

direction and leadership and supervision? Well, under Mr. Adebile's oversight, LDF lawyers promoted the pernicious myth that Abu-Jamal was an innocent man and that he was framed because of his race.

There was never any merit to the claims of racism. That was a conclusion that was investigated and reached by both State and Federal courts.

In fact, the jury that convicted and sentenced Abu-Jamal to death included two African Americans and would have included one more except that Abu-Jamal himself ordered his lawyer not to seat that third juror.

Yet, in February of 2011, Mr. Adebile's group issued a press release stating that "Mumia Abu-Jamal's conviction and death sentence are relics of a time and place that was notorious for police abuse and racial discrimination."

In May of 2011, two of the lawyers supervised by Mr. Adebile traveled to France. They went there for a rally on behalf of Mumia Abu-Jamal.

One LDF lawyer said she was "overjoyed" that Abu-Jamal's death sentence was suspended, but she bemoaned the fact that Abu-Jamal would not have a new trial and so could not be set free.

The other LDF lawyer described Abu-Jamal as one of the "people who are innocent" but "will continue to be put to death in America."

At another event in New York City that same year, a lawyer working for Mr. Adebile gushed, "It is absolutely my honor to represent Mumia Abu-Jamal." She continued: "there is no question in my mind, there is no question in the mind of anyone at the Legal Defense Fund, that the justice system has completely and utterly failed Mumia Abu-Jamal" and that failure "has everything to do with race."

I agree that the justice system has failed. But it has failed Officer Danny Faulkner and his family.

No one understands this story of injustice better than Officer Danny Faulkner's widow Maureen. Maureen Faulkner pleaded with the Senate Judiciary Committee for a chance to tell her story, for a chance to testify before the committee as they were deliberating the candidacy of Mr. Adebile. But the Senate Democrats on the committee would not allow her to testify. They did not let her tell her story and, instead, they voted to send his name on to the Senate floor for confirmation.

I think Maureen Faulkner has a right to be heard. So I hope my colleagues will listen as I read a letter she wrote addressing all of us:

Dear Senators,

While I would have preferred to do so personally, I'm writing this letter appealing to your sense of right and wrong, good and evil as you consider the nomination of Debo Adebile to be the next head of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice.

33 years ago my husband, Philadelphia Officer Daniel Faulkner, was violently murdered by a self-professed "revolutionary"

named Mumia Abu-Jamal. I was 24 years old. While most of my friends spent their summer at the Jersey Shore, I sat in a hot steamy courtroom and watched in horror and disbelief as the man who murdered my husband tried to turn the courtroom into a political stage where he could spew his hatred and contempt for this country and our judicial system.

At the moment my husband's blood stained shirt was displayed by the evidence handler, Mumia Abu-Jamal turned in his chair and smirked at me; demonstrating his contempt for law enforcement. Thankfully, a racially mixed jury that was selected by Abu-Jamal while representing himself, found him guilty. The following day they sentenced him to death for the brutal act he committed.

That's when my second nightmare began. For three decades, my family and I endured appeal after appeal—each rooted in lies, distortions and allegations of civil rights violations. And year after year, judge after judge, the conviction and sentence were unanimously upheld. Then, thirty years after the fact, my family, society and I were denied justice when three Federal District Court judges who have found error in every capital case that has come before them overturned the death sentence.

Today, as my husband lies thirty three years in the grave, his killer has become a wealthy celebrity. He pens books and social commentaries critical of our country. He regularly uses his nearly unlimited access to the prison telephone to do radio programs, has cable TV in his cell and is permitted to hold his wife, children and grandchildren in his arms when they visit.

Old wounds have once again been ripped open and additional insult is brought upon our law enforcement community in this country by President Obama's nomination of Debo Adebile. While publicly demonstrating that he doesn't even know my husband's name, Mr. Adebile fawns sympathy and caring for my family and me.

In reality, Mr. Adebile was a willing and enthusiastic accomplice in Mumia Abu-Jamal's bid to cheat us of the justice we had waited so many years for. Mr. Adebile freely chose to throw the weight of his organization behind Mumia Abu-Jamal and he has publicly stated that he would get Mumia Abu-Jamal off death row.

