

greenhouse gas emissions significantly, and we can create good-paying jobs all over this country.

The bottom line here is we cannot afford to reject basic science. We have to listen to what the scientific community is saying. We have got to act aggressively, and let's do it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, as an engineer one of the things I learned early in my education was that science does not care if you believe in it or not; you can deny science as much as you want, but the data suggests that the scientific method works pretty darn well.

The corollary to that fact is whether you believe in climate change has no bearing on whether it is actually occurring. Unfortunately, the data shows a warmer and warmer planet, characterized by weather fluctuations that are more extreme and oftentimes more destructive. In my home State of New Mexico, too often we find ourselves dealing with the impacts of climate change today, not at some theoretical future date.

For example, we are already seeing the effects of climate change and how it manifests itself in more extreme drought conditions, larger and more intense wildfires, shrinking forests, and increased flooding when it finally does rain. The longer we wait to act, the more difficult and expensive the solutions will be, and the more unpredictable our weather will become.

2012, as the Senator from Vermont mentioned, was our Nation's second most extreme year for weather on record. In my home State of New Mexico, we experienced the hottest year in our entire historical record. With humidity levels lower and temperatures higher, we are dealing with fire behavior in our forests that is markedly more intense than in the past.

We also see climate change take a toll directly on our economy, especially in my State. That is an important point, because inaction has its costs too. The costs already being borne in New Mexico are substantial. With less snowpack, communities that rely on winter sports tourism take an economic hit. Fewer people lodge in hotels, shop in stores, eat in restaurants.

Climate change is also having a devastating impact on New Mexico's agricultural industry, where farmers and ranchers are often the very first to see the direct impact of extreme weather. The agricultural sector is highly vulnerable due in large part to the sustained threat to the water supply, the soil and vegetation from continuous drought.

Things are only going to get worse if we do nothing. If we take our moral responsibility as stewards of this Earth seriously, it is imperative that we face the challenge of reversing the effects of climate change head on and have a

sober discussion about what actions we will need to take now and in the future. America clearly has the capacity to become energy independent. But we also need to transition from our current energy portfolio to one that produces as much or more power with substantially less carbon pollution per kilowatt hour.

That will require innovation, something that historically our country has done better than any country in the world. But additionally, we will need political will, something we have grown short of as climate denial and pseudoscience have made their way into the halls of Congress.

If history is our guide, we should know that investing in cleaner energy will not be without cost, but little of value is ever free. The question is, are we willing to make the modest investments now necessary to create the quality jobs of tomorrow and to protect our Nation from the serious economic and strategic risks associated with our carbon reliance, our reliance on both foreign and carbon pollution-intensive energy sources?

Since we are looking at history, let's take a moment and look at the Clean Air Act of 1990, and compare the rhetoric of debate with the reality of its implementation. In 1989, the Edison Electric Institute predicted a significant rise in energy costs due to the Clean Air Act. Yet the reality, according to a recent study by the Center for American Progress, actually showed a decrease of 16 percent over those years. In 1990, the U.S. Business Roundtable claimed that passage of the Clean Air Act would cost a minimum—a minimum—of 200,000 jobs. But a recent study released by the EPA revealed the reality. The Clean Air Act resulted in a net creation of jobs and new industries created to reduce pollution, good-paying jobs in industries such as engineering, manufacturing, construction, and maintenance.

By 2008 the environmental technology sector supported 1.7 million jobs in this country.

The time has come to address climate change rather than embracing the pseudoscience and denial that is embraced by far too many in Washington today. The Nation has never solved a single problem by denying the facts. Let me be clear. Inaction is not a solution to this very real crisis. Denial is not a strategy.

Consequently, if my Republican colleagues have a better way to address carbon pollution than what the President has proposed, I would ask them to join the debate. If they have a pollution solution that is more efficient or more effective, now is the time to have that discussion.

Through American ingenuity we can slow the impact of climate change and unleash the full potential of cleaner energy. We can create a healthier, more stable environment for future generations, but we must have the will to recognize the facts as they are. We

will need to make the investments that are necessary, and we will have to find the political will to act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator from Rhode Island withhold for just a moment.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I would gladly withhold.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to my friend from Rhode Island, who is so courteous to everyone, and I appreciate it.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, June 10, following disposition of Executive Calendar No. 734, the Lauck nomination, the time until 12 noon be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees and the Senate proceed to vote as under the previous order; further, that following disposition of Calendar No. 736, the Sorokin nomination, and Calendar No. 739, the Boulware nomination, the Senate stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.; that at 2:15 p.m. the time until 2:30 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees and at 2:30 p.m. the Senate proceed to vote on cloture on Calendar No. 769, the Brainard nomination, Calendar No. 771, the Powell nomination, and Calendar No. 767, the Fischer nomination; further, that if cloture is invoked on any of these nominations, all postcloture time be expired and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nominations on Thursday, June 12, 2014, at 1:45 p.m.; further, that any rollcall vote after the first in each sequence be 10 minutes in length; further, that if any nomination is confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. With this agreement, there will be one rollcall vote at approximately 10 a.m. tomorrow, two rollcall votes at 12 noon, and three additional rollcall votes beginning at 2:30 p.m. We had to move these votes around for a lot of reasons. One is there that is a bill signing, another is that there is a funeral, and another is that one of our Senators wants to attend his son's graduation. So we will wind up at the same place—even though it won't be as orderly—at the end of the week.

Thank you again, my friend from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Thank you, Mr. President.

First, I thank Senator SANDERS of Vermont, Senator MARKEY of Massachusetts, and Senator HEINRICH of New Mexico for their remarks. I look forward to the remarks of Senator INHOFE of Oklahoma.

Viewers may wonder what we are doing here. As some will recall, several weeks ago a number of Democratic Senators—I think we ended up being 31 in total—participated in an all-night event to raise the awareness of and the discussion of climate change in this body. At that time only one of our Republican colleagues appeared to join the discussion, and that was the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, who is here again this evening.

We heard some rumblings that some of our colleagues didn't feel they were included or wished they would have had the opportunity to participate. So taking them up on that offer, a number of us sent a letter on May 30 that says, in part:

Dear Colleague . . . We would welcome an opportunity to engage with our Republican colleagues in a discussion of how to address the problems of climate change. Indeed, we think our Republican colleagues could have a lot to offer if they wished to join us in exploring solutions.

Republican colleagues have co-authored bipartisan climate legislation, voted for the comprehensive Waxman/Markey climate legislation in the House, spoken out in favor of a carbon fee, and campaigned for national office on climate action. Republican senators represent states with great coastal cities inundated by rising tides, states with farmlands swept by unprecedented floods and droughts, states with forests lost to encroaching pine beetles and wildfires unprecedented in season and intensity, states with disappearing glaciers and reduced snowpack, and states with dying coral reefs and shifting habitats and fisheries. Republican senators represent home-state corporations with international brand names, corporations that urge action on climate. Republican senators represent great universities that contribute to the scientific understanding of climate change and how human activities are changing it. We look forward to the opportunity to discuss climate change and how to respond to it with Republican senators.

