

(B) shall apply to petitions for Commonwealth Only Transitional Workers filed on or after such date.

(2) **AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in the Secretary's discretion, may delay the effective date of any provision of this Act relating to Commonwealth Only Transitional Workers until the effective date of the interim final rule described in subsection (b), except for provisions providing annual numerical caps for such workers.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

ADMIRAL LLOYD R. "JOE" VASEY PACIFIC WAR COMMEMORATIVE DISPLAY ESTABLISHMENT ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 360, H.R. 4300.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4300) to authorize Pacific Historic Parks to establish a commemorative display to honor members of the United States Armed Forces who served in the Pacific Theater of World War II, and for other purposes.

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

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

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

The bill (H.R. 4300) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, April 24; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. I further ask that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Duncan nomination; further, that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and leader remarks count postcloture on the Duncan nomination. Finally, I ask 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.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come be-

fore the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator DURBIN and Senator WHITEHOUSE.

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

The Senator from Illinois.

DARK MONEY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for allowing Senator WHITEHOUSE and myself to conclude today's session.

I want first to salute my colleague, Senator WHITEHOUSE, who will be on the floor momentarily. He has come to the floor many times to talk about issues relative to climate change and global warming. He has come on so many occasions that I have lost track, but it shows his dedication to this issue.

He has also been outspoken on the issue of campaign financing and what is happening in America today. We all know that it takes big money to run big campaigns, and we all know that many people are put off by politicians who are waiting on wealthy donors to give them the money to make it across the finish line. That is a fact.

I have always said that in this business of politics, there are two categories. There are multimillionaires and mere mortals, and I am in the second category, never having enough money to finance my own campaign, prevailing on my friends to help. It is too bad that politics has reached the level where campaigns are so long and so expensive.

Tonight Senator WHITEHOUSE and I will highlight one aspect of that issue that is particularly worrisome and really should be front and center; that is, the so-called secret contributions, the dark money—money that is being spent on political campaigns with no fingerprints. It is a growing phenomenon, and it is troublesome to think that our democracy has reached that point.

I am going to speak about one aspect of it, and Senator WHITEHOUSE will follow me on the topic. I thank him for initiating this opportunity this evening.

Let me tell my colleagues what my topic is about. It is one aspect of it. We know that the United States leads the world in medical research. Because of the U.S. scientific community, HIV/AIDS is no longer a death sentence, polio has been eradicated in this country, people survive cancer and heart attacks in record number, and a child born today will likely live to be 78 years of age—nearly three decades longer than a baby born in 1900.

Thanks to the U.S. scientific community, we know the true dangers of tobacco. Now we are learning about the dangers related to e-cigarettes. But it was not always the case that the dangers of cigarette smoking were commonly accepted knowledge. For years,

the tobacco industry claimed to be interested in rigorous, independent science. They wanted to sell less harmful products, and they wanted to support scientific research. Evidence has now been disclosed which unequivocally demonstrates that tobacco companies, by funding alternate research and funneling money into front organizations to do their bidding, have literally corrupted the science on this issue. They produced products they knew were no less hazardous and sought to influence elections to ensure the friendliest voices supporting tobacco were elected to office at Federal, State, and local levels all across the country.

If this tactic sounds familiar, it should. It is exactly what the Koch brothers are currently doing with respect to sowing seeds of doubt about the causes of climate change and helping to elect Republicans who are climate change deniers.

I have said repeatedly on the floor of the Senate and I will repeat this evening: The Republican Party of the United States of America is the only major political party in the world today that denies climate change. I have said that repeatedly, expecting some Republican to come to the floor and say it is not true. One of them whispered to me in the elevator after I said this a few times: I think there is a party in Australia that also denies climate change. That is the best they could come up with.

How did this happen? There was a time when Republicans were the leaders when it came to environmental protection. If I am not mistaken, I say to my colleague, I think it was President Richard Nixon who created the Environmental Protection Agency.

When I look back on my own experience in Congress, there were Republicans who stood up and spoke up on the issue of climate change. I remember when JOHN MCCAIN and Joe Lieberman were the two lead sponsors on a bill dealing with global warming. It has been within my period of time serving in the Senate, but not anymore. It has changed dramatically. The Koch brothers, I think, are behind it. They didn't come up with this strategy on their own. They were able to look at Big Tobacco's playbook from years gone by.

