1 billion for the National Guard and Reserve equipment account, which is lacking.

Of course, there is military pay. The Defense appropriations bill fully funds an Active-Duty end strength of 1.2 million members of the military and a Reserve component end strength of 800,000, and it funds a 1.6 percent pay raise.

Those are some of the highlights of the bill we need, and some of the highlights of the bill that was filibustered in the wee hours of the evening last Thursday night.

Our Nation needs this bill. Our troops certainly need this bill. Our allies need this bill. We have held hearings in the Committee on Armed Services. The Chair will remember when Secretary Kissinger came and testified that the United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of World War II. Even the President, last week in the Financial

Times, stated that this is possibly the most important moment in terms of the security of the transatlantic alliance since the Cold War.

The Presiding Officer and I actually had the honor of recently going to see the new Secretary of the Army review the troops and review the Old Guard. She and I proudly represented the Senate. We have a new Secretary of the Army who is going to do a great job. The Chief of Staff of the Army, General Milley, spoke during that. He said one of the most important things the Senate and the Congress can do in the next 5 weeks is to make sure there is a budget for the U.S. military and for the U.S. Army. That is what he said. So he certainly laid out what he thought was important.

As a matter of fact, serving together on the Committee on Armed Services, the Presiding Officer and I hear this from every single admiral and general, including Secretary Carter: Fund the troops—certainty.

But the minority leader thinks it is fine to block funding for our troops. Maybe he knows more than Secretary Carter. Maybe he knows more than General Milley. Unfortunately, he has made a habit out of doing this. In my short time in the Senate—1½ years—this is the bill the minority leader has decided to filibuster more than any other bill. Since I have been here, he has done that four times. Think about that.

I hope the American people are watching. Four times in a year the bill that gets picked on more than any other bill is the one that funds the troops and our national security, and it happened again in the wee hours of the night last week.

So why does he do this? I have no earthly idea why he does this. If you asked Americans back home in Iowa, Alaska, or in any State—Democrats or Republicans; it doesn't matter the party—the people would say that national defense and funding our troops is probably the most important thing we do. It is certainly one of the top one or two. But the minority leader last year said the Defense appropriations bill is "a waste of time." Last week he put out a statement saying he needed a commitment that this bill abides by the bipartisan budget deal.

Well, guess what. The bill does abide by the bipartisan budget deal. There is no one making the argument that it doesn't. So I have no idea. I have no idea why he singles out funding for our brave men and women in uniform, thousands of whom, by the way, are serving overseas in combat—yes, in combat, right now. We are not going to fund them, though. We will filibuster that. Maybe he can come down and explain it.

Here is something else I really don't understand. I mean, I really don't understand this. Why is it that so many of my colleagues follow his lead on this—to filibuster funding for America's military not once, not twice, not

three times but four times? Why are my colleagues following his lead? I don't know why. But what I do know is that we should not be heading out on a 2-month recess without voting again on funding our troops—without voting to fund our troops—especially given all the challenges I just listed here. We know they are there. The President was talking about them. We talk about them. But we don't want to fund the troops?

We owe it to the American people and to our troops to have a vote on this Defense appropriations bill again. Let my colleagues come to the floor and explain why they are going to vote to filibuster this bill again, because when we bring it up again—and I certainly hope we do so this week—if they vote to filibuster it again, that will become the fifth time inside of a year.

What we need to do is to bring back a longstanding tradition that used to exist in the Senate, which was the bipartisan funding of our military. That is certainly what we are all focused on. That is what we thought we were going to do when we got the budget deal. That is what we thought we were going to do when we saw these very big bipartisan numbers coming out of the Appropriations Committee. Yet, every time we try to bring this bill to the floor—this year and last year—the minority leader filibusters it. The American people are watching. The American people are watching.

A recent Politico article talked about this. A defense analyst from the Heritage Foundation said:

I think this is pretty disappointing, but sadly not surprising. . . . There used to be a bipartisan consensus that defense was a priority, but sadly I think that consensus no longer exists. . . . With the Senate Democrats stopping DOD [appropriations], the Pentagon will at least have to wait until after the election for its budget, and maybe even into the next calendar year [to get its budget].

That is because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are filibustering this bill. How does that help our troops? How does that help the national defense of the United States? Somebody please come down here and explain this to me. I agree with this analyst where he said this is sad.