I ask unanimous consent the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, May 30, 2014.

DEAR COLLEAGUE, As you may know, thirty-one of us recently took to the floor of the Senate for a "climate all-nighter" to express our concern over Congress's inaction on carbon pollution. We have heard some feedback expressing concerns that Republican colleagues were not invited to join in. We would welcome an opportunity to engage with our Republican colleagues in a discussion of how to address the problems of climate change. Indeed, we think our Republican colleagues could have a lot to offer if they wish to join us in exploring solutions.

Republican colleagues have co-authored bipartisan climate legislation, voted for the comprehensive Waxman/Markey climate legislation in the House, spoken out in favor of a carbon fee, and campaigned for national office on climate action. Republican senators represent states with great coastal cities in-

undated by rising tides, states with farmlands swept by unprecedented floods and droughts, states with forests lost to encroaching pine beetles and wildfires unprecedented in season and intensity, states with disappearing glaciers and reduced snowpack, and states with dying coral reefs and shifting habitats and fisheries. Republican senators represent home-state corporations with international brand names, corporations that urge action on climate. Republican senators represent great universities that contribute to the scientific understanding of climate change and how human activities are changing it. We look forward to the opportunity to discuss climate change and how to respond to it with Republican senators.

For any colleague who felt left out of our climate all-nighter we invite you to come to the floor. We've requested from leadership that time after votes on June 9th be reserved to engage in a robust exchange of views.

We earnestly believe that the stakes of failing to exercise American leadership and solve this problem are very high, with ramifications for our health and safety, our economic well-being, our food and water supplies, and our national security and standing. We hope you will join us in a sincere discussion.

Sincerely,

SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
BARBARA BOXER,
BERNARD SANDERS,
JEFF MERKLEY,
EDWARD J. MARKEY,
U.S. Senators.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. That sets the frame for what we are doing. We have had four Democratic Senators speak. We will be joined, I believe, by Chairman BOXER and perhaps others later on in the evening.

Pursuant to the unanimous consent we have agreed to, I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for his remarks and will seek recognition pursuant to the unanimous consent at the conclusion of his remarks.

Pursuant to that understanding, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. First, I thank my good friend for yielding. I think we will have several people coming down and talking about this tonight.

I want to say something about Senator SANDERS from Vermont. I appreciate very much his comments. I think they were very appropriate.

I remember one time when he and I had a difference of opinion on an amendment. It had to do with the amount of money one of the large oil companies made. He and I debated on floor for something like 3 hours. A vote was taken, and I did win the vote. Afterward, he came up to me and he said: I want you to know that since I have been here from the House, that was probably the most enlightened debate we have ever had, and you won and I lost, and I really do appreciate it.

We have been very good friends since then.

Well, the comments he made are real because I don't have any doubt in my mind that Senator SANDERS and the rest of you have strong feelings about this.

What I want to do is something a little bit different. I have heard several

people talk, and they talk about what is the hottest year and the coldest year and all of that. I am very careful to document anything I say, and I will continue to do that tonight.

Last Monday, the EPA released the long-awaited global warming regulations for the Nation's existing fleet of powerplants. We had already talked about the new powerplants and what we are going to do. We have seen the evidence of the increased pricing of energy in this country as a result of that. Now, of course, we are going to be talking about the existing program.

The interesting thing about this—this is what they are talking about doing through regulation after they have lost every single issue on the floor of this Senate—and so trying to do it now by regulations.

The EPA's proposed rule requires powerplants to reduce their CO₂ emissions by 25 percent by 2020 and by 30 percent by 2030. I do believe there will be major legal challenges facing this rule if it goes final, and I will talk about that in just a minute.

Over the past decade the Senate has debated a number of cap-and-trade bills. The first one was the McCain-Lieberman bill of 2003—I am going from memory now. I think Republicans had a majority at that time. I think I chaired either the subcommittee or the committee of jurisdiction. We defeated the McCain-Lieberman bill. It came up again slightly changed in 2005. We defeated it at that time too. Then the Warner-Lieberman bill came up in 2008, and we defeated that even by a larger margin. The Waxman-Markey bill—and keep in mind that this was when the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts was in the House—came up in 2009, but it never did reach the floor.

All of these bills would have established greenhouse gas regulations for the Nation's largest manufacturing power-generation facilities, but once the American people learned how much these cost, Congress ran away from these bills and they were defeated.

Each and every one of these bills would have cost the economy between \$300 and \$400 billion in lost GDP every year. These figures are not disputed. The first time they were calculated was back when the first bill came up. At that time everyone assumed that global warming was real, they assumed that the end of the world was coming and that manmade gases were responsible for it, and that was something which was kind of accepted.

At that time, though—and I remember hearing the first speculation as to the cost—the Wharton Econometrics Forecasting Associates came out with the range of between \$300 and \$400 billion a year. Then the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, MIT, and Charles River Associates and others came out with the same range—between \$300 and \$400 billion a year.

When you break this down to each household—every time there is some big regulation that comes along, I take

the number of people from my State of Oklahoma who filed a Federal tax return, number of families, and then I will calculate, do the math, and it turns out about \$3,000 a family. That would make cap and trade the largest tax increase in American history.

It is not surprising that these bills did not become law. They were defeated. The McCain-Lieberman bill of 2003 fell 43 to 55; then the McCain-Lieberman bill in 2005—an even wider margin—38 to 60; and the Waxman-Markey fell because they didn't have the votes to do it.

What I am saying is that the trend is not going the way my good friend from Rhode Island would like to have it go. Instead, more and more people are opposing this.

Part of what is motivating the EPA's rule is that they want to say they leveled the playing field between parts of the country that don't have cap-and-trade programs. I think one of the previous speakers talked about the fact that many places like—I see the Senator from California is here now—California and the Northeastern States have cap and trade. These regions are hurting economically in part because of the onerous environmental regulations, including cap-and-trade programs they have been working to implement for so many years.

But the real result of this has been higher electricity prices. In fact, the average price of retail electricity in New England, according to the Energy Information Administration, is 17.67 cents per kilowatt hour. That is almost 18 cents a kilowatt hour. Compare that to Oklahoma. We are at 9 cents per kilowatt hour. We are one-half the cost in my State of Oklahoma for electricity. You see we have a real competitive advantage. There is nothing that keeps the Northeast from bringing their electricity costs down, but they are unwilling to do it. They are unwilling to do what we did; that is, utilize a diverse, inexpensive fuel supply we can source from right at home in Oklahoma.

California implemented its own cap-and-trade program just over a year ago, and it applies to both heavy industry and power generation. The State boasts that its program is second in size only to the European cap-and-trade program. Today, however, California's electricity prices are 15.94 cents—in other words, 16 cents per kilowatt hour—a stunning 70 percent more than they are in my State of Oklahoma.

Knowing this, it isn't surprising we constantly hear about all the jobs and companies and manufacturing facilities that are moving from places such as California and New England to States such as Oklahoma and to the South where we don't have these same kinds of regulations. What we want to do in Oklahoma is develop a nurturing environment for business to thrive, and a big part of it is having inexpensive, reliable energy. That is what we have in Oklahoma. EPA's rule threatens all

we have worked so hard to accomplish, and it is all because so many politicians are beholden to the radical environmentalists.

