The corporate effort in Congress to get something done on climate change rounds to zero. I am in Congress, and I am here to say we need you guys to show up. I get that it is never convenient to stand up to bullies. It is always easier if they just go away, but the fossil fuel bullies are not going away. So it is either stand up to them or keep letting them roll Congress.

If what Coke and Pepsi and other corporations say publicly are the things they really believe, then it should be important to them that Congress not get rolled by the guys who are working against what they believe. This should not be too big an ask for the corporations that stood up in Paris: Do the same thing in Congress. Do the same thing in Congress. Do the simplest and truest of things: Stand up for what you believe.

It is time to wake up, but it is also time to stand up, and what a difference you will make.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

EXXONMOBIL CORPORATION,
Washington, DC, December 2, 2015.

Hon. EDWARD J. MARKEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. ELIZABETH WARREN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS: As to your question about Donors Trust and Donors Capital, we had never heard of these organizations until you brought them to our attention. We do not provide funding to them.

At ExxonMobil we too have been following the deliberately misleading stories regarding our company published by the climate activist organization InsideClimate News and by various media outlets. If you are interested in our response, please visit our corporate blog: http://www.exxonmobilperspectives.com.

From the very beginning of concern about climate change, ExxonMobil scientists and engineers have been involved in discussions and analysis of climate change. These efforts started internally as early as the 1970s. They led to work with the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and collaboration with academic institutions and to reaching out to policymakers and others, who sought to advance scientific understanding and policy dialogue.

We believe the risks of climate change are serious and warrant thoughtful action. We also believe that by taking sound and wise actions now we can better mitigate and manage those risks. But as policymakers work to reduce emissions, it is critical to recognize the importance of reliable and affordable energy in supporting human progress across society and the economy.

Sound tax, legal, and regulatory frameworks are essential. With sound policies enacted, investment, innovation, and cooperation can flourish. In our view, policy works best when it maintains a level playing field; opens the doors for competition; and refrains from picking winners and losers.

When considering policy options to address the risks of climate change, we urge you to draw from the best insights from economics, science, and engineering. The U.S. has achieved remarkable reductions in not just greenhouse gas intensity measures, but in absolute levels of carbon dioxide emissions as a result of large-scale fuel switching from coal to natural gas for electricity generation. Thoughtful regulatory initiatives directed to both energy and building efficiency standards, as well as continued improvements in emissions levels related to industrial processes, have also contributed to the reduction in the nation's greenhouse gas emissions.

As you consider additional policy options, such as putting a more direct cost on carbon to incentivize different choices, we suggest that these policies ensure a uniform and predictable carbon cost across the economy and allow competitive market forces to drive solutions. We believe this approach will maximize transparency, reduce complexity, and promote global participation.

You are probably aware that ExxonMobil has for a number of years held the view that a ''revenue-neutral carbon tax'' is the best option to fulfill these key principles. Instead of subsidies and mandates that distort markets, stifle innovation, and raise energy costs, such a carbon tax could help create the conditions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in a way that spurs new efficiencies and new technologies. The revenue-neutral carbon tax could be a workable policy framework for countries around the world—and the policy most likely to preserve the ability of every sector of society to seek out new efficiencies and new technologies.

Sincerely,

THERESA M. FARIELLO,
Vice President, Washington Office.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PRESIDENT'S STRATEGY TO DEFEAT ISIS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, just yesterday President Obama went to the Pentagon for a long overdue meeting with his national security advisers. During that meeting or shortly thereafter, he made this statement: ''We are hitting ISIL harder than ever.'' Unfortunately, the President failed to acknowledge the simple fact that his strategy against ISIL—or ISIS, as it is more frequently called—is simply not working.

This is pretty hard to get right, but at least our leaders should have the humility to recognize reality, and when things aren't working out so well, reconsider and make some midcourse changes so they do work—not this President. I have said repeatedly that the President needs to tell Congress and the American people about his comprehensive strategy to defeat this terrorist enemy, and he has to do more to give our military the flexibility and resources they need to accomplish the mission. It is simply wrong to ask our military to accomplish something and not give them the freedom, flexibility, and resources they need in order to accomplish it.

That is why when the President talks about airstrikes—I know of no military leader who believes that you can defeat this terrorist army in Syria and Iraq by airstrikes alone. Nobody. Yet that seems to be the only tactic this President is using. So the President needs to tell the American people the truth about the realities on the ground in Iraq and Syria. He needs to listen and take advice from the military leadership he has at the Pentagon and on his own staff. Above all, he needs to learn not to be ashamed of American leadership.

