

began to tell something very different than what they knew to the public.

A 1998 Exxon internal memo acknowledged that the “greenhouse effect may be one of the most significant environmental issues for the 1990s,” but Exxon’s position would be to try to “[e]mphasize the uncertainty in scientific conclusions regarding the potential enhanced Greenhouse effect,” and that became the drumbeat of the industry: minimize the danger—the one they knew—that the greenhouse effect may be one of the most significant environmental issues for the 1990s but, instead, undermine the science.

So the industry set up front groups with innocuous-sounding names like the Global Climate Coalition or the Information Council on the Environment to do this PR work for it. The scientific brief notes this bit of industry propaganda from 1996 from the so-called Global Climate Coalition: “If there is an anthropogenic component to this observed warming, the GCC believes that it must be very small.”

Well, here is what an earlier draft of the same document said: “[The] scientific basis for the Greenhouse Effect and the potential impacts of human emissions of greenhouse gases such as CO₂ on climate is well established and cannot be denied.”

They just weren’t telling the truth. They knew, and they said things they knew were not true.

Money poured from the oil industry into these denialist groups. In 1991, the so-called Information Council on the Environment launched a nationwide campaign with one goal, to “reposition global warming as theory (not fact).” This thing they said was well established and cannot be denied, they decided to reposition as theory, not fact.

The polluters kept this up all the way through the 1990s. A 1998 American Petroleum Institute strategy memo tells what they wanted people to believe, even though they knew it wasn’t true. They said: “[It is] not known for sure whether (a) climate change is actually occurring, or (b) if it is, whether humans really have any influence on it.”

Again, well established, cannot be denied on the one hand and not sure whether it is occurring or whether humans have anything to do with it on the other hand.

Here is Martin Hoffert, who was an Exxon scientist for 20 years. He said:

Even though we—

“We,” meaning the Exxon scientists.

Even though we were writing all these papers . . . [saying] that climate change from CO₂ emissions was going to change the climate of the earth . . . the front office—

The front office said otherwise.

. . . the front office which was concerned with promoting the products of the company was also supporting people that we call climate change deniers.

So even as they spun this massive fraud out to the public, Big Oil internally took the evidence of climate change seriously. They took the evidence of climate change seriously enough to factor it into their own plan-

et. So while they were telling the public “This isn’t for real, and we don’t have anything to do it with, and the science isn’t secure,” they were doing their own planning based on that very science.

For instance, in designing and building the Sable gas field project off the shores of Halifax, Nova Scotia, Mobil, Shell, and Imperial Oil explicitly told their own engineers about sea level rise. They said that “[a]n estimated rise . . . due to global warming, of 0.5 meters may be assumed.”

Big Oil protected its own assets against predicted sea level rise based on this science, while, at the same time, funding a massive campaign of deception to fool the public and policymakers about this science. They protected themselves, and they connived to prevent the public from taking steps to protect itself.

There are some unsung heroes in this climate battle. Among them number the dedicated and assiduous group of scholars and scientists who track this climate denial apparatus that this industry built. Many of them are the authors of this brief, such as Robert Brule, Justin Farrell, Benjamin Franta, Stephan Lewandowsky, Naomi Oreskes, and Geoffrey Supran. They are just a few. There are many, many others who are watching, examining, reporting, and subject to a peer review chronicling the climate denial apparatus set up by the oil industry to fool the public. They patiently and thoroughly assembled in their brief a record of industry malfeasance, and they are helping to make sure that the long history of industry deception is part of the court’s official record.

I thank them for their work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MCSALLY). The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all postcloture time on the Reader nomination expire at 4 p.m. on Wednesday, March 6; further, that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for 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.

NOMINATION OBJECTION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I intend to object to any unanimous consent request relating to the nomination of William R. Evanina to be Direc-

tor of the National Counterintelligence and Security Center, PNI92.

When I noticed my intention to place a hold on this nominee back in June of 2018, I made it very clear to the public and to the administration my reasons for doing so, and I put my statement of those reasons in the RECORD. I have done that consistently, not only since the rules of the Senate require every Member to do that, but even before that rule was ever put in place.

I continue to experience difficulties obtaining relevant documents and briefings from the Justice Department and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, ODNI, related to 2016 election controversies. On several occasions, Deputy Attorney General, DAG, Rod Rosenstein has personally assured me that the Senate Judiciary Committee would receive equal access to information provided to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, HPSCI, with regard to any concessions in its negotiations regarding pending subpoenas from that committee. However, I and the Judiciary Committee have not received equal access.

For example, on August 7, 2018, I wrote to the Justice Department and pointed out that the House Intelligence Committee had received documents related to Bruce Ohr that we had not received. The Department initially denied those records had been provided to the House Intelligence Committee. After my staff confronted the Department, we eventually received some Bruce Ohr documents. In that 2018 letter I have referred to, I asked for documents based on my equal access agreement with Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein, and I have not received a response to date.

I have since learned that the Justice Department has taken the position that Director Coats has prohibited them from sharing the requested records with the committee.

In addition to the records request, in May 2018, the Director of National Intelligence and the Justice Department provided a briefing in connection with a pending House Intel subpoena to which no Senate Judiciary Committee member was invited.

Thus far, the committee’s attempts to schedule an equivalent briefing have been ignored.

The administration’s continued, ongoing, and blatant lack of cooperation has forced my hand. I must object to any consideration of this nomination.

In the authorizing resolution that created the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, SSCI, the Senate explicitly reserves for other standing committees, such as the Senate Judiciary Committee, independent authority to “study and review any intelligence or intelligence-related activity” and “to obtain full and prompt access to the product of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of a department or agency,” when such a