What is interesting to me is the more and more the other side talks about global warming and all of the purported solutions here in Washington, the less and less people care.

In March, when Senate Democrats hosted their first global warming slumber party, Gallup released the results of the poll I believe the same day, showing Americans rank global warming as the 14th most important issue out of 15. I believe this was on March 9 or 10 when they had their last slumber party. It used to be No. 1 or No. 2, and now it is nearly last. We can see on this chart Gallup's poll numbers over time showing Americans care less about environmental issues than they ever did before. We can see the changes that have taken place. What people really care about are the economy and government spending. Those are the top two issues across party lines.

If enacted, this rule is going to cause serious damage to the economy. The Chamber of Commerce last week put out a study on regulations similar to the EPA's new greenhouse gas rules and found they will cost the economy \$51 billion in lost GDP and 224,000 lost jobs each year—not just once but each year.

The Heritage Foundation put out separate analysis calculating that the rule would enact a cumulative hit of \$2.23 trillion in lost GDP and destroy 600,000 jobs. By their measure, the average income for a family of four would decrease by \$1,200 a year. I believe it is actually closer to \$3,000 a year. Nonetheless, there is the consistency.

If we want to see where these regulations will ultimately lead, we need look no farther than the modeling President Obama uses. We need to be, as he says, more like Germany. Starting a few years ago, Germany began implementing an aggressive alternative energy agenda where they hiked subsidies and set a goal of generating 35 percent of their electricity from renewables by 2020. By 2050, this goal would increase to 80 percent. In doing this, the price of German retail electricity has doubled from where it was before. It is now 3 times—300 percent—higher than ours.

The next chart is *Der Spiegel*, a major publication in Germany. They recently had this on the cover of the magazine with the heading "Luxury Electricity: Why energy has become more expensive and what politicians must do about it."

In this, they talk about the politicians and others who are wishing Germany had not done what it was doing. And while industry, utilities, consumers, and some politicians are calling for reforms to the laws, it may be too late because everything is already on the books. This is what they are finding in Germany—and we all know how hard it is to repeal a law once it

becomes implemented. So the Germans started this, and we are now emulating Germany, and their cost of electricity has doubled. When we talk about doubling, to a lot of people—maybe a lot of us who serve in this Chamber—that is not a big deal. But take a poor family that is spending 50 percent of their income on energy. It is something they can't handle.

EPA's rules will push us in the same direction as Germany—which makes sense, when we consider the EPA's recent rules such as utility MACT and the 316(b) rule, and the NRC's incessant overregulation of the nuclear power industry. We have perfectly good powerplants being forced to shut down all over the country. Now we have this rule coming out of EPA that will force even more shutdowns and push the Nation to more aggressively adopt renewables, and over a very short period of time. This is going to cause reliability and affordability issues.

We have been talking about affordability. Reliability is another thing too, because we have to have a reliable source that doesn't stop. There is no way around it. It is not just me saying this. FERC Commissioner Phil Moeller recently predicted that because of EPA's overregulation, the Nation could face rolling blackouts by next summer. Renewables will only make this risk more severe. If a substantial amount of electricity is being provided by renewables, then we will become vulnerable to reliability risks.

What I mean by that is we don't always know when the Sun is going to be shining or when the wind is going to be blowing, but there is always a demand for power. The demand is always there, but the wind stops. I understand this. I am from Oklahoma. We can have a very windy day and all of a sudden it stops, and the Sun maybe stops shining. If the wind is blowing really hard one day and then stops the next, significant strains are put on the electricity grid.

To compensate for that, we have to have backup power ready to come online at a moment's notice—where it is turned off 1 minute and then on the next. Having that kind of capacity sitting around waiting for the Sun to stop shining is incredibly expensive, which is one of the reasons Germany's power is so much more expensive than others.

So when I hear the President and EPA saying this rule could actually lower electricity bills, it makes me wonder if they ever sit down in the same room with FERC and NERC and NRC to tell it like it is. Honestly, they are not telling the truth.

The President and Administrator McCarthy have also been touting the human health benefits this rule will deliver. To help announce the new rule, President Obama did a conference call with the American Lung Association and said it would help reduce instances of childhood asthma. Gina McCarthy made the same point in her remarks about the rule. But this completely contradicts what EPA previously said.

In this chart which the Agency has published, in official documentation, it says greenhouse gases “do not cause direct adverse health effects such as respiratory or toxic effects.” I know others will stand up to refute this, but this is what the EPA said.

What is even worse is this rule will not have any impact on global CO₂ emissions. We know this because of the President's first EPA Administrator, Lisa Jackson. This is kind of interesting. I asked her the question during the committee hearing, on live TV: If we were to do away, either pass cap-and-trade or by regulation, would this reduce the overall CO₂ emissions worldwide?

And she said: No, it wouldn't. Her quote is: “U.S. action alone will not impact world CO₂ levels.” This is because the largest tax increase in history, without any benefits—because once you implement these regulations, our manufacturing base would go someplace where they can find it; maybe China, maybe India, maybe Mexico. But they will go places where they don't have the stringent emission requirements we have in this country. So in that case, emissions would actually go up instead of down.

Add to all of this the fact that there has been no increase in global surface temperature between 1998 and 2013. This is according to the journal *Nature*, the *Economist*, and even the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change that is the United Nations. They are the ones who started this, and even they say there has not been any increase in global surface temperature between the years of 1998 and 2013.

This pause was totally unexpected by the scientific community. After all, CO₂ concentrations went up by 8 percent over the same period of time—which, according to the models, should have led to significant temperature increases. This chart shows the difference between actual temperatures—the blue and the green lines down here—and the temperatures that were predicted by “consensus” scientific community—the red line. They said this is where the heat was coming, and it didn't happen. It is clear the scientific community, which everyone puts so much trust in, did not predict a pause would actually happen.

Add to this the fact that the U.S. Historical Climatology Network is reporting that this is the coldest year so far on record for the United States. Others will say, no, that is not true. So I quoted this source, the U.S. Historical Climatology Network, that if things continue as they are so far, this will be the coldest year on record in the United States.

Normally, putting all this together would make me wonder why the President is pushing these regulations. But then I remember Tom Steyer. Let me introduce him.

This man, who made billions in the traditional energy industry, is the new poster child of the environmental left.

He is the one who promised to direct \$100 million to resurrect the dead issue of global warming. He has the President and others on board with his plan, and they are following through. Tonight's slumber party is proof enough.

I can hear it now. A severe case of righteous indignation is going to show up, and they are going to say: Are you saying Tom Steyer is putting 100 million in these races?

No, I am not saying that. That is what Tom Steyer is saying.

I have a quote here from him: It is true that we expect to be heavily involved in the midterm elections. We are looking at a bunch of races. My guess is we will end up being involved in eight or more races. And that is with \$100 million.

But that is what this all comes down to—a key constituency of the Democratic Party wanting to see the Nation completely change the way we generate and consume energy—for no environmental benefit. The only benefit here is a political one.

