

to the United States, is now embroiled in turmoil. The United States, in partnership with the international community, must show leadership in helping it rebuild its democracy and restore its territorial integrity by reclaiming northern Mali from terrorists and extremists. So this morning, as the chair of the African Affairs Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, I chaired a hearing to assess the developments and the path forward for U.S. policy in Mali.

What I heard from our experts, from the Department of Defense, from the State Department, from the USAID, as well as a range of outside experts and one witness who testified from Bamako, the capital of Mali, was of real concern to me.

Northern Mali today is the largest terrorist-controlled area in the world. In the north, extremists have imposed a harsh and strict version of Sharia or Islamic law and committed gross violations of human rights. Many folks have heard of Timbuktu but don't know that it is an ancient city in northern Mali, a site where these Islamic extremists have behaved much as the Taliban did in Afghanistan before 9/11. They destroyed sacred religious and historic artifacts in Timbuktu, imposing a harsh version of Sharia that has meant amputations, stonings, violations of women's rights of free speech, religious exercise of rights, fundamentally changing the tolerance and exclusive history of Mali.

This created a humanitarian crisis as more than 400,000 Malians have fled, either internally displaced within Mali or going into neighboring countries as refugees.

With growing ties between these terrorists and Nigeria, Libya, and throughout the region, AQIM, we believe, may now use its safe haven in northern Mali to plan for regional or transnational terrorist attacks. Just as we should not have ignored developments in Afghanistan, which seemed a remote and troubled country when the Taliban took it over more than a dozen years ago, so too we would ignore the chaos in northern Mali at our peril.

In fact, Secretary Clinton has said that Mali has now become a powder keg of potential instability in the region and beyond. The top American military commander in Africa, GEN Carter Ham, said publicly just this week that al-Qaida is operating terrorist camps in northern Mali and is providing arms, explosives, and financing to other terrorist groups in the region. So I believe it is critical that the United States has a strong and comprehensive policy to deal with this threat.

I am concerned that the current U.S. approach may not be forward leaning enough to address all three crises—security, political, and humanitarian—in a coordinated, comprehensive, and effective way at the same time. Given the compelling U.S. interest in stability, security, and good governance

in Mali, we must ensure that we don't miss the bigger picture of what this situation means for the future of Mali, to our allies, and to our security.

The U.N. Security Council is now considering what they call a concept of operations for an African-led military operation. The United States can and should play a more active role in supporting this and preventing the country from becoming a permanent home for extremists and a safe haven for terrorists.

An active role does not mean putting American boots on the ground. Instead, we can provide operational support for a regionally led, multilateral, African-led force being organized by ECOWAS, the Economic Community of West African States, and the African Union. In the weeks ahead the U.N. Security Council will likely vote on a resolution authorizing this coalition to lead a military intervention to dislodge the terrorists in the north. We have seen models like this work in Cote d'Ivoire and Somalia, so there is reason to believe in the potential of a regional military solution to the security crisis in the north.

However, even if this intervention works, it will take time to train, equip, and assemble the regional force and to develop the appropriate plans for what happens during and after a military intervention. Frankly, Mr. President, security and stability can't be restored to Mali with military action alone. The current crisis is as much about governance as it is about security. A stronger Malian democracy is the best way to ensure security and societal gains in the short term and the long term, but democracy doesn't just begin or end with an election.

One of the reasons Mali's democracy crumbled so quickly was that Malians didn't feel connected to, represented, or well served by their government. Voter turnout in the last few elections was lower and lower, with the government viewed as corrupt, social services not benefiting the relatively sparsely populated north, and institutions nationwide that were weak.

The political and security challenges in Mali are two sides of the same coin; they are not separate issues. I will urge that we break down silos between departments and agencies in our government and take a comprehensive view.

If we focus on the political only and insist on Mali moving forward briskly with an election even when the security situation will prevent most northern Malians from meaningfully participating, I think we risk unintentionally strengthening the hands of those who want to ensure that Mali's regional divide is permanent and hand a symbolic victory to al-Qaida.

On the other hand, if we rush forward with a security solution, with a regional military intervention before it is adequately planned, before they are responsibly trained and equipped, we risk defeat on that front as well.

I think we can and should do better. We can work closely with our allies,

with regional partners in the international community to address all the security, political, and humanitarian crises unfolding in Mali. Effective, inclusive elections early next year should be one goal but not the only one. We also have to address the ongoing humanitarian crisis of the 400,000 displaced persons and refugees, the more than 4.5 million people in need of emergency food aid in the region, and the security crisis of terrorists controlling an area this large.