The first thing Big Tobacco did was to question legitimate science. The Koch brothers got right in line. They have been questioning legitimate science when it comes to global warming, and they pioneered efforts to use dark money to influence America's public opinion and to sway elections without ever really revealing their true identities or motivations.

I look back on tobacco and cancer. I am one—probably, like most Americans—who has lost a dearly loved member of my family to tobacco and cancer. My father died when he was 53 years of age from lung cancer. I was 14 years old. He smoked two packs of Camels a day. It was a horrible death.

He lingered for 100 days in the hospital before he died. It is something you never forget. There is hardly a family in America who doesn't have a similar story to tell.

By the early 1950s, evidence linking smoking and lung cancer was growing. Tobacco companies could have responded by taking steps to protect American consumers. What they did was to launch a conspiracy to challenge the science behind tobacco. In 1953, tobacco companies hired the PR firm Hill+Knowlton to lead a pioneering effort to discredit emerging science and keep people smoking. At the heart of this strategy was an effort to manufacture a scientific controversy by insisting there were two sides to the debate about whether cigarette smoking caused cancer. Tobacco companies identified and paid scientists who had expressed skepticism about the health risk of cigarettes, who were critical of statistical methods, and who had offered alternative theories of what really was causing cancer among smokers.

They also formed an industry-sponsored research entity that claimed to support independent research. Instead, the organization's main purpose was to serve the industry's public relations interests—namely, to sow seeds of doubt about the health risks of smoking and not advance science. Does it sound familiar to the scientists sowing seeds of doubt about global warming?

As more and more independent research found an association between smoking and disease, tobacco companies used their so-called independent research organizations to insist that there was a great deal of uncertainty about whether smoking caused cancer. These entities supported scientists who showed a willingness to generate data and provide testimony that would support the industry. Meanwhile, tobacco-friendly elected officials were happy to accept this bogus, fake science while also receiving generous campaign contributions from Big Tobacco.

The tobacco industry efforts reached new highs—or lows, if you wish—when, in the early 1970s, there was growing concern about the impact of secondhand smoke. Arizona became the first State to restrict indoor smoking in some areas in 1973 after a Surgeon General report mentioned that secondhand smoke could be harmful to non-smokers. By 1981, 8 years later, 36 States had some type of smoking restriction in place.

I know this issue, personally, because as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives I decided to offer an amendment to ban smoking on airplanes. At the time, I was opposed by the leadership of both the Republicans and the Democrats in the House of Representatives. Of course, anyone from a tobacco-growing State or from the South opposed my efforts to ban smoking on airplanes. Well, it turned out we had a lucky break here and there in the House Rules Committee

and got to bring the measure to the floor of the House for a vote, and I succeeded in passing the first restriction on smoking on airplanes.

It turned out the reason was obvious: The largest frequent flier club in America is the U.S. Congress. We spend half of our lives on airplanes, and we know better when people say: You are sitting in the nonsmoking section of an airplane. Everybody was in the smoking section in the back of the airplane was puffing away.

So that measure passed. I called my friend Frank Lautenberg of New Jersey, then a Senator, and said: Frank, can you take this up in the Senate? He said he would, and he did, and the two of us passed the basic prohibition of smoking on airplanes.

By the 1980s, evidence had accumulated about the health risks of secondhand smoke and, in 1986, the Surgeon General concluded that secondhand smoke causes lung cancer in non-smokers and was associated with respiratory illness in children. Once again, tobacco companies didn't accept the obvious. They responded to the evidence of harm from secondhand smoke and restrictions on smokers by launching an effort to undermine the scientific evidence. They identified, trained, and subsidized friendly scientists and sponsored symposia all around the world to feature these scientists without revealing they were paying them to come up with these opinions.

In 1988, tobacco companies began funding the Center for Indoor Air Research. This is after we started banning the use of cigarettes on airplanes, for example. Like the other so-called independent research organizations funded by tobacco companies, CIAR—the Center for Indoor Air Research—allowed tobacco companies to fund and control the use of research favorable to their market position so they could continue to sell addictive, cancer-causing products to more and more people—especially to kids. To shift emphasis away from secondhand smoke, the so-called research institute supported studies to weaken the case for regulation of tobacco.