In closing, I wish to highlight a few of the legal issues I mentioned a minute ago that will likely come up once the rule is finalized. There are three main reasons why I do not believe this rule, from a legal perspective, is an appropriate construct of the Clean Air Act. I always supported the Clean Air Act amendments, and good things happened from them.

The first is the Clean Air Act was never designed to handle greenhouse gas emissions. We know that. This is a bipartisan perspective. Congressman JOHN DINGELL, one of the principal architects of the Clean Air Act over in the House, said last week:

I do not believe the Clean Air Act is intended, or is the most effective way, to regulate greenhouse gases.

The second legal reason is this rule relies on an outside-the-fence approach to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Section 111 of the Clean Air Act should only allow the EPA to establish a process where the States determine the most appropriate emission reductions on a facility-by-facility basis. Instead, the EPA has set statewide emission reduction mandates, without regard to the technical feasibility of actually accomplishing the goal.

Cap-and-trade proposals will emerge under this, which will ultimately pit industries against one another. So the real impact of this rule could far exceed its advertised intent of targeting only powerplants.

Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt has effectively made this case and will lead the charge challenging the legal authority of this rule, should it become final. I am very proud of the attorney general, because he has been very effective in leading other attorneys general around the country to join in this effort.

The third reason this rule is inappropriate is because the Clean Air Act states that section 111(b) regulations cannot be pursued in the event the fa-

cilities are already regulated under section 112, which governs air toxins. Powerplants are already regulated under this section. So the fact they are trying to regulate them under 111(b) is inconsistent with the law, and that of course will be on our side on this.

There are a number of major reasons why this rule may not stand up in the courts. But it is my expectation that it will not come to that point. The largest tax increase in history. The Earth's surface has not gotten warmer in 14 years. Polling shows Americans don't believe it is a huge problem. It is huge for job losses. Stopping CO₂ in the United States won't affect world CO₂ emissions. That is what we have from the Administrator of the EPA. So we will be hearing a lot of things tonight, all about what is going on, and they will be discreet with me. That is the reason I always document things.

Let me predict what I think is going to happen. A lot of people are not aware that there is something called the CRA, the Congressional Review Act. The Congressional Review Act is something where people say: Yes, there is a crisis in this country. Don't blame me. I am a Member of Congress. I didn't vote for it, but the regulators did this. This puts them where they should be in having to take a position.

The CRA is something introduced with 30 cosponsors. I already have 30 cosponsors to file a CRA on every one of these regulations, if they do become final. You cannot do it until they become final. Then it is a simple majority. So people are going to have to get on record, and to me that is really all we really need to get people on record on this.

I think you are probably going to hear some issues and people will assume that these are really happening. You will hear that extreme weather is increasing. The reinsurance company and global-related disaster losses have declined by 25 percent as a proportion of GDP. They will say that hurricanes are happening. Yet the Washington Post says the United States has not been witness to a category 3 or higher major hurricane landfall since October of 2005 when Wilma hit Southwest Florida as a Category 3 storm.

They will be talking about drought, in spite of the fact that even the IPCC has stated that in the United States droughts have become less frequent, less continuous, or shorter in central North America. *Nature*, the well-respected publication, says drought for the most part has become shorter, less frequent, and covered a smaller portion of the United States over the last century.

Flooding—the IPCC comes in again talking about this. The USGS says floods have not increased in the United States in frequency or intensity since at least 1950. NOAA says flood losses as a percentage of GDP have dropped by 75 percent since 1940. You are going to hear about flooding. That is why it is necessary to document these things.

NOAA, talking about tornadoes, says: Tornadoes have not increased in frequency, intensity or normalized damage since 1950. Some data shows that there has been a decline. So we have all these issues that I am sure we will be discussing sooner or later.

Polar bears—the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee gave me a polar bear coffee cup, which I use frequently, and we display that very prominently. But they say in the 1950s and 1960s there were between 5,000 and 10,000 polar bears. Today there are between 15,000 and 25,000.

So we have all these issues that are a reality on the glaciers. You can record the hurricanes and all these other items, and, yes, they are going to be talking about them, I am sure, during the course of the evening.

Let me just mention one other item from memory on this, but I know it is right because the I have said it so many times and it has recently been documented. We go through these 30-year cycles all the time. We have been going through them for a long time. If you take in 1895, all of a sudden everything started getting cooler, and that is when the term ice age first came along. They said another ice age is coming. That lasted until 1918. In 1918, all of a sudden it started getting warmer, and that was the first time you heard about global warming. That was 1918 to 1945. In 1945 it turned again—you see, every 30 years—and all of a sudden it got cold. They talked about another ice age coming. I remember Time magazine had a cover talking about the ice age. Then in 1970 another warm period came along. That is the one that people have been talking about.

Here is the thing. In 1945 we had the largest amount of increase in CO₂ emissions of any time in the recorded history of this country, and that precipitated not a warming period but a cooling period. Now as they have said, we haven't been warming for the last 15 years. So this is always a difficult issue to deal with. I know the effort is there. I know it is renewed now and people are excited about it, and I could assure you the trend is in the wrong direction, and it is not going to happen.

With that, Mr. President, my time has expired, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Under the unanimous consent request, the floor reverts to me, but the distinguished Member from California, my chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, has joined us, and I will yield for the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Presiding Officer, and I also want to thank my friend Senator WHITEHOUSE, such a great leader on this issue.

I am really glad that Senator INHOFE, my good friend, came down to the floor. He deserves a thank you because

he has laid out why he denies the obvious, and that is that this planet is warming and it is due to human activity. Frankly, it is his right to turn his back on 97 percent of the scientists just like the deniers did when we learned that it was, in fact, smoking that was causing an epidemic of lung cancer. I respect Senator INHOFE. I am glad he came. But I have to say, I am sad that we haven't seen any Republicans come here except for Senator INHOFE who has written a whole book on this—and we know his views—but we don't see anybody else.

Let me tell you what we know from our other colleagues. Let's just take the Speaker—the Republican Speaker of the House, who said when asked about climate change—he kind of has a different view than Senator INHOFE, as does Senator RUBIO. This is what they said when asked what they think about climate change. Their answer is: Well, I am not a scientist. What do I know?

Well, right. They are not. Why don't you listen, then, to 97 percent of the scientists, if you admit that you are not a scientist?

What are Speaker BOEHNER or Senator RUBIO or the others who are these deniers saying? They are now saying they are not a scientist. Let's say they went to the doctor and the doctor said: Look, you have a serious liver condition, and I have a new drug that has been created to cure your disease. I don't think we should wait, and let's go.

And you didn't say: Well, I want a second opinion; I want to go to another doctor. You said: You know what. I am not a doctor. I don't think so.

Does that make sense?

What if you went to a dentist and the dentist said: Senator, you have an abscess. It is pretty straightforward. I can fix it. If you let it go, you are going to get an infection. I don't know what can happen.

Now, if I said to the dentist that I am going to check with a couple other people, then that is fine. But no, if I said: Oh, I am not a dentist, but I don't think so. As my friend told me before, you take your car in for repair, and they say: You know, there is something wrong with the brakes here, and we have to tighten those brakes. Can you leave the car here?