I hope we will bring this bill to the floor again and drop what has been happening, which is playing politics with our troops and funding our military.

I will conclude by saying that after the Vietnam war, the Democratic Party gained a reputation as the anti-military party of America, and they struggled for years to shed that reputation. I don't think having any of America's major political parties being viewed as anti-military is good for us as a nation.

Support for our military should never be a partisan issue, and I proudly serve—with the Presiding Officer and

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 Kaine, 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 Kaine 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

can say with new focus to our American heroes, "God bless our law enforcement community."

I don't expect to give such a speech without having some folks respond positively and some even negatively. But this night, this day, knowing that tomorrow in Texas our current President, our former President, and a number of folks throughout the State of Texas will be together in a part of our family territory, celebrating the sacrifices, mourning the loss, but doing something that needs to be done. It is simply this: not coming as a Democrat, not coming as a Republican, not coming as a Black American, not coming as a White American, not coming as a Hispanic American, but coming to a family gathering for family funerals—plural—which hopefully will start a family conversation that I will look forward to continuing on Wednesday.

Madam President, I thank you.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I wish to commend the Senator from South Carolina for an extraordinary speech. I look forward to hearing the two subsequent speeches that the Senator from South Carolina is going to make on the subject. No one better expresses in stronger and more persuasive terms what needs to be said in the wake of these tragedies than the Senator from South Carolina, and I congratulate him on his outstanding remarks.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam 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.

60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS LAS VEGAS CHAPTER

Mr. REID. Madam President, today I wish to recognize the 60th anniversary of the American Institute of Architects, or AIA, Las Vegas chapter.

Established in 1857, the AIA works to elevate the architecture profession throughout the United States. In Nevada, a small group of architects joined together to promote a high standard of architecture and started the first AIA chapter in Las Vegas in 1956. At first, the chapters were so small that individual members took turns acting as president. The organization has grown into one of the leading professional organizations in my State, and the Las Vegas chapter recently elected exceptional leaders from its membership, including the current president, Brett Ewing, and the president-elect, Jon Sparer.

The Las Vegas Chapter of AIA has played a distinct role in the expansion of Las Vegas and Clark County. With the incredible growth in Nevada, architects have played a key role in design-

ing iconic properties on the Las Vegas Strip and housing developments throughout the valley. AIA members developed many of the same entertainment venues that accommodate tourists and provide essential jobs for Nevadans. The creative genius of architects was essential to transforming Las Vegas into the "Entertainment Capitol of the World," which welcomes more than 50 million visitors annually.

Members of the AIA have made a significant and positive contribution to the security, arts, culture, beauty, and livability of our community. Southern Nevada is a better place to live and work because of the efforts of AIA Las Vegas. I appreciate and admire the dedicated professionals of the AIA, and I wish them continued success for years to come as they design the future of Las Vegas.

TRIBUTE TO CYNTHIA LUMMIS

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, each year the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame asks for nominations of farmers, ranchers, and others who contribute to the agriculture industry in Wyoming. After the nominations are received, a panel of three judges selects those who will be added to the hall of fame. This year U.S. Representative CYNTHIA LUMMIS is one of the hall's inductees. I think it's fitting that CYNTHIA is being added to the hall of fame's roster on its 25th anniversary because her participation, encouragement, and support of our State's farmers and ranchers deserve to be recognized on a momentous occasion for the Hall itself.

CYNTHIA has a long background in agriculture, beginning on her family's ranch on Crow Creek. Growing up, she learned about the importance of being a good steward of the land, how to tend her family's livestock, and how to make good use of all the resources that were at her disposal. She also participated in 4-H, raising shorthorn cattle. Over time CYNTHIA became a skilled horseman, and she used that talent to good effect at the world's largest outdoor rodeo: Cheyenne Frontier Days.

In fact, CYNTHIA was such an important addition to the "Daddy of 'em All" that she is also being inducted into the Cheyenne Frontier Days Hall of Fame this year. It is worth noting that her parents, Doran and Enid, and her whole family have already been inducted into that hall, but this year, CYNTHIA will be recognized for her singular contributions, from repairing parade costumes to serving as "Miss Frontier." CYNTHIA is fully deserving of that honor, and this is just another example of the mark she has left on every corner of our State.