It is absolutely true that America doesn't necessarily need to fight the wars for other countries in the region that ought to be engaged in the fight themselves, but the fact is there is no one else on the planet who can lead like the United States of America. We have to organize it, we have to lead it, and we have to support it if we expect other people to be the boots on the ground to fight those wars, but the action we are seeing currently from this administration does not match the very serious threat we face, and it is a threat that has gotten worse, not better, under the President.

CIA Director John Brennan recently estimated that before President Obama prematurely pulled all U.S. troops out of Iraq, without any sort of transition at all, the predecessor of ISIS, known as Al Qaeda in Iraq, had ''maybe 700-or-so adherents left.'' This is the CIA Director, nominated by President Obama and confirmed by the Senate. He said, before the President pulled the plug in Iraq, there were about 700 or so adherents left in Al Qaeda in Iraq, the predecessor of ISIS. If we fast forward that to today, according to the New York Times, just a few months ago, he said: ''Nearly 30,000 foreign recruits have now poured in to Syria, many to join the Islamic State, a doubling of volunteers in the last 12 months. . . .''

Nearly 30,000 foreign recruits, a doubling of volunteers in just the last 12 months, these are pretty amazing and concerning numbers but more often they demonstrate how out of touch the President's remarks are when he says ISIS has been contained or we are hitting them harder than we ever have before. It is simply not working. Clearly, we need the President to execute an effective military strategy that results in both the physical destruction of ISIS and the complete rejection of their bankrupt ideology—not just in the Middle East but around the world, including here at home.

Frequently, when various pundits react when they hear people like me saying the President doesn't have an effective strategy, they say: OK. What is your strategy? First of all, I am not the Commander in Chief, but we did make some constructive suggestions to

the President. Nine other Republican Senators joined me in a letter, where we recommended six specific military options that if brought to bear on ISIS, would go a long way toward achieving his stated goal of destroying this terrorist army. First, it would take the handcuffs off the U.S. military and let our troops do what they have trained to do and what they have volunteered to do. Increasingly, we need a strategy that doesn't just handle the fight over there. We need a strategy to handle the fight here at home because of the danger of foreign fighters, of fighters going from the United States to the fight in the Middle East and then returning or people going to Europe. In particular, one concern has been raised by many of our Democratic colleagues is the use of the visa waiver, where you don't actually need—the 38 countries where you can travel to the United States without actually getting a specific visa or having to be interviewed by a consular officer at one of our embassies. This is a potential vulnerability for the United States.

The third area beyond the fight over there, beyond the danger of people exploiting the flaws in our screening system within immigration, whether it is fiance visas, whether it is a visa waiver or whether it is refugees—there is a third area the FBI Director talked about last week when he testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee. He talked about homegrown terrorists—people like the ones in San Bernardino who did actually travel to the Middle East and come back—but he also included people in the United States, American citizens. I must admit I appreciated the FBI Director's understanding of the threat that ISIS poses, including their attempts to inspire people in this country to become terrorists and commit acts of violence.

This Senator was astonished that the Department of Homeland Security would have a policy preventing the United States from screening the social media use by foreign nationals who are attempting to use our immigration system to come to the United States. In the instance of the female shooter in San Bernardino, it was revealed that using social media, she had posted things that should have been an alert—if our immigration officers were doing their job—to the fact that she was likely to be a jihadist and be a threat here at home.

Another threat we are going to have to deal with that Director Comey and the Deputy Attorney General raised is the use of encryption as a challenge that hinders the FBI's counterintelligence efforts against these ISIS-inspired extremists. Encryption applications are available on your cell phone, and some of the companies—Apple, for example—market them because people want to keep their communications private. We all understand that, but an encrypted message—one that is incapable of being unlocked—is one that can't be used to respond to a court order when somebody in law enforcement goes to court and says: We have probable cause to believe a crime was committed, so we want to execute this search warrant. As Director Comey confirmed, increasingly using encryption is part of terrorist trade craft.

I was shocked—because I hadn't heard it before—to hear Director Comey talk about how encryption impacted an investigation in my home State of Texas. He said many will remember that back in May, two men attempted to attack people at an event northeast of Dallas in Garland, TX. He said that fortunately the quick and effective response of law enforcement officials in the area stopped the men from making their way into the conference center, keeping them from inflicting more harm. We now know the attack was at least inspired by ISIS. In fact, according to media reports, ISIS quickly claimed responsibility for the attack.