Well, I am not a repairman.

Ninety-seven percent of the scientists—they are all peer reviewed and are telling us what is happening to our planet.

Here is the thing about these deniers. If they want to jump off the climate change cliff and just go by themselves, that is their choice, but they are going to take everybody with them; OK? My grandkids, your grandkids, and their kids—and we are not going to let it happen. Senator WHITEHOUSE isn't going to let it happen. I am not going to let it happen. The President isn't going to let it happen.

Climate change is all around us. We must take action to reduce harmful

carbon pollution, which 97 percent of scientists agree is leading to dangerous climate change that threatens our families. We cannot be bullied by those who have their heads in the sand, and whose obstruction is leading us off the climate change cliff.

One week ago the President released his new proposal to control dangerous carbon pollution from existing power plants, and it is a win-win-win for the American people. Power plants are the largest source of the Nation's harmful carbon pollution accounting for nearly 40 percent of all carbon released into the air. Unlike other pollutants, right now there are no limits to the amount of carbon pollution that can be released into the air for power plants. The President's carbon pollution reduction plan will protect public health and save thousands of lives. It will avoid up to 6,600 premature deaths, 150,000 asthma attacks, 3,300 heart attacks, 2,800 hospital admissions, and 490,000 missed days at school and work.

The President's plan to reduce harmful carbon pollution will also create thousands of jobs. By reducing carbon pollution we can avert the most calamitous impacts of climate change—such as rising sea levels, dangerous heat waves, and economic disruption.

As the recent Congressionally-required National Climate Assessment report tells us, we could see a 10 degree Fahrenheit rise in temperature if we do not act to limit dangerous carbon pollution now.

The President's proposal is respectful of the States' roles and allows major flexibility, while ensuring that big polluters reduce their significant contributions to climate change. The plan will allow the States to work with the EPA to analyze costs, and ensure carbon pollution standards continue to promote innovation and continue America's leadership in pollution control technology.

By cutting carbon emissions from power plants by 30 percent nationwide from 2005 levels, the President's plan will also help American families and businesses. The President's plan is projected to shrink electricity bills roughly 8 percent by increasing energy efficiency and reducing demand in the electricity system.

The American public wants action. According to a Washington Post-ABC poll released today, a bipartisan majority of the American people want Federal limits on carbon pollution. Approximately 70 percent say the Federal Government should require limits to carbon pollution from existing power plants, and 70 percent—57 percent of Republicans, 76 percent of Independents, and 79 percent of Democrats—support requiring States to limit the amount of carbon pollution within their borders.

The President's proposed carbon pollution standards for existing power plants is supported by the Clean Air Act. Congress gave the President the ability to control air pollution in the Clean Air Act. In 1990, revisions to the

Act overwhelming passed by a vote of 89-11 in the Senate and 401-21 in the House. In 2007, the Supreme Court confirmed in *Massachusetts v. EPA* that as passed by Congress, the Clean Air Act in no uncertain terms gave the Environmental Protection Agency authority to control carbon pollution. Four years later, the Supreme Court in *American Electric Power v. Connecticut*, specifically found that the Clean Air Act has provisions in place to limit carbon pollution from power plants—the very provisions the President is using in his proposed power plant carbon standards.

We have long known that air pollution contributes to climate change. During the debate on the 1970 Clean Air Act Amendments, Senator Boggs introduced into the record a White House Report stating that: “Air pollution alters climate and may produce global changes in temperature. . . . [T]he addition of particulates and carbon dioxide in the atmosphere could have dramatic and long-term effects on world climate.” And the Clean Air Act has a proven track record.

The U.S. has shown we can continue to protect the environment and grow the economy. Over the last 40 years since the passage of the Clean Air Act, air pollution has dropped 68 percent and America’s GDP has grown 212 percent. Total private sector jobs increased by 88 percent. Between 1980 and 2012, gross domestic product increased 133 percent, vehicle miles traveled increased 92 percent, energy consumption increased 27 percent, and U.S. population grew by 38 percent. During the same time period, total emissions of the six principal air pollutants dropped by 67 percent.

It is in America’s DNA to turn a problem into an opportunity, and that is what we have done by being a pioneer in the green technology industry. These new carbon pollution standards are no different. Landmark environmental laws have bolstered an environmental technology and services sector that employs an estimated 3.4 million people, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. And many of these jobs, like installing solar roofs and wind turbines cannot be outsourced.

We must take action to protect families and communities from the mounting impacts of climate change. Just look at China, which has hazardous levels of air pollution and toxic emissions. According to a scientific study from the Health Effect Institute on leading causes of death worldwide, outdoor air pollution contributed to 1.2 million premature deaths in China in 2010, which is nearly 40 percent of the global total. Officials in China have recently suggested that they plan to take steps to address their carbon pollution, but the U.S. cannot wait for China to act. The President’s new power plant standards are a major step forward. They show that America will finally lead on a path to averting the most dangerous impacts of climate change.

On Friday the White House released a report on the harmful health impacts of climate change, especially on our most vulnerable populations like children, the elderly and low-income Americans. The report cited impacts like increased ground level ozone which could worsen respiratory illnesses like asthma, increased air pollutants from wildfires, and more heat-related and flood-related deaths. The first line in this new report sums up why we must take action to reduce carbon pollution:

We have a moral obligation to leave our children a planet that’s not irrevocably polluted or damaged.

The American people want us to protect their children and families from dangerous climate change. We must safeguard our children, our grandchildren, and generations to come.

The people of my home State of California and the American people deserve these new protections, and the President should be lauded for moving forward and tackling one of our Nation’s greatest challenges.

I am going to spend the rest of my time summing it up by refuting some of the things Senator INHOFE said.

I have to say the President deserves a lot of credit for his plan. What is really interesting is it is supported by 70 percent of the American people, who “think the Federal Government should limit the release of greenhouse gasses from existing power plants in an effort to reduce global warming.”

That includes amazingly 57 percent of Republicans, 79 percent of Democrats, and 76 percent of Independents who support the President’s plan. They are not stupid. They are smart.

Look what happens when you throw the environment under the bus. People walk around in air that you can see. You don’t want to see the air. You don’t want to wear a mask when you go outside. The American people get it.

Then my colleague says: They are going to scare you. They are going to scare you. There is no problem with carbon in the air. There is no problem at all.

Well, let me tell you who disagrees with Senator INHOFE, who disagrees with the Republicans: the American Medical Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Thoracic Society, the American Public Health Association, the American Lung Association, the National Nurses Union. They all have statements that say climate change is a threat to public health.

Who are the people going to listen to? Us politicians or people who spend every day of their life waking up in the morning and thinking of ways to protect our health? Yes, if the deniers want to jump off the cliff and they only hurt themselves, I suppose that is their option. But they are taking my kids, and they are taking all the kids of our American families, and we are not going to let that happen.