Why is it important to reflect on history of 30 years ago? It is happening all over again. Tobacco companies continue to provide funding to third-party organizations that advocate policies that align with the interests—such as e-cigarettes—without ever publicly disclosing their ties to these tobacco companies. In recent years, tobacco companies have sought to advance the idea that bringing to market so-called lower risk tobacco products will actually benefit public health. They warn that overregulations are going to hurt their business.

Tobacco companies have provided funding to an array of think tanks—the Heartland Institute, the R Street Institute, the National Center for Public Policy Research, just to name a few. These tobacco industry-funded groups

have sent letters to policymakers, they publish op-eds, they write reports, and they issue press releases that mirror the tobacco industry's position, warning that any future FDA rules will burden the tobacco industry and undermine efforts to bring a so-called lower risk product to market. Many of these groups have historically been silent or opposed policies that have proven effective in reducing smoking rates. Do you know what reduces smoking more than anything else? Cost of the product. As we have seen States and the Federal Government raise the tobacco tax, we have seen use of the product diminish. They haven't supported that, of course, and they don't support smoke-free laws or mass media campaigns.

Last year, Philip Morris, notorious as a tobacco company, established the Foundation for a Smoke-Free World. Let me repeat that. Philip Morris, a tobacco company, established the Foundation for a Smoke-Free World. They are going to fund research to end cigarette smoking and provide \$80 million a year for 12 years. Given their history and their continued opposition to proven policies to reduce cigarette use, excuse me if I am skeptical.

That is the problem, isn't it? Research from the Foundation for a Smoke-Free World or TV ads or op-eds from the Heartland Institute or the National Center for Public Policy Research just may seem harmless, but if the American public and elected officials knew that R.J. Reynolds, Altria, or Philip Morris—some of the biggest tobacco companies—were behind this research PR, they would be as skeptical as I am.

One more example: corporations and wealthy donors flooding cash into efforts to influence the American public and American political officials. In addition to funding bogus research, we know tobacco companies have poured millions of dollars into nonprofit, dark money organizations, which, in turn, spend millions of dollars to influence elections, never disclosing who they are or where the money is coming from. Dark money makes it nearly impossible to find the true sources behind the attack ads and political campaigns these organizations fund, but sometimes, thanks to the news media and transparency organizations, the donors are revealed.

In 2013, the Center for Public Integrity reported that the tobacco giant Reynolds American, Incorporated, funded several dark money groups during the 2012 election cycle, including conservative activist Grover Norquist's Americans for Tax Reform, the Koch brothers' Americans for Prosperity—a conservative political advocacy group—and the Partnership for Ohio's Future, an anti-union organization backed by the Ohio Chamber of Commerce.

The only reason we know Reynolds was the secret source is because it was disclosed at the behest of an unnamed

shareholder; otherwise, these donations and the involvement of tobacco companies would have remained a secret.

Whether they are quietly funding attack ads or the release of supposedly unbiased reports, corporations and wealthy donors are using anonymous, dark money contributions to influence America's public, casting doubt on legitimate science and trying to sway elections without ever revealing their true identities and motivations.

It is not just limited to Big Tobacco and their campaigns to turn public opinion against tobacco taxes and smoke-free laws; the Koch brothers have built on this model and expanded the Big Tobacco playbook. They are pushing faulty research in an attempt to obscure the reality of global warming and using dark money to influence our political system. Why would the Koch brothers care so much? They are in the oil business. It is so a rich few can benefit financially at the expense of everyone else if they vote the Koch brothers' line—and that is at the expense of our children and grandchildren.

It is time to put an end to dark money influence in elections.

I yield the floor to the leader on this issue in the Senate Democratic caucus, Senator WHITEHOUSE.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

MR. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes.

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

MR. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I thank Senator DURBIN, who is a leader in our caucus, but also a very important leader on these issues.

We are here this evening because a group of us now embark on a series of speeches on the Senate floor to shine some light into a network of phony front groups—a web of deceit conceived and bankrolled by the Koch brothers and other self-interested billionaires to advocate for very selfish and unpatriotic policies.

This web of deceit has infiltrated and populated the Trump administration, and it is swamping the interests of everyday Americans. I will not dwell on its policies. The billionaires having to hide behind these front groups tells you all you need to know about their policies.