Mr. Adebile holds Mumia Abu-Jamal, a remorseless unrepentant cop killer, in high esteem. We know this because attorneys working under Mr. Adebile's supervision have stood before public rallies held in support of my husband's killer and openly professed that it was "an extreme honor" to represent the man who put a hollow based bullet into my husband's brain as he lay on the ground, wounded, unarmed and defenseless. And while Mr. Adebile and those who support his nomination will undoubtedly argue that he did not personally make such statements, he did nothing to counter or stop them.

In the end, like so many attorneys before him, Mr. Adebile's allegations of civil rights abuse rang hollow. Mumia Abu-Jamal's death sentence was overturned not because of civil right abuse as alleged by Mr. Adebile, but because three judges with a personal dislike for capital punishment conveniently determined that the wording in a standard form given to the jury might have confused them.

While Debo Adebile may be a well qualified and competent litigator, through his words, his decisions and his actions, he has clearly and repeatedly demonstrated that he is not the best person to fill this important position. Certainly there are others with similar qualifications that would be better

choices. I would argue that Mr. Adebile's decision to defend a cop killer should preclude him from holding any public position.

Your decision means a lot to me personally. The thought that Mr. Adebile would be rewarded, in part, for the work he did for my husband's killer is revolting.

Throughout my long ordeal I have frequently been labeled a racist by many who support my husband's killer simply because he is black and I white. I have also been asked to throw my name, my voice and my support behind political candidates from both parties. In each case I have declined. I have always believed that my husband's death and my quest for justice transcends politics and race.

From my heart, I'm asking you to do the same thing. Set aside any partisan feelings you have and do the right thing today when you vote on Mr. Adebile's confirmation. Please spare my family and me from further pain.

Sincerely, Maureen Faulkner.

As the Justice Department's Web site explains, the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department "fulfills a critical mission in upholding the civil and constitutional rights of all individuals." Clearly, this requires that the head of the Civil Rights Division have an absolute commitment to truth and justice. There are many highly qualified Americans who can carry out this critical mission. Mr. Adebile's record creates serious doubts that he is among them. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose the nomination of Mr. Debo Adebile to serve as Assistant Attorney General for the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division.

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here now for the 60th time to ask my colleagues to wake up to the threats of climate change. To see the damage that is being caused by our shifting climate, we need look no further than the Winter Olympics. The most recent Winter Olympics concluded last month. Over 200 countries broadcast the event to an estimated 3.8 billion people worldwide. In Rhode Island, we rooted for our very own Marissa Castelli, who brought home a bronze medal in pairs figure skating.

But what does the future hold for the Winter Olympics? As global temperatures rise and weather patterns shift, the world's glaciers are receding and snowpack in traditionally snowy regions is declining.

A report from the University of Waterloo found that February daytime high temperatures during the Winter Games have been steadily increasing from the 1920s and the 1950s to the 21st century. This forced the International

Olympic Committee to take drastic measures to ensure adequate conditions: ramping up the use of snow-making machines and physically transferring large amounts of snow to the site of the games.

This is just the beginning of things to come. If our emissions are left unchecked, as the Republicans and the polluters prefer, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change reports we will likely see warming between 4.7 and 8.6 degrees Fahrenheit by the end of the century. The Waterloo report found that only 10 of the 19 cities to previously host the Winter Olympics would be cold enough to host the games by the 2080s. There could be no Sochi Olympics, no Vancouver or Squaw Valley or Sarajevo Olympics, and that is if we are able to stabilize and ultimately reduce our global carbon emissions before the year 2100. If carbon pollution continues on the current pace, only six of these cities could host the games. Forget about Torino and Nagano, Lake Placid and Lillehammer.

Over 100 Olympic athletes from 10 different countries signed a letter asking world leaders to take action to curb climate change. They said:

As winter Olympic athletes, our lives revolve around the winter and if climate change continues at this pace, the economies of the small towns where we live and train will be ruined. Our sports will be forever changed and the winter Olympics as we know it will be a thing of the past.