I will close with this. The Senator from Oklahoma started to say: This is

going to kill you. It is going to raise your prices of electricity. Jobs are going to be lost. He cited a U.S. Chamber of Commerce study that has been so rebuffed that the Washington Post gave it their most Pinocchios—in other words, four Pinocchios for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce because they were responding to something that never came about.

This plan of the President’s makes a whole lot of sense. He has courage to do it. We are going to stand behind it. And, yes, the Republicans are going to try to repeal it. Let me give them the bad news from their perspective. They have sent over dozens and dozens of environmental riders. I want to say over 90—over 90—and we have beaten back every single one of them. For colleagues to stand there and say Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE and I are doing this because it is an election year is a joke. We have been doing this for years.

I daresay Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE has made more speeches on the floor than anyone on this subject. When I had the gavel for the first time in 2007, I had to fight to keep it in my hand because, guess what. We had Al Gore before the committee. Remember? Senator INHOFE was so stressed he tried to grab the gavel. We have kind of a funny picture in our office in which I said: “Elections have consequences.” And they do. But to say that we are doing this because there is some donor is the most absurd thing I have ever heard.

I will put in the record a statement by Lyndon Johnson. This shows how far back Democrats have warned about this. This is amazing. My staff discovered this. He said this in 1965.

In his “Special Message to the Congress on Conservation and Restoration of Natural Beauty” President Lyndon B. Johnson stated that, “The Clean Air Act should be improved to permit [EPA] to investigate potential air pollution problems before pollution happens, rather than having to wait until the damage occurs, as is now the case, and to make recommendations leading to the prevention of such pollution.”

“Air pollution is no longer confined to isolated places. This generation has altered the composition of the atmosphere on a global scale through radioactive materials and a steady increase in carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels.”

So don’t come on this floor and say suddenly the Democrats care about this because it is an election year. It is ridiculous. We have known about this for years. We have been trying to get the attention of our colleagues.

I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE. He and I signed a letter with several others inviting our colleagues to the floor. All we got was Senator INHOFE—not that we don’t love him, and we appreciate he came over here, but we have to now assume he speaks for everybody on that side, which is scary, because they have turned their backs on the doctors.

They have turned their backs on the scientists, and they have turned their backs on the American people.

Thank you, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and I would yield back to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, the hope for this evening was that by extending a formal invitation to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, somebody would come to the floor who was not just outright denying that climate change is happening.

For a while Senator INHOFE's was focused on the economics of various types of regulation during his remarks. At that point I thought maybe we could have a conversation about the best way to solve the climate change problem, but toward the end of his remarks, he got back to denying that it is happening at all, which makes a tough place to begin negotiations.

There are plenty of other Republican Senators in this body, many of whom have worked on this issue in the past. I don't know whether it is a coincidence, but the level of activity by Republican Senators on climate change collapsed shortly after the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Citizens United*. As many of my Republican friends have pointed out to me on the floor, there have been times when the big, dark, anonymous election money that has been thrown around since that decision has been made has been spent against Republicans more than against Democrats.

We hope that as we resolve that issue, some of our friends find a way back to the positions they have held in the past, back to campaigning nationally on climate issues, supporting bipartisan climate legislation, supporting a carbon fee, and voting for a cap-and-trade bill. That is where they had been before *Citizens United*, and we had hoped to bring them back. But the champion sent by the Republican side to represent their point of view tonight was Senator INHOFE, who has written a book that said this is all just a big hoax. In that sense it was disappointing.

I have heard these arguments before, and as we go down the list, I think it is worth taking a moment to knock them aside. One of my personal favorites is that the EPA is doing this after the issue was repeatedly blocked in Congress. Well, yes, it has been blocked in Congress by coal and oil and polluter interests. So the interests that have blocked a highway don't get to complain when traffic has to take a detour.

We would be delighted to work on serious climate legislation in this body. We would be delighted to have it here. For a lot of reasons, we would get a better result if we addressed climate change legislation here rather than through the EPA rule. This is where the conversation should take place, but when oil and coal and polluting industries take the position that this is not real and force the Republican Party

into that position—that climate change is not real—then we are obviously not going to have a very meaningful discussion about solving a problem, and that is what forces it go to the EPA. It is a little rich for those who have shut down this forum for solving this problem to complain when it gets solved in another and less efficient way. They don't very well get to do that.

The high cost of the solution is—I think Senator INHOFE said—\$300 to \$400 billion and that it is not disputed. Well, yes, it is totally disputed. It is absolutely disputed. In fact, it is not even true.

The best way to solve this problem is with a revenue-neutral carbon fee. What does revenue neutral mean? Revenue neutral means that for every dollar that comes in from the carbon pollution fee that the polluters have to pay, it goes right back out to the American people and straight back into the economy; 100 cents on the dollar goes back to the American people. That is what I would like to see. It can be done through tax deductions.

A conservative organization, the American Enterprise Institute, has co-authored a report with the Brookings Institution on what they call a carbon tax. I call it a carbon pollution fee, because when we are giving all the money straight back to the American people, it is not truly a tax. It is not general revenue to the government. The money goes straight back out. When we do that, I think there is a case to be made that that actually propels the economy.

Investing in innovation, supporting and creating different types of energy that we can build in America is inevitably going to be better for our economy than having to use fossil fuels, clean up after the pollution, and deal with the foreign countries that traffic in fossil fuels. It would all lead to a better circumstance for our country.

The Senator from Oklahoma also said this is the product of what he called the radical environmental movement. One group that speaks very strongly on climate change is NASA. Right now NASA is driving around a Rover on the surface of Mars. They built a Rover that is about the size of an SUV, launched it into space, landed it successfully on the planet Mars, and they are now driving it around. Do you think these people know what they are talking about? Do you think NASA is a radical environmentalist movement? Really? That is a conspiracy theory that has run amok if you think NASA is part of a radical environmentalist movement.

How about our military? "National Security and the Accelerating Risks of Climate Change" by the CNA Military Advisory Board. The CNA Corporation is a corporation largely comprised of retired military who are kept on in that role to advise the military on emerging issues. It is sort of a think tank for the U.S. military that has

been there through Republican and Democratic administrations alike. This report, "National Security and the Accelerating Risks of Climate Change," was done by this military advisory board with some very interesting people.

How about BG Gerald E. Galloway, Jr., the former dean at the U.S. Military Academy. Do you think the dean from West Point is part of a radical environmental movement?

How about Lee Gunn, a former inspector general of the Department of the Navy. He doesn't seem like a very radical environmentalist to me.

ADM Skip Bowman, former Director of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program; Gen. James Conway, former Commandant of the Marine Corps—now there are some radical leftwing environmentalists for you, the U.S. Marines.

This is so far beyond that. Organizations such as Walmart, Coke and Pepsi, Ford and GM, UPS and FedEx, Target, Nike, VF Corporation, one of the biggest apparel manufacturers in the country located in North Carolina—all are totally on board with this.

The military is totally on board with this. NASA is totally on board with this, as is the National Science Foundation and every major scientific organization in the country—every single one. So let's not pretend this is a fringe group of radical environmentalists trying to foist an idea on the country. This is a fringe residue of oil and coal and polluting interests trying to prevent the end of a long holiday they have had from any responsibility for all the harm their carbon pollution has caused.