There are plenty of billionaires these days, and a bunch of them do pretty good stuff, but there is an extremist subset trying to quietly remake America to their ideology, and they are behind the web of deceit.

When an issue affects some hyperwealthy interest group, the web activates. In the Halls of Congress, on cable news, in opinion pages, on social media, the front groups will be everywhere, with fake news, bogus studies, and phony science.

This is a well-studied phenomenon. Two speeches ago, I had a stack of books about this high here on the desk

with authors who had written about it. There is also excellent academic research by Robert Brulle, Riley Dunlap, Nancy MacLean, David Rosner, Gerald Markowitz, Michael Mann, and many others who deserve credit for shining light into these front groups.

The graphic behind us is actually a diagram from the work of Professor Brulle. To the uninitiated, it might appear that these are all actual, different groups and that they might actually represent—who knows—thousands, maybe even millions of real people across America. That is the scheme. These front groups are designed to provide a simulacrum, a manufactured, artificial appearance of public support for ideologies and policies that actually just benefit the richest of the rich or the “pollutingest” of the polluters.

Got a tax scam to sell? Call in the front groups who will parrot, falsely, that the middle class will benefit, when it is the billionaires and big corporations that actually make out like bandits.

Want to block action on climate change and let fossil fuel companies keep polluting for no charge? Quick, activate those front groups to spread climate denial, the original fake news: Climate change isn't happening; or, OK, maybe it is, but we don't really know how human activity is the cause; or, OK, maybe it is, but who knows how bad it will really get. OK, really bad, but it is too hard, so let's leave it to some other generation.

Never mind what the real scientists have to say. The web of deceit has fake scientists, and it doesn't matter to the web if their phony scientists are right or wrong. They couldn't care less. They just have to keep their fake scientists talking, make it seem like there may be a real question about the science—in essence, pollute the public's mind.

While these phony front groups are out working their PR magic, connected lobbyists and electioneering groups stalk the Halls of Congress, ready to kneecap Republicans who might—like Bob Inglis did—have the temerity to think about acting on climate. More generally, this web of deceit has infected the Republican Party with climate denial, all to help polluters pollute for free. That is part of the creepy billionaire ideology behind the web of deceit.

Of course, a web like this has its stooges and quislings, and in the Trump administration they can get to high places. Imagine if you have been building this web of deceit for decades, and one day you get to plant your phony minions into real, high-level government positions. Oh, what wonderful legitimacy, and what would you not then do to defend your stooges?

We just saw this web of deceit spring into action to defend fossil fuel stooge Scott Pruitt, our ethically challenged Environmental Protection Agency Administrator.

You may have seen the steady stream of news about Pruitt's ethical

lapses: huge bills for taxpayers for first-class flights and 24/7 security, even on family trips; a \$43,000 Maxwell Smart secret phone booth; a jaunt to Morocco for the natural gas industry; a condo deal from a lobbyist with business before the EPA; massive raises to cronies from Oklahoma through a loophole in, of all things, the Safe Drinking Water Act. He even was caught firing or reassigning people who told him he could not sign up for perks like a private jet service at taxpayer expense.

Talk about lights and sirens. This guy is a lights-and-sirens affront to any concept of decency in government service. As scandal after scandal piled up, pressure mounted to fire the scoundrel.

Never fear, the web of deceit is here. Nearly two dozen phony industry front groups rode to the rescue, urging the President to keep Pruitt on. Here is the letter. As you can see, all these groups' logos are on it. They praise Pruitt for his work to help fossil fuel polluters pollute. They rejoice that his rollback of fuel economy standards will raise drivers' fuel costs. They applaud his getting rid of independent scientists and putting industry insiders on EPA advisory committees.

It is actually the reporting of Pruitt's scandals, they write, that is the conspiracy. “This whole ordeal is nothing more than an orchestrated political campaign,” they write—“an orchestrated political campaign”—so says the polluters' orchestrated political campaign to save Pruitt's political hide. If you want to see something about orchestrated political campaigns, this is it.

The web also went to war in the press and on social media for Pruitt. The so-called Heartland Institute defended Pruitt as “the single most effective appointment of the president of the United States,” and went after Republican Representative CARLOS CURBELO on Twitter for breaking with Republican complicity by calling on Pruitt to resign.