Much as we all love the Winter Olympics, we could do without them. We cannot very well do without freshwater. Glaciers represent the largest reserves of freshwater on Earth. Their freshwater feeds our rivers and streams, waters our farms and ranches, and provides some of our drinking water. Glacier loss is happening all over the world, including right here in the United States.

Just like atmospheric warming, ocean acidification, and sea-level rise, this evidence of climate change is not a theoretical projection. It is not a complex scientific model. It is simply observation and measurement.

This is Grinnell Glacier in Montana's Glacier National Park. On top we see the glacier in 1940. On the bottom is the same spot in 2004. Grinnell Glacier has lost 90 percent of its ice in the last century. The glacier has almost disappeared or, as the U.S. Geological Survey puts it, "effects of global climate change are strikingly clear." The U.S. Geological Survey further explains:

Glacier recession is underway, and many glaciers have already disappeared. The retreat of these small alpine glaciers reflects changes in recent climate as glaciers respond to altered temperature and precipitation. It has been estimated that there were approximately 150 glaciers present in 1850 and most glaciers were still present in 1910 when the park was established. In 2010 we considered there to be only twenty-five glaciers larger than twenty-five acres remaining in Glacier National Park.

So there were 150 glaciers 100 years ago, 25 now.

Here we see a similar change at Lillian Glacier in Washington's Olympic National Park. On the top we see a large healthy glacier in 1905, and this almost unrecognizable view of the same landscape in 2010.

Of course, this is not just happening in the United States. Countries across the world are seeing rapid glacier loss.

A 2013 article published in *Nature* found clear evidence that the Tibetan glaciers—the world's third largest ice reservoir behind Antarctica and Greenland—are shrinking, even at altitudes above 20,000 feet.

South America's Andean glaciers are retreating at an amazing rate. Climatologists from Ohio State University and NASA loaned my office a piece of a plant that had been preserved under the Quelccaya icecap in Peru for at least 5,200 years, a little bitty piece of plant. But under the pressure of the ice and the cold, it had been preserved for 52 centuries. Today, due to glacial retreat, it was exposed and I now have that piece of plant in my office.

Glaciers are some of the largest reservoirs of fresh matter on Earth. According to the U.S. Geological Survey, glaciers store 69 percent of the world's fresh water. Annual spring glacial melt provides a dependable source of water for streams, plants, spawning fish, farming, and now often hydroelectricity. In Central Asia hundreds of millions of people rely on the Tibetan glaciers to supply drinking water. The same goes for the people of Peru and Bolivia in the Andes.

This is a crisis we must take seriously. Unfortunately, Congress remains barricaded behind a blockade of polluter influence. Only last week a Republican witness at an Environment and Public Works hearing on adapting to climate change argued that we would all be better off if the glaciers just went away—if they just melted away. After all, he told the committee:

We evolved at the equator in a climate where freezing weather did not exist. . . . It could be said that frost and ice are the enemies of life.

He continued:

Obviously if the glaciers stop melting, there will be no more meltwater from them. So my questions . . . are, Are you saying you want the glaciers to stop melting? Then where would the irrigation water come from? . . . I say let the glaciers melt.

That is the witness the Republicans put up. Let the glaciers melt.

I guess he missed the difference between seasonal melting, whose annual rhythms fill our streams and rivers for drinking water, fishing and farming, and glaciers outright melting away.

There is another little trick the deniers like to play when it is winter-time. Every time there is a cold snap or a little snow falls in Washington, DC, or back in their home States, they say: How can there be global warming when it is cold out? And, yes, we have had a cold winter. But what scientists

and other level-headed observers understand is the changes occurring in the climate are happening over longer periods than just one winter and across broader regions than only one State or even the United States. Moreover, short-term temperature anomalies such as a cold snap might be worse because of climate change, because of changes in the jetstream, for instance. This chart shows how worldwide winter temperatures every year since 1880 compare with the 20th century average.

