

That is the industry playbook, faithfully spouted through the editorial page of the Wall Street Journal—No. 1, deny the science; No. 2, question the motives; and No. 3, exaggerate the costs.

But we made undeniable progress against acid rain despite the efforts of the editorial page. Guess what. The Journal's editorial page suddenly reversed its tune. A July 2001 editorial called the cap-and-trade program for sulfur dioxide "fabulously successful," noting that the program "saves about \$700 million annually compared with the cost of traditional regulation and has been reducing emissions by four million tons annually." On this occasion, when its effort had failed, the Journal changed its tune, but until then it was still the industry playbook—No. 1, deny the science; No. 2, question the motives; and No. 3, exaggerate the costs.

With carbon pollution running up to 400 parts per million for the first time in human history, the Journal is using the same old polluter playbook against climate change. The Journal has persistently published editorials against taking action to prevent manmade climate change. As usual, they question the science.

In June 1993 the editors wrote that there is "growing evidence that global warming just isn't happening."

In September 1999 the page reported that "serious scientists" call global warming "one of the greatest hoaxes of all time."

In June 2005 the page asserted that the link between fossil fuels and global warming had "become even more doubtful." This is June 2005, and the Wall Street Journal editorial page is questioning whether there is a link between fossil fuels and global warming.

A December 2011 editorial declared that the global warming debate requires "more definitive evidence."

As usual—back to the industry playbook—the motives of the scientists were smeared.

A December 2009 editorial claimed that leading climate scientists were suspect because they "have been on the receiving end of climate change-related funding, so all of them must believe in the reality (and catastrophic imminence) of global warming just as a priest must believe in the existence of God."

As usual, we heard that tackling climate change, tackling carbon pollution, would cost us a lot of money. In August 2009, the editorial page warned "that a high CO<sub>2</sub> tax would reduce world GDP a staggering 12.9 percent in 2100—the equivalent of \$40 trillion a year."

Just last month, October 2013, the editorial board of the Wall Street Journal warned that in the face of climate change, "interventions make the world poorer than it would otherwise be."

That same October 2013 editorial actually completed the full polluter playbook trifecta by also decrying the "po-

litical actors" seeking to gain economic control and by questioning the science, saying "global surface temperatures have remained essentially flat."

They covered them all in just the one editorial. If only the editorial page writers at the Wall Street Journal would turn the page to the actual news their own paper reports on climate change.

A March 2013 article reported:

New research suggests average global temperatures were higher in the past decade than over most of the previous 11,300 years, a finding that offers a long-term context for assessing modern-day climate change.

A piece from the Wall Street Journal news in August 2013 revealed:

Average global temperatures in 2012 were roughly in line with those of the past decade or so, but the year still ranked among the 10 warmest on record as melting Arctic ice and warming oceans continued to boost sea levels.

That takes me to a particular fact about what carbon pollution is doing, and that is our oceans are taking the brunt of the harm from carbon pollution, and it is time to stop looking the other way. But the Wall Street Journal editorial page doesn't often address the effects of carbon pollution on oceans, perhaps because the changes taking place in our oceans are not a matter where the complexity of computer modeling leaves room for phony doubt to be insinuated.

The oceans' recent changes from our carbon pollution aren't projections and they aren't models, they are measurements—simple, unyielding measurements. We measure sea level rise with a ruler. It is not complicated. We measure ocean temperature with a thermometer. We measure ocean acidification on the pH scale. They do not talk about that much in the Wall Street Journal editorial pages. There is no room for phony doubt. So they look elsewhere.

We have the right to expect independent and honest media to teach the American public about the threats facing our oceans and our environment. What a difference good reporting can make. Exemplary and compelling storytelling can and does influence our national conversation and inspire change. Reporters fail when they give false equivalency to arguments on each side of the political spectrum, even though they are not really equivalent. Editors fail when they look at the science, look at the measurements, look at the real threats posed to our world and then fail to tell us the unvarnished truth.

The story of climate change needs to be told. Our oceans need a voice. It seems the big polluters already have one.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

#### SEQUESTRATION IMPACT

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the impact of seques-

tration on our national security and the economy.