Another tool of this web is a front group called the Media Research Center. They are also on this letter. The Media Research Center's job, when stooges are caught stooging, is to go on the attack and accuse the journalists of bias. This Media Research Center has a website called NewsBusters devoted to attacking honest reporting that it doesn't like. In articles and on Twitter, it attacked ABC News and other networks for reporting on Pruitt's expensive first-class travel.

Other groups on this letter also took to Twitter to defend their boy Pruitt, including the Energy and Environment Legal Institute, the American Energy Alliance, and the Conservative Partnership Institute. “Orchestrated political campaign,” indeed.

When I saw this orchestrated “protect Pruitt” letter, it reminded me of this one, which I received in the summer of 2016. Back then, a group of us delivered speeches exposing this web of

deceit's role in blocking action on climate change. We called it the web of denial because climate denial is the web's recipe for delay and inaction on carbon pollution.

More than 20 organizations in the Koch brothers' network, with lengthy records of climate change denial, objected to being called out as Koch-linked climate change deniers. To challenge our assertion that they were an orchestrated bunch of front groups, they responded with this orchestrated letter from all the front groups. They went on to say it was "tyranny" that we would call out who actually pays them and what interests they actually front for. I can't wait to hear the caterwauling from them now.

Why are these polluter-funded front groups so desperate to protect Pruitt? That question sort of answers itself, doesn't it? They do a good job of hiding. Unfortunately, our laws allow wealthy donors to funnel money through opaque brokers and anonymous shell companies. The dark money could be from the ultrawealthy, right-wing Mercer family, from the Koch brothers' empire, from ExxonMobil, from whomever—even a Russian oligarch. We get only occasional glimpses into these dark-money channels of influence in our political system, often through leaks or mistaken filings or extraordinary, painstaking research. It is not easy.

For the 22 front groups that signed this recent letter, we have figured out one common denominator: the Koch brothers' empire. Let's go down the list.

We will start with the Heartland Institute. We know that Heartland received at least \$100,000 from foundations connected to the Koch brothers, and it received at least \$7 million from DonorsTrust. But what is DonorsTrust? It has no business purpose. It is an identity-concealing device whose entire purpose is to launder donations to front groups so that you will not know their real backers. Journalists have learned, however, that the Koch brothers are among the largest, if not the largest, contributors to DonorsTrust.

Back to our list—ALEC: Koch-connected foundations gave ALEC at least \$600,000. Koch Industries is also a donor, but we don't know how much it has given. More secrecy.

Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow: Wow, there is a good name. Who could possibly be against a constructive tomorrow? Certainly not the Kochs, whose foundations gave it at least \$45,000. That will buy a signature on a letter, for sure.

American Energy Alliance: Koch-connected organizations gave the American Energy Alliance at least \$1.7 million.

60 Plus: Koch-backed organizations have given 60 Plus more than \$42 million. This is interesting because 60 Plus is actually a front group that supposedly advocates for senior citizens. So its presence on this Pruitt letter is weird and telling.

Idaho Freedom Foundation: It received at least \$570,000 from the Koch-backed DonorsTrust.

That Media Research Center I talked about received at least \$1 million from DonorsTrust.

Independence Institute: Koch-connected foundations gave the so-called Independence Institute more than \$140,000 while Koch-backed DonorsTrust provided the group more than \$2.5 million.

Conservative Partnership Institute: This is a relatively new group, and we don't yet know who is funding it, but we do know it is staffed by folks from other Koch-backed groups. This web of deceit shares not only common funding but common personnel.

American Commitment received at least \$21 million from Koch-affiliated organizations.

The Center for Security Policy received at least \$1.9 million from Koch-backed DonorsTrust. Like 60 Plus, this Center for Security Policy doesn't usually work on environment or energy issues. It lists its research areas as "Shariah, Defense, Homeland Security, Israel & the Middle East, Sovereignty, and National Security & New Media." Its presence on the Pruitt letter is also weird and telling.

The Institute for Liberty received at least \$1.8 million from Koch-affiliated organizations.

Americans for Limited Government received at least \$5.6 million from Koch groups.

Tea Party Patriots Citizens Fund: We don't know how much money this group received directly from Koch-affiliated organizations, but we do know that Tea Party Patriots was created by yet another front group called Freedom Works. We are getting into front groups within front groups here, folks, and Freedom Works received at least \$12 million from Koch-affiliated foundations.

