The preamble was agreed to.
(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

NORTH PACIFIC FISHERIES CONVENTION IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 405, S. 1335. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The minor assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1335) to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of the High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean, as adopted at Tokyo on February 24, 2012, and for other purposes.

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

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sullivan substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be 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 amendment (No. 4003) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today’s RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

The bill (S. 1335), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 2016

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate comes to business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 18; 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 be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein, and with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half; that following morning business, the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 2577; finally, that all time during the adjournment and morning business count postcloiture on the Blunt-Murray amendment No. 3990.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHOUSE. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I thank the chairman for giving me this time at the end of the day and congratulate her on the progress that has been made with the senior Senator, JACK REED, on this bill.

This is the 137th time that I have addressed this body, asking us to wake up to the threat of climate change. While we sleepwalk, our atmosphere and oceans continue to suffer the damage caused by carbon pollution. As we do nothing, more and more Americans demand action. Look at the new findings from Yale and George Mason Universities. Despite years of industry climate denial propaganda, 75 percent of all registered voters—88 percent of Democrats, 78 percent of Independents, and 61 percent of Republicans—support regulating carbon dioxide as a pollutant; 74 percent of registered voters—88 percent of Democrats, 74 percent of Independents, and 56 percent of Republicans—say corporations and industry should do more to address global warming, and 68 percent of all registered voters—86 percent of Democrats, 66 percent of Independents, and 47 percent of Republicans—say fossil fuel companies should be required to pay a carbon tax and the money should be used to reduce other taxes, such as income taxes, by an equal amount.

So why does this Chamber sit idly by and not even have that conversation? Take the fossil fuel industry. For years Big Oil and its allies funded outright denial of man-made climate change. Now they have shifted strategies, from denial to degrading—saying one thing but doing another.

Take ExxonMobil. In 2007, the oil giant committed to stop funding the front groups that promote science denial. Now they have shifted strategies, from denial to degrading—saying one thing but doing another.
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Take ExxonMobil. In 2007, the oil giant committed to stop funding the front groups that promote science denial. Now they have shifted strategies, from denial to degrading—saying one thing but doing another.

I have a revenue-neutral carbon tax bill, along with Senator SCHATZ, and I can assure this body that ExxonMobil is publicly saying it is separated from the climate denial outfits, but it is still subsidizing their work to undermine public understanding of climate change. This doesn’t even count whatever they may be doing behind the dark money curtain that wretched Citizens United decision gave them.

The hypocrisy turns even worse in fossil fuel industry lobbying. An ExxonMobil executive recently stated: “When governments are considering policy options, ExxonMobil believes a revenue-neutral carbon tax is the most effective way to manage carbon emissions.”

I want to begin by saying one thing and doing another—ExxonMobil is publicly saying it is separated from the climate denial outfits, but it is still subsidizing their work to undermine public understanding of climate change. This doesn’t even count whatever they may be doing behind the dark money curtain that wretched Citizens United decision gave them.
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I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the letter at the conclusion of my remarks.

The question is, Has any Member of the Senate ever seen Shell or BP or Statoil or any other oil and gas company, or any of their lobbying organizations, even once lobby Members of Congress on carbon pricing—other than, of course, to say, hell, no.

My bill with Senator SCHATZ, the American Opportunity Carbon Fee Act, provides a market-based, revenue-neutral carbon fee—just like these companies say they support. It is built on principles espoused by leading Republican economists and by Republican former officeholders.

Despite the industry's claims, I have seen exactly zero evidence that any of these companies—or their sizable trade associations—are using any of their lobbying muscle to advance carbon pricing legislation. Instead, ExxonMobil and Shell and the trade associations that represent them continue to pump millions of dollars into political machinery designed to lobby against any action on climate change. They say one thing, but they do another.

This chart from the nonprofit research organization InfluenceMap shows the streams of money flowing from ExxonMobil and from Shell, as well as from the American Petroleum Institute, the Western States Petroleum Association, and even the Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association. In 2015 alone, ExxonMobil spent $27 million, Shell spent $22 million, and the American Petroleum Institute spent $65 million on obstructive climate lobbying. This money deluge includes advertising and public relations, direct lobbying in Congress and at statehouses, and political contributions and electioneering.

They say one thing but do another—to the tune of $100 million a year.

As late as 2014, ExxonMobil gave the U.S. Chamber of Commerce $1 million for the chamber to propagate its climate message, delivered loud and clear not only here in Congress but in the courts, of absolute intransigence against any serious climate action. The U.S. Chamber is powerful, and in Congress we all see everywhere around us its implacable hostility against serious climate legislation.

They say one thing but do another. Soon after, ExxonMobil's stated support for a revenue-neutral carbon tax and its lobbying activities in Congress against any such thing is why Representative TED LIEU of California recently wrote for Harvard Business Review explaining this reality.