At the University of Wyoming, CYNTHIA received degrees in animal science and biology and was a member of the rodeo team. She then became the youngest woman ever elected to the Wyoming Legislature and also earned a law degree from UW. She put that degree to use as a clerk for the Wyoming Supreme Court and in private practice.

After serving 14 years in the Wyoming House and Senate, where she focused largely on agriculture and natural resources issues, CYNTHIA served as Governor Geringer's policy director and was then elected State treasurer. While serving as treasurer, CYNTHIA became the first woman on the Cheyenne Frontier Days board of directors. For all of these reasons and more, CYNTHIA was named a 2005 Outstanding Alumna for the University of Wyoming College of Agriculture.

But CYNTHIA wasn't done fighting for Wyoming or the agriculture industry. In 2008, she took the next step in her political career and was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. CYNTHIA has proven to be up to the challenge of being our State's lone voice in the House, and I have been proud to work with her.

Through all of this, CYNTHIA has been active in the operations of the Lummis family ranch. I am sure she will continue to work on behalf of the State and the industry that she has loved her entire life.

I want to extend my congratulations to CYNTHIA for everything she has accomplished and for her induction into the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame. She would be the first to say she couldn't have done it alone, so I also want to recognize CYNTHIA's family and in particular her daughter, Annaliese, and her husband, Al. For years, CYNTHIA and Alvin were a team that took on the issues that will direct the future of Wyoming and our Nation, and I know Alvin would be so proud of her recognition in the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame.

REMEMBERING SERGEANT DAVID THATCHER

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I want to recognize SGT David Thatcher, a member of the Greatest Generation and a true American hero, who sadly passed away on June 22, 2016, in Missoula, MT. Born on July 31, 1921, in Bridger, MT to homesteaders, Joseph and Dorothea Thatcher, David grew up in Montana during the Great Depression.

David enlisted in the U.S. Army Air Corps and in 1942 volunteered to go on a secret mission that ultimately became the Doolittle Raid on Tokyo. He was a crew member on plane No. 7, the Ruptured Duck, which crash landed in water off China after their bombing mission. His heroic efforts saved the lives of his badly injured crew members, and with the help of local Chinese guerillas, he helped his crew evade Japanese troops and make their way to safety.

Sergeant Thatcher's actions and those of all of the Doolittle's Raiders were nothing but heroic, yet Sergeant Thatcher was a humble man and did not feel he did anything great. He just felt he was doing his job. Doing his job, however, helped to win a war and maintain our freedom as a nation. Sergeant

Thatcher will be missed by his family, Montanans, and an entire grateful nation.

REMEMBERING SONIA AND MARTIN J. WOLF

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, today I want to recognize the legacy of two great Coloradans, Sonia and Martin J. Wolf. After 54 years of marriage and a lifetime of public service, Martin and Sonia passed away recently within weeks of each other in Denver, CO.

Martin Wolf was chief of staff to Senators Mike Gravel and Floyd Haskell and administrative assistant to two Colorado Governors and former Denver Mayor Federico Peña. He then went on to work on President Johnson's staff—all with the love of his life by his side. The two spent a lifetime advocating for what they believed in, and they worked tirelessly to leave the world a better place than they found it.

Their dedication to public service is widely renowned and respected. Martin and Sonia, and the passion they carried for their work, will be deeply missed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following obituary for the Wolfs be printed in the RECORD.

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

Admired for their decades of public service, Sonia and Martin J. Wolf, married for fifty-four years, died within weeks of each other in Denver, CO.

Mr. Wolf was Chief of Staff to two United States Senators and Administrative Assistant to two Colorado Governors and a Denver Mayor. They were much admired in Washington and Denver for their devotion to each other and to public service.

Mrs. Wolf, a native New Yorker raised primarily in Miami, Florida, met her husband during her career as an accountant and financial advisor. Recognizing that they must be lifetime companions, they slipped away for a weekend from the campaign of Gov. Steve McNichols to get married in 1962, flying to Santa Fe where New Mexico's Governor made special arrangements to open a court on a Saturday. They were inseparable ever after.

Mr. Wolf, a Colorado native, was a Navy veteran of WW II, graduating from Denver University in 1950. He embarked on a journalism career that took him to posts in Australia and Alaska before returning to Denver as a reporter on KOA-TV.