To bring long-term peace and stability to Mali and to ensure northern Mali doesn't slide into being the base of operations for the next al-Qaida attack on our allies, our interests abroad, or even the United States, we can't afford to ignore any of the pieces of this complex puzzle. The United States simply cannot afford, despite the many distractions and other priorities facing us, to ignore Mali.

I pledge to work in close partnership with my colleagues in the Senate and with my friends on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to ensure an effective engagement by the United States in this important area.

I yield the floor.

EXTENSION OF MORNING HOUR

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent morning business be extended until 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, last week I came to the floor and spoke about our Nation's military and intelligence leaders acknowledging, along with our Nation's scientific leaders, the clear evidence that carbon pollution is changing our climate. Unfortunately, there continues to be some confusion among many Americans regarding the clear scientific consensus, but that is confusion caused by coordinated and deliberate attempts to mislead the American people.

For more than two decades now, the climate denial movement has been well-organized and funded by the fossil fuel industry and conservative ideologues and foundations. The mission of these paid-for deniers is to "manufacture uncertainty," to manufacture doubt so the polluters can keep on polluting.

This isn't a new strategy. We have seen self-serving strategies such as this before. These strategies questioned the merits of requiring seat belts in cars. They questioned CFCs causing deterioration of the ozone layer. They questioned the toxic effects of lead exposure for children. They questioned whether tobacco was really bad for people—the same strategy to manufacture

doubt, and often, actually, the same cast of characters was involved.

While the Congress of the United States has been distracted and deceived by these ploys, climate change marches on. The laws of chemistry and the laws of physics don't care about the nonsense we are up to in this building. They do what the laws of chemistry and physics say. Precious time is wasting. In the balance hangs lives and jobs. This nonsense has gone on long enough.

The public is being misled. Special-interest dollars pull the strings of sophisticated campaigns to give the public the impression that there is a real scientific debate regarding whether climate change is happening. Well, there isn't. There just isn't. The real scientific debate is about how bad the changes will be.

Here is one example out of my home State, the Warwick Beacon, in an article entitled, "Sandy: A wake up call to climate change." It describes the head of our Coastal Resources Council, saying—he is talking about the sea level rise:

I can tell you that it is real. I can't tell you how fast or how bad it is.

That is what I said. The real scientific debate is actually about how bad the changes are going to be.

To manufacture doubt to allow the polluters to keep polluting, skeptics with little training in climate science are promoted as experts. Front groups such as the Global Climate Coalition, Information Council for the Environment, Heartland Institute, Annapolis Center and Cooler Heads Coalition are created or enlisted to propagate this message of doubt. Deniers question the motives and engage in harassment of the real credentialed climate scientists.

Well, for the record, there has been scientific debate regarding climate change. Ideas have been tested, theories have been ventured, and the evidence keeps coming back to the same conclusion: Increased carbon dioxide in the atmosphere from human-related sources is strengthening the greenhouse effect, adding to recent warming and acidifying the oceans.

Actually, the evidence coming in tends to confirm the worst and most dangerous projections. Claims, for instance, that solar activity is causing recent global warming, and even about whether the atmosphere is really warming, have been settled. But when the scientific research doesn't work out for the skeptics, they turn to straw man arguments. One straw man is that extreme weather events such as hurricanes and droughts aren't proof of climate change.

Well, let's be clear. No credible source is arguing that extreme events are proof of climate change. But extreme events are associated with what has been staring us in the face for years: The average global temperature is increasing, average sea level is rising, and average ocean acidity is in-

creasing. When averages change, extremes usually change with them, and a warming climate, to use the best example, loads the dice—loads the dice for extreme weather.

So let's look at some of the games that the deniers display to try to manipulate public opinion. One gimmick they have reverted to is the observation that there has been no warming trend in the last 10 years—no warming trend, they say, in the last 10 years.

In 2010, a Republican Senator said: I don't think that anyone disagrees with the fact that we actually are in a cold period that started about 9 years ago.

Well, let's look at the facts. Let's start with the green line on this graph. The green line is the global surface temperature data. It is not a protection, it is not a hypothesis, it is a measurement. This is global surface temperature data. As you can see, it changes monthly.

The red line that goes through it is the trend line that is mathematically developed from that data. That trend line is the product of basic and undeniable mathematics.

The trend is extremely clear.

So let's look at what the deniers do with the very same data. Here they take the very same data, and the green line is unchanged. It is exactly the same data, and this is how they get to saying that we have had a cooling period for the past 10 years. They pick a high point, and they pick a low point out of this data, and they say that is their 10-year cooling period.

The problem is, if you go back, here is another one, here is another one, here is another one, and here is another one. It is interesting how all the cooling periods stack up to an increase.