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

(From the Harvard Business Review, Feb. 25, 2016)

THE CLIMATE MOVEMENT NEEDS MORE CORPORATE LOBBYISTS

(By Sheldon Whitehouse)

Across corporate America, there is broad support for action on climate change. Leadership has become a matter of corporate responsibility. Companies are adopting policies and actions across the board to become sustainable. No lobbying. Apple and Google and Facebook are forward-looking, cutting-edge companies of the future, and they lead in sustainability. No lobbying.

From Coca-Cola to PepsiCo to Apple to Google to Facebook, the corporate handiwork all around me—and they have no corporate opposition.

Let me use the example of two good guys: Coca-Cola and PepsiCo. I believe they care about climate change. They have no conflict of interest like fossil fuel companies do. Both signed a public letter urging strong action on climate change, and both supported bipartisan action on the carbon pricing they claim to espouse.

I am a sponsor of a Senate carbon fee bill, so I am firsthand about their destructive handiwork all around me—and they have no corporate opposition.

What we see in Congress is that their lobbying is about pushing climate change, but from what I see, corporate opposition in Congress is immense. But in my experience, exactly zero of it is dedicated to lobbying for a good, bipartisan climate bill.

Inferno was a sign: “Abandon hope all ye who enter here.” But there is hope in Congress. Many of my Republican colleagues are eager for some political support, to counter the fossil fuel industry’s relentless onslaught.

Despite the statements emitted from oil companies’ executive suites about taking climate change seriously and supporting a price on carbon, their lobbying presence in Congress is 100% opposed to any action. In particular, the American Petroleum Institute, the oil industry trade association, is an implacable foe. Given the industry’s massive conflict of interest, there is every reason to believe they are playing responsible talking, trying to buy a little credibility with these public comments while using all their quiet lobbying muscle to crush any threat of bipartisan action on the carbon pricing they claim to espouse.

The good-hearted folks at the American Geophysical Union is made up of honest scientists. In their world, they likely expect that when people say something, it is true. Sadly, in Congress the same is not the same. People fear retribution, so embedded is the fossil fuel industry in Congress. The
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result is the good guys abandoning the field to the worst climate actors in America: the fossil fuel industry and its array of front groups. They don’t just lobby. The roughest of them, Americans for Prosperity, boasts loudly that it will spend $750 million in this election (it’s already through $400 million and climbing) and that any effort to address climate change will condemn the U.S. to “a per- ceived peril,” that they’ll be “at a severe dis- advantage.” Subtle like a brick.

My response is twofold.

Climate change is not just any other issue. It’s so big an issue that the world’s leaders just gathered in Paris to address it. It’s so big an issue that it has its own page on most corporate websites. It’s so big an issue that our former Pacific commander, Admiral Samuel J. Locklear, said it was the biggest national security threat we face in the Pac- ific Theater. To use his words, climate change “is probably the most likely thing that is going to happen . . . that will cripple the security environment, probably more likely than the other scenarios we all often talk about.” So it’s big enough for corpora- tions to treat it as more than just another issue in Congress.

Second, they can’t hurt you if you organ- ize. An antelope alone may fall to the hy- enas, but the herd will protect itself. The fossil fuel industry can’t punish Coke and Pepsi and Apple and Google and Mars and all the other 100-plus compa- nies who rallied publicly around a strong Paris agreement. You have to stand to- gether.

Around Congress, the bullying menace of the fossil fuel industry is a constant. If the good guys cede the field to them, the result is predictable: members of Congress frozen in place, often against their better judgment. It doesn’t have to be this way. I’m in Congress, and I’m writing here to say: we need you guys to show up.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, it is time not just for us to wake up but for the good guys to show up. Fossil fuel folks for years outright denied cli- mate change and happily funded their array of denial front groups. That failed the tests of truth and decency, but it’s consistent, like the hypocrisy, to say one thing and do an- other, is playing with fire. First, it poses a legal risk. It is never good to say things you can’t truthfully say under oath, which may be one reason we see economics from the cli- mate denial front groups about inves- tigations where fossil fuel executives may have to tell the truth under oath. Second, it is a real reputation risk, espe- cially among younger consumers who aren’t going to love an industry that lies. It is hard to say that you are not lying when what you are saying and what you are doing are opposite.

It is time for the fossil fuel industry to end this new double game. Either put your money where your mouth is and vote in line with Congress to enact a price on carbon, as you say you wish, or go back to your climate denial and your creepy front groups and see how that works out for you, but saying one thing while you are doing the exact opposite is just not sustainable.

I yield the floor.

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

Her Excellency, Ms. CHRISTIANA FIGUERES, Executive Secretary of the UNFCCC, Bonn, Germany.

His Excellency Mr. LAURENT FABIUS President of COP21, Paris, France.