Mountain States Legal Foundation received at least \$90,000 from Koch-backed DonorsTrust.

Energy & Environment Legal Institute received at least \$16,000 from Koch-affiliated foundations and at least \$500,000 from Koch-backed DonorsTrust. This, by the way—Energy & Environmental Legal Institute—is a particularly creepy group whose function—hold your breath—is actually to harass legitimate scientists. That is what they do.

Georgia Public Policy Foundation received at least \$125,000 from Koch-backed DonorsTrust.

Mississippi Center for Public Policy received at least \$500,000 from Koch-backed DonorsTrust.

Carbon Sense Coalition: We don't know yet how much money this group received from Koch-affiliated organizations, but we do know that it works in close concert with many of the other front groups in the Koch-funded web of deceit.

American Family Association received at least \$50,000 from Koch-affili-

ated organizations. This beauty of an organization has been identified as an anti-LGBTQ hate group—hate group—by the Southern Poverty Law Center. But here it is, signing a letter boosting Trump's EPA Administrator. Weird, again—but telling.

ConservativeHQ.com: We don't know how much money this website received from Koch-affiliated organizations, but its job is to provide favorable online coverage of the Kochs and the web of front groups.

Climate Science Coalition of America: Its parent organization received at least \$45,000 from Koch-affiliated organizations.

If you do the math, that is actually a grand total of at least \$87,281,000 received by these 22 front groups from Koch-affiliated organizations, and that is only the part that has leaked out through the screens of secrecy. Who knows how much dark money remains hidden behind those screens?

Here is the point. This is a scam—so much money and so many front group tentacles. Once you see what is going on, you realize these front groups are just tentacles of the creepy billionaires, of giant polluting corporations, and of the other special interests that fund them. The tentacles don't represent America; they represent a bunch of polluters and billionaires.

The pollution angle keeps rearing its ugly head in all of this—and guess what. Koch Industries is a very big polluter. In 2014, Koch Industries dumped more than 6.6 million pounds of toxic pollution into our waterways. That same year, Koch Industries spent almost \$14 million in lobbying the Federal Government. One of Koch Industries' biggest targets has been the EPA's clean water rule—6.6 million pounds of toxic pollution into our waterways, millions in lobbying to target the clean water rule. Since the clean water rule protects our rivers and streams—sources of drinking water for millions of Americans—when Pruitt promised to repeal the clean water rule, that could mean big bucks for polluters like Koch Industries.

Koch Industries has major holdings in the energy industry—refining gasoline and other petroleum products, operating pipelines, and manufacturing petrochemicals. So when Pruitt promised to repeal the Clean Power Plan and undo fuel economy standards, that could mean big bucks for Koch Industries. Protecting clean water, reducing carbon emissions, and saving consumers money at the pump may be good for the planet and may be good for the American people, but these things are not good for polluters. So queue the web of deceit for Scott Pruitt to write letters and bombard social media and the press with front group disinformation.

If the public could see it is just a couple of billionaires and oil companies and coal barons who are defending Pruitt, the jig would be up—Americans could see the special interest motive.

Yet add on this web of phony front groups and hide-the-special-interest funding in dark money channels, and it is money well spent if Koch Industries and companies like it can go right on polluting—polluted water, polluted air, climate change unchecked—some victory, but that is who they are.

Americans need to get a good look at these phony front groups, so we will explain who these groups are, where they get their money, and how they have installed operatives throughout the Trump administration.

Once upon a time, Donald Trump said he didn't want Koch money or anything else from them. It turns out doz-

ens of Koch apparatchiks are running the Trump administration. The Kochs probably have more control in this administration than the Trumps. They are making the Trumps their chumps.

As we spotlight this web of deceit, keep in mind this one simple truth: This is not democracy. This is the corruption of democracy. It is the corruption of democracy to benefit narrow special interests at everyone else's expense. It is the enemy of our vision of America as a shining city on a hill.

We face a choice now in this country—to reclaim our destiny as that shining city on a hill that John Winthrop and Ronald Reagan spoke of or

to sink into the corrupting ooze of special interest dark money, hidden influence, phony front groups, and fake news.

History is watching.
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 7:21 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, April 24, 2018, at 10 a.m.