In 1962 he became Press Secretary for Gov. McNichols, also directing Coloradans for President Lyndon Johnson in 1964.

LBJ's White House Chief of Staff W. Marvin Watson was so impressed that he brought Sonia and Marty to Washington as Special Assistant to Chairman John Bailey at the DNC and later as Special Assistant to The Postmaster General when Watson was appointed to the Cabinet.

In 1970, Marty became Chief of Staff to Alaska Senator Mike Gravel. In that position, he came into possession of the "Pentagon Papers," loading the boxes into the trunk of his car. To Sonia's chagrin, he kept a lifelong pledge never to reveal his source to anyone. Senator Gravel astounded the world reading sections aloud on the floor of the Senate while the Washington Post was fighting to publish.

The Wolfs kept their home in Denver, so it was a natural transfer when Marty became

Chief of Staff for newly elected Senator Floyd Haskell, a lifelong friend.

In 1979, the Wolfs returned permanently to Denver where he became Regional Small Business Advocate.

Wolf was considered a great success moulding together the freshman agency within six mountain states. When he retired in 1985, Gov. Richard Lamm proclaimed "Martin J. Wolf Day" in Colorado, hailing "his dedicated, thoughtful, persuasive leadership."

Wolf went on to assist Gov. Lamm as an AA and completed his long career as Denver Mayor Federico Peña's Assistant for Boards and Commissions from 1988 to 1991.

During retirement, the Wolfs contributed their efforts to numerous not-for-profit endeavors and were much sought after for their calm, genial expertise, achieved over a lifetime of public service. In particular they supported the Multiple Sclerosis Society in response to Sonia's heroic lifelong struggle with MS. They never missed a chance to participate in Presidential campaigns as loyal Democrats.

A memorial service will be held on June 6 at 11 a.m. at the Little Ivy Chapel, 430 S. Quebec St., Denver, CO (Tel: 303 399 0692). Martin Wolf passed from us on February 3, 2016 and Sonia Wolf joined him on May 1, 2016.

The Wolfs are survived by a number of relatives, including Sonia's brother, Eugene Kesser of Miami, FL; Martin's nephew, Paul Downing of Denver and two godchildren whom they considered "grandchildren." Broadway director, Ethan McSweeney of Brooklyn, NY and Federal Trade Commissioner, Terrell McSweeney of Washington, DC.

In lieu of flowers, contributions can be made to the Colorado Multiple Sclerosis Society, 900 S. Broadway, Suite 250, Denver, CO 80209.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO TOM KUNTZ

• Mr. DAINES. Madam President, nestled along the banks of the Madison River, protected by the Madison, Gravelly, and Tobacco Root Mountains sits the charming town of Ennis, MT. Ennis is a strong community of nearly 1,000 citizens. This humble city boasts blue ribbon trout fishing, gorgeous hiking, and attracts people from all walks of life to the spirit and values of the Old West.

Tom Kuntz and his wife made Ennis, MT, their home in 2014. Since then, he has weaved himself into the fabric of this community as a dedicated volunteer at Ennis Community Children's School. After raising kids of his own, Kuntz still wanted to be involved in the lives of children. They say it takes a village to raise a child, and Kuntz takes his part in this happily.

Lacy Keller, director of the Community School, says Kuntz is a weekly volunteer and lends a hand whenever and wherever he can. "He comes in every week, hangs out with the kids, comes on field trips, fixes our bikes and broken toys, mows the lawn, he does whatever he can for us and the kids." The community school averages 20-25 children ranging in ages from 2-12, and Keller says that all of them adore Kuntz.

Just a few weeks ago the kids couldn't wait to invite him on one of

their hiking trips. One girl had recently fractured her foot and would have missed out on the group adventure if it weren't for Kuntz. Keller says that Kuntz graciously carried the little girl on his back up and down the mountain trail. Together the pair spent the day smiling, laughing, and Kuntz even sang songs to entertain her and the students throughout the day.

Kuntz is a selfless volunteer who donates his time and money and expects very little in return. On numerous occasions he has purchased items out of his own pocket to help out with maintenance or building projects. Most recently, Kuntz helped to complete a garden for the school so that students can grow vegetables and cultivate a first-hand knowledge of agriculture.