Let me tell you firsthand there is harm happening in my home State of Rhode Island, and it is not deniable. The deniers will never talk about the oceans. They will never talk about the oceans. They will talk about distant climate theory all day long, but when we go to the sea, the sea does not bear false witness.

The sea level is rising, and we measure that with essentially a yardstick nailed to the end of a pier. A tide gauge is not a complex instrument, and off the Naval War College in Newport, RI, the seas are up 10 inches since the 1930s. Why is that? We have known since President Lincoln was President that when we add carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, it warms the planet. That is not a hypothesis. That science has been established since Abraham Lincoln in his stovepipe hat drove around Washington in a carriage.

We know billions of tons of carbon dioxide have gone up there. We know further that virtually all the heat has gone into the oceans. Unless somebody wants to deny the law of thermal expansion—and I have not heard anybody willing to deny that yet—when we warm up the ocean, guess what. It expands and rises. We in Rhode Island have seen seas 10 inches higher thrown at our shores by a big storm or hurricane. It makes a big difference.

I challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to give me just 5 minutes of their time and go to Google and look up the images of the hurricane of 1938. Look at the pictures of what happened in my State when the sea level was 10 inches lower.

Senator INHOFE mentioned the U.S. Chamber of Commerce study. I am a little surprised he did that because he is not the first Republican to mention the U.S. Chamber of Commerce study. Speaker BOEHNER mentioned the U.S. Chamber of Commerce study too. He earned a false from PolitiFact for referencing that study. The Washington Post gave it four Pinocchios. You know Pinocchio, his nose would grow longer when he would not tell the truth. So that was a strange place to go.

He said there has been no temperature increase. He said: "It didn't happen." It did happen. It absolutely did happen. It happened in the oceans where more than 90 percent of the heat goes. It happened in the oceans, and it can be measured with thermometers. It is not complicated.

If you go to Narragansett Bay in Rhode Island, you will see that the mean winter water temperature is 3 to 4 degrees warmer, and it has a real effect on Rhode Islanders. Men used to go out on boats with trawls and catch winter flounder in Narragansett Bay, and it was a cash crop. It was a fishery that fed their families. It has crashed 90 percent, and a significant part of that is because the bay is no longer hospitable to winter flounder when it is 3 to 4 degrees warmer. It simply doesn't work.

The public is with us, and we will get this done. Tonight we have seen what we are up against. Not one Republican in this building would come tonight at our invitation and say one word about climate change being real—not one Republican, not one word. So that is what we are up against. But they have lost the American public, and so the fall of the denial castle is inevitable. It is built on sand, and the sand is eroding. It is eroding.

Even among young Republican voters—self-identified Republican voters under the age of 35—the hypothesis offered by the deniers that climate change is not real is viewed as—and these are the words from the poll, not my words—"ignorant, out of touch, or crazy."

I submit that a party whose own voters under the age of 35 view that party's position of denying climate change as "ignorant, out of touch, or crazy" is a party that needs a new position on climate change. They are not even selling their own young voters, and they are certainly not selling the general public, which wants the President to do something about this in enormous numbers—70 and 80 percent, depending on whether one is looking at Democrats, Independents or the full population.

I will close with two specifics because we often have these debates sort of at the IPCC versus the Sierra Club level.

I have been going around to different States, and I have been looking at what is going on State by State. I have been to seven States already. I wish to mention two tonight. I just got back from New Hampshire, the most recent trip. What is going on in New Hampshire? New Hampshire, as many people know, has a big ski industry. It is a winter holiday destination, a winter vacation and tourism destination, and skiing is a big part of that. I met with the guy who runs the Cranmore ski mountain. They have, I want to say, tripled, or thereabouts, the number of snowmaking guns they have on their slopes. They have gotten better at it. They have made it more efficient so they make more snow. So as there is less snowpack in the mountains, they are able to get around it by making more snow. But the reality of this is proven by the fact that they have to go out there and make more snow. As a New Hampshire official said, that is fine for the slopes. They can get out there, and they can roar those guns all night long and make snow on those mountain slopes. But if a person is a Nordic skier, they have to go out on trails, and there is no economic way to blow snow onto trails. If a person is a snowmobile enthusiast, they go out on snow trails, and there is no economic way to blow snow onto snowmobile trails. They are seeing a dramatic falling off in Nordic and snowmobile tourism as a result and of the availability of that important market for them.

They talked about two animals. I will start with the moose. It is a pretty iconic species for New Hampshire, I was told. There are moose tours. Who knew? People go up to New Hampshire to look at moose. Moose touring is a multimillion-dollar industry. I learned something new on that trip. That industry is suffering from a couple of things. First of all, sometimes they do the moose tours on snowmobiles—no snow, no snowmobile moose tours. But worse—indeed, eerily, horrifyingly, creepily—the moose are dying off because they are being overwhelmed by ticks. Now, picking a tick off my dog is enough to give me the heebie-jeebies, and if I find one myself, it is a little creepy. We are not talking about one tick on these moose. We are not talking about 100 ticks. We are not even talking about 1,000 ticks on these moose. We are talking about 50,000 to 100,000 ticks per moose—so much that they can't keep themselves healthy. The blood is being sucked out of them by tens of thousands of ticks.

So the expert in that area who spoke to me said the reaction from the mothers is to just have one calf instead of two. That keeps the population from growing, and the calves basically starve. They die of anemia. They can't feed themselves.

They can't keep a blood system running that feeds themselves and the thousands of ticks. These things grow to be the size of a blueberry or a grape. It is really appalling. This is an em-

blematic mammal of New Hampshire, and this is what is befalling it.

What do the New Hampshire folks say is causing it? The retreat of the snow. The ticks, when they are falling and breeding and laying their eggs—whatever the heck they do to reproduce; I am no tick expert. But they do it on Earth now, whereas when they fell on snow, boom, that was it. So the explosion in the tick population and the disgusting infestation on those poor animals is directly related to the retreat of the snow.

The last point on New Hampshire, the State bird is evidently the purple finch. The purple finch has a very particular kind of habitat. Because of the way the climate is changing, that habitat is shrinking, and one of the bird experts I spoke to said they are looking at the prospect of the purple finch being a species that New Hampshire folks have to go to Canada to find. It is their State bird, but they have to go to Canada to find it.

The other State I will close with is Florida. Florida is ground zero for climate change. In Florida, great cities are flooding at high tide. The systems that used to drain water out of the cities in a rain storm are now flooding salt water into the cities because of sea level rise at high tides. I have met with former mayors and county commissioners who have shown me pictures of people riding their bicycle hub deep through water, on a bright sunny day. It is not raining; it is salt water. It has come up. One picture was of a yard where the homeowner had hammered a sign into the yard, "No wake zone," so that cars driving by on the flooded road wouldn't create a wake and wash more salt water into their yard. Some weren't so lucky, and the water was right through the front door and into the house.

The Republican mayor of Monroe County has made climate change a priority. She has instructed her county government to do a climate change report, looking particularly at sea level rise—the Republican mayor of Monroe County. Yet, what do we hear from the Republican side here? Not a peep. Not a peep.