It is a little bit like—who was the guy on the radio? He explained something to you, and it didn't seem quite right. Then he would say: "Paul Harvey, what's the rest of the story?"

So the rest of the story is that if someone picks one piece of data out of a line that is going like this and then they go forward and pick a lower one later, they can manufacture the hypothesis there has been no warming trend in the last 10 years. But if we do it legitimately, if we run an actual trend line with mathematical precision through the data, it shows this theory is nothing but misleading bunk—misleading bunk—designed for the purpose of creating confusion.

This period, of course, is only a recent portion of the temperature record. When skeptics and deniers look deeper into the past, they find even more strawmen—that the Earth's climate always changes; that it has been warmer in the past. Yes, the Earth has seen different climates in the past, not all ones we would necessarily want to live in, by the way. The reason we know about these climates is because of the excellent work done by scientists—the same scientists who tell us that recent climate change can only be explained by increased carbon dioxide in the atmos-

phere. The final classic is that more carbon in the atmosphere is good because it provides more food for plants, the old plant food theory.

The fact is we have changed the composition of our atmosphere, pushing the concentration of carbon dioxide beyond the range it has been in for 8,000 centuries. For 8,000 centuries, it has been between 170 and 300 parts per million. For the first time this past year, it touched 400 parts per million in the Arctic. To give a time scale of what 8,000 centuries means, the practice of agriculture has been around for about 100 centuries. That is 8,000 centuries in this safe zone of carbon concentration of our atmosphere, with only 100 centuries of those with the human species, even farmers. Modern humans began to migrate out of Africa 600 centuries ago. Once again, 8,000 centuries of this safe climate belt of carbon concentration and 600 centuries of our species leaving Africa and migrating to populate the rest of our planet. Homo sapiens, our species, appeared around 2,000 centuries ago.

We are messing with planetary concentrations of atmospheric carbon that go back four times longer than our species has inhabited this planet. In all that time, in those 8,000 centuries, the Earth has never reached carbon dioxide concentrations as we have caused now through human activity.

Deniers also tend to just flat ignore the facts they can't explain away or gimmick the data for. For example, the increased acidification of the oceans, that is something that is simple to measure. It is undeniably chemically linked to carbon concentrations in the atmosphere. So we hear nothing about ocean acidification from the deniers. But ocean acidification is possibly the most disastrous consequence of our carbon pollution. The rate of change in acidity of our oceans is already thought to be faster than at any time in the past 50 million years.

I was talking a moment ago about being outside a boundary of carbon concentration or atmosphere that has persisted for 8,000 centuries. We are talking now about a rate of change of acidity in the ocean that hasn't been seen on this planet in the past 50 million years. A paper published this March in "Science" concluded the current rate of carbon dioxide emissions could drive chemical changes in the ocean unparalleled in the last 300 million years.

We are effecting changes in our atmosphere and in our oceans that only compare to ancient periods of geologic time. When we consider the implications for food security, biodiversity, and ocean-based industries, we cannot ignore these changes in our oceans.

Coincidentally, just last Friday, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration proposed listing 66 species of coral as endangered or threatened and cited climate change as driving three key threats: disease, warmer seas, and more acidic seas.

It might be worth reminding the deniers what NASA says. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration—NASA—says this about climate change and our global temperature rising.

All three global surface temperature reconstructions show that Earth has warmed since 1880. Most of this warming has occurred since the 1970s, with the 20 warmest years having occurred since 1981 and with all 10 of the warmest years occurring in the past 12 years. Even though the 2000s witnessed a solar output decline resulting in an unusually deep solar minimum in 2007–2009, surface temperatures continue to increase.

On ocean temperatures and sea level rise, NASA said:

The oceans have absorbed much of this increased heat, with the top 2,300 feet showing warming of 0.302 degrees Fahrenheit since 1969. Global sea level rose about 6.7 inches in the last century. The rate in the last decade, however, is nearly double that of the last century.

On ocean acidification, this quote from NASA:

Since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, the acidity of surface ocean waters has increased by about 30 percent. This increase is the result of humans emitting more carbon dioxide into the atmosphere.

Let me say that again:

This increase is the result of humans emitting more carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. The amount of carbon dioxide absorbed by the upper layer of the oceans is increasing by about 2 billion tons per year.

NASA scientists put a man on the Moon. NASA scientists have a rover right now driving around on the surface of the planet Mars. They are not the quacks. Our Nation's best and brightest minds accept the evidence of climate change and they are urging us to act.