He embodies the diligent and gracious heart of Ennis citizens and is instilling that into the future Montana farmers, educators, and leaders growing up in Ennis. Montana is truly one of the last best places, and I am honored that Tom is so invested in the success of our children. Thank you, Tom, and welcome home.●

TRIBUTE TO NOAH COZAD

• Mr. ROUNDS. Madam President, today I recognize Noah Cozad, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Noah is a graduate of Washington High School in Sioux Falls, SD. He recently graduated from the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis, where he studied political science, global studies, and German. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience and who has been a true asset to the office.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Noah for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ANDREW LEIFERMAN

• Mr. ROUNDS. Madam President, today I recognize Andrew Leiferman, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Andrew is a graduate of T.F. Riggs High School in Pierre, SD. He attends the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, where he studies finance and economics. He is an analytical and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience and who has been a true asset to the office.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Andrew for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS MCNAMARA

• Mr. ROUNDS. Madam President, today I recognize Thomas McNamara,

an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Thomas is a graduate of St. John's College High School in Washington, DC. He attends the University of Texas at Austin, where he studies business and accounting. He is an inquisitive and committed worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience and who has been a true asset to the office.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Thomas for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 2015, the Secretary of the Senate, on July 8, 2016, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1777) to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the "Former Presidents Act of 1958", with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 524) to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, with amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 2943. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes

The message further announced that the House insist upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2943) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for mili-

tary activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that the following Members be the managers of the conference on the part of the House:

From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of the Senate bill and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. THORNBERRY, FORBES, MILLER of Florida, WILSON of South Carolina, LoBIONDO, BISHOP of Utah, TURNER, KLINE, ROGERS of Alabama, FRANKS of Arizona, SHUSTER, CONAWAY, LAMBORN, WITTMAN, GIBSON, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Messrs. LANGEVIN, LARSEN of Washington, COOPER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Messrs. GARAMENDI, JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. PETERS.

From the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for consideration of matters within the jurisdiction of that committee under clause 11 of rule X: Messrs. NUNES, POMPEO, and SCHIFF.

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of sections 571-74 and 578 of the Senate bill, and sections 571, 573, 1098E, and 3512 of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. WALBERG, GUTHRIE, and SCOTT of Virginia.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of sections 3112 and 3123 of the Senate bill, and sections 346, 601, 749, 1045, 1090, 1095, 1673, 3119A, and 3119C of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. LATTA, JOHNSON of Ohio, and PALLONE.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of sections 828, 1006, 1007, 1050, 1056, 1089, 1204, 1211, 1221-23, 1231, 1232, 1242, 1243, 1247, 1252, 1253, 1255-58, 1260, 1263, 1264, 1271-73, 1276, 1283, 1301, 1302, 1531-33, and 1662 of the Senate bill, and sections 926, 1011, 1013, 1083, 1084, 1098K, 1099B, 1099C, 1201, 1203, 1214, 1221-23, 1227, 1229, 1233, 1235, 1236, 1245, 1246, 1250, 1259A-59E, 1259J, 1259L, 1259P, 1259Q, 1259U, 1261, 1262, 1301-03, 1510, 1531-33, 1645, 1653 and 2804 of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROYCE, ZELDIN, and ENGEL.

From the Committee on Homeland Security, for consideration of sections 564 and 1091 of the Senate bill, and sections 1097, 1869, 1869A, and 3510 of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. MCCAUL, DONOVAN, and THOMPSON of Mississippi.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of sections 829J, 829K, 944, 963, 1006, 1023-25, 1053, 1093,

1283, 3303, and 3304 of the Senate bill, and sections 598, 1090, 1098H, 1216, 1261, and 3608 of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GOODLATTE, ISSA, and CONYERS.

From the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of sections 601, 2825, subtitle D of title XXVIII, and section 2852 of the Senate bill, and sections 312, 601, 1090, 1098H, 2837, 2839, 2839A, subtitle E of title XXVIII, sections 2852, 2854, 2855, 2864-66, title XXX, sections 3508, 7005, and title LXXXIII of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. COOK, HARDY, and GRIJALVA.

From the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for consideration of sections 339, 703, 819, 821, 829H, 829I, 861, 944, 1048, 1054, 1097, 1103-07, 1109-13, 1121, 1124, 1131-33, 1135, and 1136 of the Senate bill, and sections 574, 603, 807, 821, 1048, 1088, 1095, 1098L, 1101, 1102, 1104-06, 1108-11, 1113, 1259C, and 1631 of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CHAFFETZ, RUSSELL, and CUMMINGS.