She said something else that is interesting. I will close with this. I asked her how the coral reefs were doing. A lot of people go to Florida to snorkel and to scuba dive and to see the wonders of the world under the sea. I said: Mayor, how are your reefs doing? I have heard a lot about what acidification and warming temperatures are doing to reefs. She said: They are still beautiful. Then she paused and said: Unless you were here 10 or 20 years ago. Ten or 20 years, and we see that change.

What is happening to the reefs is really catastrophic.

My friends on the other side never want to talk about this. They want to talk about climate modeling. We don't need a model to go to the end of the dock at Fort Pulaski and see how much

the sea level has risen. We measure it. It is simple. It is the same thing at the Naval War College. We measure it. It is simple. We don't need complex computer models to go to Narragansett Bay and see it is nearly four degrees warmer mean water temperature and all the changes that happen as a result. We use a thermometer. It is not complicated. And the acidification of the oceans that is affecting the coral reefs and so many other creatures—it wiped out the northwest oyster spat. People grow oysters in the Pacific Northwest, and the sea water that came in was so acidic, it dissolved the shells of the baby oysters and wiped out a huge percentage of their crop. That we measure with the same kind of litmus tests kids do with their aquariums. It is not complicated. But they always want to talk about where it can be confusing. They never want to confront the problem.

We are going to find ways to continue to insist on confronting this problem. They may not be here tonight, but as the old saying goes, you can run, but you can't hide. There are too many of my colleagues who have been helpful and good on this issue before—as I said, before Citizens United. If we look at the Republican Senate activity on climate change before Citizens United and after, it is like looking at a heart attack. We see steady activity until Citizens United, and then it is a flat line. Citizens United, dark money, polluter money has done as much damage polluting our democracy as they have done polluting our planet. But we are going to continue to do something about it, and the American public not only is with us, they are going to insist on it.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

GASPEE DAYS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I am so glad to have you here because a recurring tradition on the Senate floor is about to take place, and it is always particularly good for a Senator from Rhode Island to have a Senator from Massachusetts presiding while I talk about this.

Today I am here to recognize and celebrate one of the earliest acts of defiance against the British Crown in our great American struggle for independence. Most Americans remember the Boston Tea Party as one of the major events building up to the American Revolution. We learned the story of spirited Bostonians—and when I say “spirited,” I mean that in several senses; I gather that spirits had been served to those Bostonians before they embarked on this adventure—clamoring onto the decks of the East India

Company's ships and dumping bales of tea into Boston Harbor as a protest of British “taxation without representation,” which was a fine and worthy stunt, and I am certainly not here to defend taxation without representation.

However, there is a milestone on the path to revolution that is frequently overlooked, and it is the story of 60 brave Rhode Islanders who challenged British rule more than a year before that Tea Party in Boston, and they did a little bit more than throw tea bags overboard. So every year I honor those little known Rhode Island heroes who risked their lives in defiance of oppression 1 dark night more than 240 years ago.

In the years before the Revolutionary War, as tensions with the American Colonies grew, King George III stationed revenue cutters, armed customs patrol vessels, along the American coast. They were there to prevent smuggling, to enforce the payment of taxes, and to impose the authority of the Crown.

One of the most notorious of these ships was the HMS Gaspee. Its captain, Lieutenant William Duddingston, was known for destroying fishing vessels, seizing cargo, and flagging down ships only to harass, humiliate, and interrogate the colonials.

Outraged by this egregious abuse of power, the merchants and shipmasters of Rhode Island flooded civil and military officials with complaints about the Gaspee, exhausting every diplomatic and legal means to stir the British Crown to regulate Duddingston's conduct.

Not only did British officials ignore the Rhode Islanders' concerns; they responded with open hostility. The commander of the local British fleet, ADM John Montagu, warned that anyone who dared attempt acts of resistance or retaliation against the Gaspee would be taken into custody and hanged as a pirate, which brings us to June 9, 1772, 242 years ago.

Rhode Island ship captain Benjamin Lindsey was en route to Providence from Newport, in his ship the Hannah, when he was accosted and ordered to yield for inspection by the Gaspee. Captain Lindsey ignored the Gaspee's command and raced away up Narragansett Bay—despite warning shots fired by the Gaspee. As the Gaspee gave chase, Captain Lindsey knew a little something about Narragansett Bay and he knew a little something about the Hannah. He knew that she was lighter and drew less water than the Gaspee. So he sped north toward Pawtuxet Cove, toward the shallow waters off Namquid Point. His Hannah shot over the shallows there, but the heavier Gaspee grounded and stuck firm. The British ship and her crew were caught stranded in a falling tide, and it would be many hours before a rising tide could free the hulking Gaspee.

Presented with that irresistible opportunity, Captain Lindsey continued

on his course to Providence and there enlisted the help of John Brown, a respected merchant from one of the most prominent Providence families. The two men rallied a group of Rhode Island patriots at Sabin's Tavern, in what is now the east side of Providence. So perhaps something the Bostonians at the Tea Party and the Rhode Islanders at the Gaspee had in common was spirits. Together, the group resolved to put an end to the Gaspee's threat to Rhode Island waters.

That night, the men, led by Captain Lindsey and Abraham Whipple—later to become a commander in the Revolutionary navy—embarked in eight longboats quietly down Narragansett Bay. They encircled the Gaspee, and they called on Lieutenant Duddingston to surrender his ship. Duddingston refused and ordered his men to fire upon anyone who tried to board.

Undeterred, the Rhode Islanders forced their way onto the Gaspee's deck—in a hail of oaths and sword clashes and musketfire—and Lieutenant Duddingston fell with a musket ball in the midst of the struggle. Right there in the waters of Warwick, RI, the very first blood in the conflict that was to become the American Revolution was drawn.

As the patriots commandeered the ship, Brown ordered one of his Rhode Islanders, a physician named John Mawney, to head to the ship's captain's cabin and tend to Duddingston's wound—a humane gesture in their moment of victory to help a man who had threatened to open fire on them only moments before.

Brown and Whipple took the captive English crew back to shore and then returned to the Gaspee to rid Narragansett Bay of her despised presence once and for all. They set her afire. The blaze spread through the ship, and ultimately to the ship's powder magazine, which went off with an explosion like fireworks, the blast echoing through the night across the bay, the flash lighting the sea up like daylight, and fragments of the ship splashing down into the water all around.

The site of this audacious act is now named Gaspee Point in honor of these brave Rhode Islanders. So I come again here to share this story and to commemorate this night so many years ago—June 9, 1772—and the names of Benjamin Lindsey, John Brown, and Abraham Whipple, and those men not known to history who fought beside them that night.

The Gaspee Affair, as it was called, generated furor in the British Government, which appointed a royal commission of inquiry based in Newport to gather evidence for indictment. The indicted men were then to be sent to England for trial.

Well, not so fast. Rhode Island's colonial charter guaranteed its citizens the right to a trial in the vicinity in which the crime was alleged to have occurred. And beyond that, these Rhode Islanders presumed they were entitled to the