As a Nation, our military strength is directly supported by our economic strength, and sequestration has done substantial harm to both. This senseless policy has put our military in a very bad position and undermines or national security strategies.

In fiscal year 2013, the Defense Department's budget was reduced by approximately \$43 billion due to sequestration, or a roughly 8 percent cut to each defense account. These cuts have undermined our military's readiness and reduced necessary maintenance. They have also undermined long-term investments in modernizing our force.

Our military leadership has been clear about the impact of sequestration at numerous hearings before Congress. All of the services have raised concerns about the Budget Control Act's sequestration and the post-sequester budget caps. In particular, we have heard how these cuts undermine their ability to carry out the 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance or DSG.

The DSG outlines the strategic priorities of the Department of Defense. The DSG reflects the input of a wide range of military stakeholders. The DSG describes the security challenges we are likely to face as well as the resources needed to meet key mission requirements.

The 2012 DSG sets as a central goal the transition of a U.S. defense enterprise from an emphasis on today's wars to preparing for future challenges. The cuts due to the Budget Control Act undermine that goal. As a result, the services will have to reduce personnel levels, delay or scrap necessary equipment modernization and acquisition, and reduce training and readiness activities.

In recent testimony before the House of Representatives, Army GEN Ray Odierno noted the Army's personnel will shrink by 18 percent in the next 7 years. This includes a 26 percent reduction in Active Army personnel, 12 percent reduction in Army National Guard, and a 9 percent reduction in the Army Reserve.

In discussing these reductions, General Odierno said:

In my view, these reductions will put at substantial risk our ability to conduct even one sustained major combat operation.

While I hope we will not have to engage in such an operation in the near future, this reduction in our capacity to do so is very troubling.

In addition, Navy ADM Jonathan Greenert expressed serious concern about cuts to operations and maintenance and investment accounts. These cuts threaten the Navy's readiness. He explained that the Navy would likely have to cancel necessary maintenance, which reduces the useful life of ships and aircraft. In addition, the Navy's shipbuilding program could be seriously affected. This means a submarine, a littoral combat ship, and an

afloat forward-staging base could be on the chopping block.

Hawaii is home to the Pacific Command. Its responsibility encompasses half the globe. This enormous area of responsibility is home to some of the most dynamic and fastest growing economies in the world. The Asia-Pacific nations are huge markets with growing middle classes of consumers for American goods and services. However, it is also home to some of the most serious security threats we face. It is an area where U.S. economic, strategic, and security interests face many challenges, but also many opportunities.

As part of our Nation's recognition that we need to engage more in this region, President Obama has committed to a rebalance of our strategic focus to the Asia-Pacific. The chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Dempsey, described the Asia-Pacific rebalance by saying:

It's about "Three Mores"—more interest, more engagement, and from the military perspective more quality assets and quality interaction.

For the Asia-Pacific rebalance to provide the long-term benefits to our Nation, we need to be fully committed. This requires the transition, training, and support of U.S. military personnel and assets to the region. However, this important initiative is undermined by the budget cuts our military is facing. We cannot support regional peace and stability with insufficient resources and personnel. Yet this is the reality if we fail to address planned budget cuts.

These are just some examples of how our ability to effectively protect U.S. interests and security are being impacted by the Budget Control Act. We also know that reductions in defense spending impact the Nation's economy. For example, Department of Defense employees across the country, including thousands in Hawaii, have faced furloughs this year. This is a pay cut for many families at a time when they can least afford them.

Some will argue that all we need to do is to give the Department of Defense the authority to transfer funds between accounts. I strongly disagree. Congress can address these cuts to national security while also strengthening our overall economy. How can we do this? By simply eliminating sequester and funding the whole government at the level assumed by the Senate's budget resolution.

Sequestration, like the recent government shutdown, results in self-inflicted wounds to our economy. The shutdown was like a sudden economic heart attack. But sequestration is like death by a thousand cuts to our national defense, our science and research enterprise, and programs which our communities rely upon.