From the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for consideration of section 874 of the Senate bill and sections 1605, 1673, and title XXXII of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SMITH of Texas, WEBER of Texas, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

From the Committee on Small Business, for consideration of sections 818, 838, 874, and 898 of the Senate bill, and title XVIII of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CHABOT, KNIGHT, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of sections 541, 562, 601, 961, 3302-07, 3501, and 3502 of the Senate bill, and sections 343, 601, 731, 835, 1043, 1671, 3119C, 3501, 3504, 3509, 3512, and title XXXVI of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. HUNTER, ROUZER, and SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

From the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for consideration of sections 706, 755, and 1431 of the Senate bill, and sections 741, 1421, and 1864 of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROE of Tennessee, BOST, and TAKANO.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of section 1271 of the Senate bill, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BRADY of Texas, REICHERT, and LEVIN.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1270. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on July 8, 2016, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1252. An act to authorize a comprehensive strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to reduce global poverty and hunger, achieve food and nutrition security, promote inclusive, sustainable, agricultural-led economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resilience among vulnerable populations, and for other purposes.

S. 2845. An act to extend the termination of sanctions with respect to Venezuela under the Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act of 2014.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2517. A bill to require a report on United States strategy to combat terrorist use of social media, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-295).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2522. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to build partnerships to prevent violence by extremists (Rept. No. 114-296).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 3152. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the tax treatment of certain equity grants; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 3153. A bill to require the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies to take risk profiles and business models of institutions into account when taking regulatory actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 3154. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in awarding a contract for the procurement of goods or services, to give a preference to offerors that employ veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COONS, Mr. LEE, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 3155. A bill to amend chapter 97 of title 28, United States Code, to clarify the exception to foreign sovereign immunity set forth in section 1605(a)(3) of such title; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. Res. 524. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the conflict in Yemen; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REID, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TESTER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CORKER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 525. A resolution designating August 16, 2016, as "National Airborne Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. THUNE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Con. Res. 43. A concurrent resolution supporting the bid of Los Angeles, California, to bring the 2024 Summer Olympic Games back to the United States and pledging the cooperation of Congress with respect to that bid; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Con. Res. 44. A concurrent resolution recognizing the sunflower as the flower for military caregivers; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. Con. Res. 45. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to the disapproval of certain activities of certain companies, trade associations, foundations, and organizations; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 366

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 366, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 804

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 804, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 827

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 827, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure the integrity of voice communications and to prevent unjust or unreasonable discrimination among areas of the United States in the delivery of such communications.

S. 1013

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1013, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage and payment for complex rehabilitation technology items under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1175

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1175, a bill to improve the safety of hazardous materials rail transportation, and for other purposes.

S. 1327

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1327, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act relating to controlled substance analogues.

S. 1458

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1458, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to ensure scientific transparency in the development of environmental regulations and for other purposes.

S. 1737

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1737, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

S. 1874

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1874, a bill to provide protections for workers with respect to their right to select or refrain from selecting representation by a labor organization.

S. 1911

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1911, a bill to implement policies to end preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths globally.

S. 1915

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1915, a bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to make anthrax vaccines and antimicrobials available to emergency response providers, and for other purposes.

S. 1982

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1982, a bill to authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial

and to allow certain private contributions to fund the Wall of Remembrance.

S. 2067

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 2067, a bill to establish EUREKA Prize Competitions to accelerate discovery and development of disease-modifying, preventive, or curative treatments for Alzheimer's disease and related dementia, to encourage efforts to enhance detection and diagnosis of such diseases, or to enhance the quality and efficiency of care of individuals with such diseases.

S. 2216

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2216, a bill to provide immunity from suit for certain individuals who disclose potential examples of financial exploitation of senior citizens, and for other purposes.

S. 2541

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2541, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act to further the conservation of prohibited wildlife species.

S. 2659

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2659, a bill to reaffirm that the Environmental Protection Agency cannot regulate vehicles used solely for competition, and for other purposes.

S. 2759

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2759, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a non-refundable credit for working family caregivers.

S. 2795

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2795, a bill to modernize the regulation of nuclear energy.