DEAR EXCELLENCIES: Climate change is a critical threat to the future of the world. As major companies from the oil & gas sector, we rec-ognize both the importance of the climate challenge and the importance of energy to human progress. We acknowledge that the current trend of greenhouse gas emissions is in excess of what the Intergov- ernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) expects to prevent the temperatures rise to no more than 2 degrees above pre-indus- tries. The challenge is how to meet greater energy demand with less CO2. We stand ready to play our part.

Our companies are already taking a num- ber of actions to help limit emissions, such as growing the share of gas in our production, making energy efficiency improve- ments in our operations and products, pro- viding renewable energy, investing in carbon capture and storage, supporting new low-carbon technologies and business models. These actions are a key part of our mission to provide the greatest number of people with access to sustainable and secure energy.

For us to do more, we need governments across the world to provide us with clear, stable, long-term, ambitious policy fram- eworks, and private sector cooperation and help stimulate investments in the right low carbon technologies and the right resources at the right pace.

We believe that a price on carbon should be a key element of these frameworks. If gov- ernments act to price carbon, this discour- ages high carbon options and encourages the most efficient ways of reducing emissions widely, including reduced demand for the most carbon intensive fossil fuels, greater energy efficiency, the use of natural gas in place of coal, increased investment in carbon capture and storage, renewable energy, smart buildings and grids, off-grid access to energy, cleaner cars and new mobility busi- ness models and behaviors.

Our companies are already exposed to a price on carbon emissions by participating in carbon markets, but mitigating ‘shad- ow’ carbon prices in our own businesses to test whether investments will be viable in a world where carbon has a higher price.

Yet, what we would like to see is a carbon pricing ourselves will not be sufficient or commercially sustainable unless national governments introduce carbon pricing even- handedly and eventually enable global link- age between national systems. Some econo- mies have not yet taken this step, and this could create uncertainty about investment and disparities in the impact of policy on businesses.

Therefore, we call on governments, includ- ing at the UNFCCC negotiations in Paris and Beyond-to:

1. Introduce carbon pricing systems where they do not yet exist at the national or re- gional levels.

2. Create an international framework that could eventually connect national systems.

3. Support progress towards these out- comes, our companies would like to open di- rect dialogue with the UN and willing gov- ernments. We have important areas of inter- est in and contributions to make to creating and implementing a workable approach to carbon pricing, including:

- Experience. For more than a century we have provided energy to the world. We are familiar with managing projects and risks of many kinds, and well-versed in trading and logis- tics. As we are already users of carbon pricing systems across the world, exchange of infor- mation at international scale could help to identify the best solutions.

- Appropriations. We would be a part of the solution and deliver energy to society sustainably for many decades to come. Like many other industries, we will play a key role in implementing the measures and delivering the technologies that will lead to a lower carbon future. Low carbon business models are fragile until they reach critical size, but with linked carbon pricing systems worldwide, uncertainty would be reduced and such solutions will start to create value for busi- ness more rapidly.

3. Pragmatism. We believe our presence at the table could be helpful in designing an ap- propriate carbon pricing that would be both practical and deliverable, as well as ambition- ous, efficient and effective.

4. A forum for discussion. Our companies and others have come together under the auspices of the World Economic Forum to form the Oil & Gas Climate Initiative, or are members of the International Emissions Trading Association, the World Bank or the UN Global Compact Carbon Pricing initia- tives. We believe these forums may offer an appropriate ground for private sector dia- logue on how to price carbon into energy.

Practically, and we our senior staff will seek to engage in other industry forums and our companies’ per- spectives on the role of carbon pricing in sev- eral important settings:

Our meetings with Ministers and Gov- ernment representatives.

As we attend and address conferences. As we hold engagements with our inves- tors.

As we conduct meetings with other stake- holders including partners, suppliers, aca- demics and researchers.

As we hold meetings for management and staff within our businesses.

Pricing carbon obviously adds a cost to our production and our products—but carbon pricing policy frameworks will contribute to provide our businesses and their many stake- holders with a clear roadmap for future in- vestment, a level playing field for all energy sources across the board and a clear role in securing a more sustainable future.

We acknowledge the long-term challenge and appreciate that this will be trans- formative across the energy sector. Over many decades, our industry has been innova- tive and has been at the forefront of change. We are confident that we can build on our trajectory of innovation to meet the chal- lenge of the future.

Each of us will copy this letter personally to key contacts among investors, govern- ments, civil society and our staff.

Yours sincerely,

HELGE LUND,
BG Group.

BOB DUDLEY,
BP.

CLAUDIO DESCALZI,
Eni S.p.A.

BART VAN BEURDEN,
Royal Dutch Shell.

ELDAR SAETRE,
Statoil ASA.

PATRICK POUYANNE,
Total S.A.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:15 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 18, 2016, at 9:30 a.m.