Do you think there is a trend visible there? Over 100 years, yes, winter is still cold, but it is not as cold as it used to be. This change is ravaging winter sports and tourism across the United States. The National Resources Defense Council found that between 1999 and 2010, a lack of snowfall cost our ski industry \$1 billion and up to 27,000 jobs. Before the end of the century, the number of economically viable ski locations in New Hampshire and Maine will be cut in half. Skiing in New York will be cut by three-quarters and, the report says, there will be no ski area in Connecticut or Massachusetts. If we know our geography, we know if that is true of Connecticut and Massachusetts, there goes Rhode Island's Yawgoo Valley ski area and slope.

The Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change, which I started with Representative HENRY WAXMAN, asked the National Basketball Association, Major League Baseball, National Hockey League, National Football League, and the United States Olympic Committee, to tell us what climate change means for their sports.

National Hockey League Deputy Commissioner William Daly wrote:

Hockey's relationship with the environment is unique. Our sport was born on frozen ponds, where—to this day—players of all ages and skill levels learn to skate. For this magnificent tradition to continue, it is imperative that we recognize the importance of maintaining the environment.

The Park City Foundation in Utah predicts an annual local temperature increase of 6.8 degrees Fahrenheit by 2075, which could cause a complete loss of snowpack in the lower Park City resort area of the Rocky Mountains. The foundation estimates that this will result in thousands of lost jobs, tens of millions in lost earnings, and hundreds of millions in lost economic growth.

While we in Congress equivocate and stall, the evidence of climate change relentlessly mounts. The damage is being done in our atmosphere and our oceans. The longer it takes us to wake up, the harder and more expensive it will be to fix it.

The sickening part is that everyone else is waking up. Sixty-five percent of voters support the President taking significant steps to address climate change now. Another poll found that 82 percent of Americans believe we should start preparing now for rising sea levels and severe storms from climate change.

Even in the party that won't speak the words "climate change" any longer—not since Citizens United cleared the way for big spending by polluters in Republican primaries—even in the Republican Party, among young Republican voters 35 and under, the majority of them feel that climate denial is either ignorant, out of touch, or crazy. If that is what young Republicans feel, that is a very poor foundation for the Republican Party to maintain this denier policy.

The campaign of money and denial that imprisons Congress is as poisonous to our American democracy as carbon pollution is to our atmosphere, oceans and, yes, glaciers. It is time to fight back. It is time to wake up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

ADEGBILE NOMINATION

Mr. CRUZ. I rise today to pay tribute to the men and women across the country serving as police officers who protect law-abiding Americans. It is out of this respect for our Nation's police officers that I also rise to oppose the nomination of Debo Adebile to be the head of the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division.

We must always remember our Nation's fallen police officers who have bravely given their lives to serve our Nation and to protect us.

Police officers help form the backbone of our country that supports the rule of law. They risk their lives every day to help keep law-abiding citizens safe. According to the FBI, in 2012, 95 law enforcement officers were killed in line-of-duty incidents and 52,901 officers were victims of line-of-duty assaults—52,901.

The New York Times in 2012 observed: "As violent crime has decreased across the country, a disturbing trend has emerged: rising numbers of police officers are being killed."

In 2008, 41 officers were killed; in 2009, 48 officers were killed; in 2010, 56 officers were killed; in 2011, 72 officers were killed; and in 2012, 95 officers were killed.

Unfortunately, as Byron York noted today, the New York Times has not reported on the controversial nomination of Debo Adebile to head the DOJ Civil Rights Division.

It is out of respect for all of our Nation's police officers that I rise to oppose Mr. Adebile's nomination. Under Adebile's leadership and supervision, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund brazenly politicized the murder of a Philadelphia police officer, Officer Daniel Faulkner. On December 9, 1981, 25-year-old Officer Faulkner was murdered by Wesley Cook, who is widely known as Mumia Abu-Jamal. Officer Faulkner was shot several times. The fatal shot was when Abu-Jamal pointed the gun inches from Officer Faulkner's face and pulled the trigger.

During the trial it was made known that Abu-Jamal was a supporter of the

MOVE Organization, an anarchist group that explicitly advocates for violence against police officers.