S. 2927

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2927, a bill to prevent governmental discrimination against providers of health services who decline involvement in abortion, and for other purposes.

S. 2932

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2932, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the provision of emergency medical services.

S. 2957

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2957, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 50th anniversary of the first manned landing on the Moon.

S. 2962

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2962, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the low-income housing credit, and for other purposes.

S. 2971

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2971, a bill to authorize the National Urban Search and Rescue Response System.

S. 3026

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3026, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to expand and clarify the prohibition on inaccurate caller identification information and to require providers of telephone service to offer technology to subscribers to reduce the incidence of unwanted telephone calls, and for other purposes.

S. 3074

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3074, a bill to authorize the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to establish a Climate Change Education Program.

S. 3106

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3106, a bill to provide a coordinated regional response to effectively manage the endemic violence and humanitarian crisis in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras.

S. 3125

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 3125, a bill to establish a designation for jurisdictions permissive to terrorism financing, to build the capacity of partner nations to investigate, prosecute, and hold accountable terrorist financiers, to impose restrictions on foreign financial institutions that provide financial services for terrorist organizations, and for other purposes.

S. 3135

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3135, a bill to prohibit any officer or employee of the Federal Govern-

ment who has exercised extreme carelessness in the handling of classified information from being granted or retaining a security clearance.

S. 3138

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3138, a bill to prevent Iran from directly or indirectly receiving assistance from the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

S.J. RES. 35

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 35, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule of the Department of Labor relating to "Interpretation of the 'Advice' Exemption in Section 203(c) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act".

S. CON. RES. 30

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 30, a concurrent resolution expressing concern over the disappearance of David Sneddon, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 36

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 36, a concurrent resolution expressing support of the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years, and urging the Federal Republic of Germany to reaffirm its commitment to that goal through a financial commitment to comprehensively address the unique health and welfare needs of vulnerable Holocaust victims, including home care and other medically prescribed needs.

S. CON. RES. 38

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 38, a concurrent resolution reaffirming the Taiwan Relations Act and the Six Assurances as cornerstones of United States-Taiwan relations.

S. RES. 520

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 520, a resolution reaffirming the strong relationship, both in defense and trade, between the United States and the United Kingdom.

S. RES. 521

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 521, a

resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2016 as National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 524—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE CONFLICT IN YEMEN

Mr. MURPHY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 524

Whereas the enduring security partnership between the United States Government and the Government of Saudi Arabia has historically served to preserve the stability of the Middle East;

Whereas the United States Armed Forces provide support to the armed forces of Saudi Arabia and its coalition partners to support their military operations in Yemen, including over 700 air-to-air refueling sorties, and to assist with effectiveness and reduction of collateral damage;

Whereas the United States Government has consistently urged all sides of the conflict in Yemen to take all feasible precautions to reduce the risk of harm to civilians and to comply with their obligations under international humanitarian law, which includes minimizing harm to civilians and differentiating between civilian infrastructure and military objectives; and

Whereas designated foreign terrorist organizations, including al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula and the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant, which pose a grave threat to the national security of the United States, have significantly expanded the territory under their control in Yemen since the Government of Saudi Arabia began military operations in Yemen on March 26, 2015: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) all sides to the current conflict in Yemen should—

(A) abide by international obligations to protect civilians;

(B) facilitate the delivery of humanitarian relief throughout the country; and

(C) respect negotiated cease-fires and work toward a lasting political settlement;

(2) United States-supported Saudi military operations in Yemen should—

(A) take all feasible precautions to reduce the risk of harm to civilians and civilian objects, in compliance with international humanitarian law; and

(B) increase prioritization of targeting of designated foreign terrorist organizations, including al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula and affiliates of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant;

(3) the Houthi-Saleh forces engaged in the conflict in Yemen should—

(A) cease indiscriminate shelling of areas inhabited by civilians; and

(B) allow free access by humanitarian relief organizations seeking to deliver aid to civilian populations under siege; and

(4) a reconstruction and stabilization plan should be developed alongside a negotiated political framework, in consultation with local stakeholders and with robust financing from the international community, including Gulf Cooperation Council countries that have previously made pledges to fund Yemen's post-conflict reconstruction.