Yet still, for some in this body, the deniers carry the day. Why? In a week-end editorial entitled "Flight from Facts"—"Flight from Facts"—my home State Providence Journal said:

[The] GOP is winning the race to avoid evidence—some of this escapism based on a desire to hold on to what had been comforting, if error-based, traditional beliefs, and some of it to avoid policies that might be economically and otherwise inconvenient.

Whatever the reason, the price of our folly will be very high for future generations.

One of the things I have noticed on this floor is that when it is a question of putting the cost of taking care of their grandparents on our children and grandchildren, oh, how the Republican crocodile tears flow about that unfair burden on children and grandchildren. In one of their attacks on Medicare and Social Security, which the Republicans like to call entitlements, we heard this:

We have got a serious spending problem here . . . and we need to have an impact on entitlements . . . if we're going to have entitlements for our children and grandchildren when they reach retirement age, we have got to change the trajectory.

The minority leader has also spoken about what appears in his remarks to be the health care bill—the ObamaCare

bill—and he worried about it "creating a more precarious future for our children."

The minority leader has said this about the stimulus effort to get our economy back on its feet: "This needs to stop for the future of our country and for our children and for our grandchildren."

When it is the deficit, he has urged us "to make sure we have the same kind of country for our children and grandchildren that our parents left for us." He has even talked about "the Europeanization of America," and as a result of that Europeanization of America—whatever that is—he has said, "Our children and grandchildren could no longer expect to have the same opportunities that we've had."

On virtually every traditional anti-Obama Republican tea party bugbear—Medicare, ObamaCare, the stimulus, the deficit, even this Europeanization of America—out come the children and grandchildren. Let's assume they are sincere. Let's assume they have a sincere concern for what we are leaving to our children and grandchildren.

So when it comes to big corporate polluters of today leaving our children and grandchildren a damaged and more dangerous planet, where then is the concern for those children and grandchildren? To have children and grandchildren pay for the care of their grandparents through Medicare and Social Security is some kind of sin or outrage, but to force on those same children and grandchildren the untold costs and consequences of the harms done by today's corporate polluters, what do they have to say about that? For that, the future generations' interests receive nothing from the Republican Party but stony silence or phony and calculated denial.

But the cost will be on them. The cost of our negligence and folly in not addressing our carbon pollution will fall on our children and our grandchildren. The cost will be on them and the shame will be on us.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WICKER. I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for up to 6 minutes.

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

RUSSIA TRADE RELATIONS

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, in a few moments the distinguished chair of the Finance Committee and the Senator from Utah will commence debate on H.R. 6156, the Russia and Moldova

Jackson-Vanik Repeal and Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012. Because of scheduling concerns, I am speaking on this in morning business, and that will allow time for other Members to speak.

I come to the floor today to support this bill. It has a very important twofold purpose: It approves normal trade relations with Russia, and at the same time the legislation insists that the Russian Government adhere to the rule of law. It does so by putting consequences in place for those in Russia who abuse basic human rights.

Granting PNTR to Russia is a big win for Americans. If Congress does not act, American workers, including millions employed by small businesses, stand to lose out to foreign competitors as Russia opens its market as a new member of the WTO.

Many in my home State of Mississippi and around the country deserve to benefit from increased trade that this new relationship would bring. More jobs and greater economic growth are our potential rewards here in the United States. Last year Mississippi's \$55 million in exports to Russia helped support an estimated 170 jobs. Certainly this number needs to grow, and I believe it will under this legislation.

Yet in realizing the immense trade potential at hand, we cannot ignore the urgent need to address serious concerns about Russia's appalling human rights record. Most agree that the Jackson-Vanik amendment currently in place is an outdated restriction on trade which could hurt American competitiveness. But repeal alone will not suffice when dealing with a country that continues to protect corrupt officials, and that is what the Russian Government continues to do.

The Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act is a necessary replacement for Jackson-Vanik. The legislation targets human rights violators by imposing restrictions on their financial activities and travel. It recognizes that the privilege of using America's banking system and acquiring a U.S. visa should be denied to those who disgrace human dignity and justice.

Facts need to be retold today about the case of Sergei Magnitsky after whom this legislation is named. Sergei Magnitsky was a lawyer and partner with an American-owned law firm based in Moscow. He was married and had two children. In his investigative work on behalf of the Hermitage Fund, the largest foreign portfolio investor in Russia, Mr. Magnitsky uncovered the largest tax rebate fraud in Russian history. He found that Russian Interior Ministry officers, tax officials, and organized criminals had worked together to steal \$230 million in public funds.

In 2008 Mr. Magnitsky voluntarily gave sworn testimony against officials from the Interior Ministry, Russian tax departments, and the private criminals whom he discovered were complicit in the fraud. A month later, instead of being commended for doing the right