In a letter to the Senate Judiciary Committee, Mrs. Faulkner described that during the trial, when her husband's bloodstained shirt was displayed by the evidence handler, Abu-Jamal turned in his chair and smirked directly at her, the grieving widow. The jury convened for a matter of hours before they came back with a guilty verdict and a death sentence. That was 1982.

Fast forward 27 years to the year 2009, Adebile was at the time the NAACP's Legal Defense Fund Director of Litigation. In 2009, the Legal Defense Fund began advocating for Abu-Jamal—first as an amicus and then as cocounsel. To be clear, every criminal defendant is entitled to an attorney, but Adebile's representation of Abu-Jamal was pure advocacy.

Abu-Jamal's guilt was not in doubt. Four eyewitnesses saw the shooting. Abu-Jamal confessed and stated in front of three witnesses that he hoped Officer Faulkner died.

There was significant ballistic and forensic evidence. For example, the murder weapon was registered to Abu-Jamal and found at the scene with spent shell casings.

Abu-Jamal already had a team of high-priced lawyers working pro bono, who had filed decades of post-trial petitions and appeals, delaying the carrying out of his sentence.

Under Adebile's supervision, LDF lawyers fanned the flames of racial tension. Through rallies, protests, and a media campaign, all portrayed Mumia Abu-Jamal, an unrepentant cop killer, as a political prisoner.

For example, a 2011 LDF press release said: "Abu-Jamal . . . is widely viewed as a symbol of the racial injustices of the death penalty."

That press release also said: "Mumia Abu-Jamal's conviction and death sentence are relics of a time and place that was notorious for police abuse and racial discrimination."

LDF lawyers under Adebile's supervision went farther than that. They held rallies and protests.

This is advocacy. This is political advocacy. This is extreme and radical advocacy. This is not legal representation. They even went so far as to travel to France to hold multiple rallies for Abu-Jamal. The French had already named a street after Abu-Jamal in a suburb of Paris.

This prompted the House of Representatives in 2006 to vote 368-31 to condemn the murder of Officer Daniel Faulkner and to urge the French town to change that street name.

After fanning those flames of racial tension in the court of public opinion, Adebile pressed aggressive arguments on race in our courts of law. Thankfully, the State and Federal courts rejected those arguments.

Under Adebile, the LDF initially argued in court that Abu-Jamal's death

sentence should be overturned because he believed there should have been more African Americans on Abu-Jamal's jury.

During his Senate confirmation on January 8, Adebile said the LDF filed a legal brief regarding merely jury instructions about the death penalty. LDF did make those arguments eventually, but Adebile's initial arguments had nothing to do with jury instructions. They were arguments that Abu-Jamal's jury was unconstitutional because it didn't have, he argued, a sufficient number of African Americans serving in the jury.

The courts rejected those arguments. The jury that convicted Abu-Jamal had two African Americans serving on it. It would have had a third African American serving on it but Abu-Jamal instructed his lawyers to strike that person.

The Fraternal Order of Police vehemently opposes this nomination. According to a letter written by the president of the FOP, Adebile's nomination only exacerbates the "growing division and distrust" toward local law enforcement agencies—a trend that has continued from the time now-Labor Secretary Thomas Perez was leading the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division.

Peter Kirsanow, a member on the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, wrote:

Responsible people should agree that going out of your way to defend a convicted cop-killer long after it has become unequivocally clear that he was guilty and had suffered no violation of his civil rights disqualifies one from serving as the head of a division of the U.S. Department of Justice.

The Obama administration's message with the nomination is clear: It wants even more politicization of the Department of Justice. This is insulting to law enforcement officers everywhere. I stand with the Fraternal Order of Police and oppose Adebile's nomination, and I urge my Democratic colleagues to join the Democratic senior Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. BOB CASEY, and vote no on this nomination.

This is not a matter of leftwing or rightwing. We all should agree that violent criminals should be punished, and we all should agree that those who go out of their way to advocate for, to celebrate, to lionize convicted cop killers are not suitable for major leadership roles at the U.S. Department of Justice.

I urge every Member of this body to oppose that nomination.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. FLAKE. I rise to discuss the nomination of Mr. Debo Adebile to