SENATE RESOLUTION 525—DESIGNATING AUGUST 16, 2016, AS “NATIONAL AIRBORNE DAY”

Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REID, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TESTER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CORKER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 525

Whereas the members of the airborne forces of the Armed Forces of the United States have a long and honorable history as bold and fierce warriors who, for the national security of the United States and the defense of freedom and peace, project the ground combat power of the United States by air transport to the far reaches of the battle area and to the far corners of the world;

Whereas the experiment of the United States with airborne operations began on June 25, 1940, when the Army Parachute Test Platoon was first authorized by the Department of War, and 48 volunteers began training in July 1940;

Whereas August 16 marks the anniversary of the first official Army parachute jump, which took place on August 16, 1940, to test the innovative concept of inserting United States ground combat forces behind a battle line by means of a parachute;

Whereas the success of the Army Parachute Test Platoon in the days immediately before the entry of the United States into World War II validated the airborne operational concept and led to the creation of a formidable force of airborne formations that included the 11th, 13th, 17th, 82nd, and 101st Airborne Divisions;

Whereas, included in those divisions, and among other separate formations, were many airborne combat, combat support, and combat service support units that served with distinction and achieved repeated success in armed hostilities during World War II;

Whereas the achievements of the airborne units during World War II prompted the evolution of those units into a diversified force of parachute and air-assault units that, over the years, have fought in Korea, Vietnam, Grenada, Panama, the Persian Gulf region, and Somalia, and have engaged in peace-keeping operations in Lebanon, the Sinai Peninsula, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Bosnia, and Kosovo;

Whereas, since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the members of the United States airborne forces, including members of the XVIII Airborne Corps, the 82nd Airborne Division, the 101st Airborne Division, the 173rd Airborne Brigade Combat Team, the 4th Brigade Combat Team (Airborne) of the 25th Infantry Division, the 75th Ranger Regiment, special operations forces of the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force, and other units of the Armed Forces, have demonstrated bravery and honor in combat, stability, and training operations in Afghanistan and Iraq;

Whereas the modern-day airborne forces also include other elite forces composed of airborne trained and qualified special operations warriors, including Army Special Forces, Marine Corps Reconnaissance units, Navy SEALs, and Air Force combat control and pararescue teams;

Whereas, of the members and former members of the United States airborne forces, thousands have achieved the distinction of making combat jumps, dozens have earned

the Medal of Honor, and hundreds have earned the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star, or other decorations and awards for displays of heroism, gallantry, intrepidity, and valor;

Whereas the members and former members of the United States airborne forces are all members of a proud and honorable tradition that, together with the special skills and achievements of those members, distinguishes the members as intrepid combat parachutists, air assault forces, special operation forces, and, in the past, glider troops;

Whereas individuals from every State of the United States have served gallantly in the airborne forces, and each State is proud of the contributions of its paratrooper veterans during the many conflicts faced by the United States;

Whereas the history and achievements of the members and former members of the United States airborne forces warrant special expressions of the gratitude of the people of the United States; and

Whereas, since the airborne forces, past and present, celebrate August 16 as the anniversary of the first official jump by the Army Parachute Test Platoon, August 16 is an appropriate day to recognize as National Airborne Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates August 16, 2016, as “National Airborne Day”; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States to observe National Airborne Day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 43—SUPPORTING THE BID OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, TO BRING THE 2024 SUMMER OLYMPIC GAMES BACK TO THE UNITED STATES AND PLEDGING THE COOPERATION OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO THAT BID

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. THUNE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. CON. RES. 43

Whereas the International Olympic Committee will meet on September 13, 2017, in Lima, Peru, to consider a site for the Summer Olympic and Paralympic Games (in this preamble referred to as the “Games”) in 2024;

Whereas the United States Olympic Committee has selected Los Angeles, California, as the candidate of the United States for the 2024 Games;

Whereas the Games further the cause of world peace and understanding;

Whereas the country that hosts the Games performs an act of international goodwill;

Whereas the Games have not been held in the United States since 1996;

Whereas many of the world-class venues to be used in Los Angeles’ 2024 plan for the Games are already built or are planned as permanent facilities; and

Whereas Los Angeles is positioned to deliver an innovative, fiscally responsible, and sustainable Games: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) advises the International Olympic Committee that the United States would welcome the holding of the 2024 Summer Olympic and Paralympic Games in Los Angeles,

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

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 countermovement 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-founded 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-founded 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

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 for 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 payrolled 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 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. 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