I have spoken a great deal about the impact of sequestration on our military. However, the substantial cuts sustained by our education, research and development, and infrastructure

are equally as damaging. These are programs that support an educated and productive workforce, improve the flow of commerce and support those in our communities in the greatest need. Just as a hollowed-out force will struggle to meet mission requirements, a hollowed-out workforce will struggle to compete in the global economy. These two are tightly linked. That is why I urge my colleagues to support eliminating sequestration for both military and nondefense programs.

The Financial Times recently reported that U.S. public investment has dropped to 3.6 percent of GDP. This is well below the 5 percent we have averaged since World War II. These cuts not only undermine our long-term national security strategy but also our long-term competitiveness and economic growth. Without a strong economy, we cannot sustain the investments we need and a strong national defense.

According to Macroeconomic Advisers, spending cuts enacted since 2010 have reduced GDP by 0.7 percentage points. This reduction in our economy has raised unemployment by 0.8 percent, or 1.2 million jobs. The Congressional Budget Office—CBO—recently reported we could give our economy a significant boost by eliminating sequestration. In fact, CBO found that if Congress had enacted legislation last summer to cancel the 2013 and 2014 sequester, the economy would have nearly 1 million more jobs by next year. Our economy would also grow nearly a full percentage point faster.

To put this in perspective, without sequestration, our economy would be nearly back on track to where it was before the great recession.

We all recognize a strong economy is the backbone of our strength as a Nation. In order to get back to full strength, we need to get more people back to work. The more people who are working, the more productive our economy is. This is not rocket science. The more productive our economy, the more opportunity there is for people to achieve the American Dream.

Getting people back to work also means less people have to rely on safety net programs and more tax revenues coming in without raising any tax rates. By reducing spending and increasing revenue this way, we are helping to stabilize our fiscal situation.

A robust economy ensures that our Nation has the capacity to meet our commitments and support our vital priorities. This means we don't have to choose between a strong national defense and investment in education, infrastructure, and innovation. We can, and must, do both.

The place to start is with ending sequestration and revising the Budget Control Act caps. This modest policy change will pay dividends for our economy and, in turn, will strengthen our national security.

I yield the floor.

## NSA OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we are at a watershed moment in the history of intelligence oversight, like nothing I have seen since the Church Committee. Some of the recent revelations have led to important national conversations about the scope of our Nation's intelligence gathering powers here at home, and to renewed legislative efforts to recalibrate those authorities and the related oversight regimes. The USA FREEDOM Act that Congressman JIM SENSENBRENNER and I introduced last week along with more than 100 members of Congress does just that.

It is important, however, to acknowledge that some of the leaks have led to needless risk to our national security and have threatened our relationships with some of our most important international partners.

And all of this leads back to a 29-year-old contractor named Edward Snowden.

Let me make clear once more that I do not condone the way any of these highly classified programs were disclosed. I am deeply concerned about the potential damage to our intelligence gathering capabilities, foreign relationships, and national security.

I am also deeply concerned that one person could wreak this much havoc in such a short period of time. Especially in the wake of the Private Manning leaks, I do not understand how the National Security Agency could have allowed this to happen.

This past weekend, Colbert King wrote in the Washington Post that this damage was, in a sense, self-inflicted. I ask unanimous consent that the King op-ed be printed in the RECORD. As Mr. King put it, "I want to know how Snowden got his hands on so much of the nation's most sensitive intelligence and was able to flee the country, all within three months."

I want to know too. We need to hold people accountable for allowing such a massive leak to occur and we need to change the way we do business to ensure that we prevent this type of breach in the future. In public and in private, I have continued to ask the leaders of the intelligence community to tell me who is being held accountable and what is being done to prevent this from happening again.

Without adequate answers to these questions, the American people are rightly concerned that their private information could be swept up into a massive database, and then compromised. The NSA has acknowledged that it is collecting U.S. phone records on an unprecedented scale, and that it is also collecting massive amounts of Internet content against targets abroad, which also includes some communications of law-abiding Americans. And yet the government asks us to trust that it will keep this information safe, and that we should have faith in its internal policies and procedures.

This plea comes from the same intelligence community that the FISA