Shockingly, Director Comey said last week before the Senate Judiciary Committee that the FBI had 109 encrypted messages with a terrorist overseas as part of this investigation of the Garland incident. According to the FBI Director, that is 109 messages the FBI still doesn't have access to because they are encrypted and they can't even crack it given a court order showing probable cause that it might lead to further evidence in this investigation. He pointed out that these sorts of encrypted communications are part of terrorist trade craft. In fact, there is reason to believe that within terror circles, they understand which of these devices and which of these apps are encrypted and thus make it less likely that they will be discovered when they are conspiring against Americans either here or abroad.

It troubles me that the men and women charged with keeping us safe don't have all the information they need. I think that is a subject on which we need to have a more serious conversation. I think that is why Director Comey mentioned that last week, and that is why the Deputy Attorney General came to testify before the Senate Judiciary Committee to raise the concern, so we can have the kind of debate we always have in America when it is a balancing of privacy and security.

I commend the Director for engaging Congress on this critical issue, but what it points out is that the President and this administration need to have a three-pronged strategy when dealing against a terrorist threat: As I mentioned, over in Syria and Iraq, unhandcuff our military and make sure they have a strategy that will actually work over and above just airstrikes; second, try to make sure we enhance our screening system for immigration for people who come into the United States so we don't inadvertently allow someone into our country who has the intention of doing us harm; and third, do more to come up with a plan to deal with people being radicalized right here in the United States, not the least of which, I would hope the Department of Homeland Security voluntarily reverses their policy of not screening social media communications which are in the public domain. I mean, there is no expectation of privacy on the part of people posting things in a public domain such as Twitter or Facebook, particularly things like Twitter. I know you can restrict access, but most people communicate with their friends, family, and anybody else who happens to want to have a conversation with them on social media.

We can all agree that the threat of ISIS to the United States is broad and real. Sadly, we were reminded in San Bernardino and in Garland last May of this fact.

Last week, both in a letter I sent to the President and here on the floor, we sought to make some constructive suggestions to begin to have that conversation, which was long overdue, about what an effective strategy to carry out the President's stated goal of degrading and destroying ISIS would actually look like. I hope the President listens. Unfortunately, so far experience has taught us he is not necessarily primed that way. But I hope he will reconsider in light of the increased public concern about terrorist activity in the United States. Certainly, public opinion polls have shown that is the No. 1 issue of concern to the American people, and as the leader of the U.S. Government and as Commander in Chief, I hope he will have the humility and the common sense to say that what we are doing now is not working the way it should. We can do better. We can do more.

Certainly, if the President would work with us in a bipartisan and bicameral fashion, I know we would support a strategy that I think Members of Congress felt had a reasonably decent chance of working. But right now the President seems stuck on this same inadequate strategy of just bombing missions. These airstrikes are necessary but not sufficient to get the job done over there. It certainly is incomplete when you look at the threat in terms of exploiting our immigration system and in terms of homegrown radicalism. We haven't heard the kind of plan that we need to hear from the President of the United States that we are willing to work with him on. We need to hear from him what he is willing to do to help keep the American people safe and to fight and win this war against Islamic radicalism.

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

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

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, according to press reports, this administration may be just weeks away from lifting sanctions on Iran. This is despite Iran's recent actions that indicate they have little intention to comply with the terms of the agreement called the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, also known as the Iran nuclear deal. Most recently, the International Atomic Energy Agency released the final report on the possible military dimensions of the Iranian nuclear program. It is quite clear Iran was less than cooperative with the International Atomic Energy Agency. For some reason, despite Iran's stonewalling, the President seems intent and confident that they know the extent of Iran's past nuclear weaponization work.

It is important to remember the evolution of the importance of this information. In April 2015, Secretary Kerry stated in an interview that Iran must disclose its past military-related nuclear activities as part of any final deal. His words on this matter were unequivocal.

He stated:

> They have to do it. It will be done. If there's going to be a deal it will be done. It will be part of the final agreement. It has to be.

Just a few weeks later, when it was clear President Obama's administration was ready to surrender to Iran's demands on this issue, Secretary Kerry said that we didn't need a full accounting of Iran's past activities. He said the U.S. intelligence agencies already had ''perfect knowledge'' of Iran's activities.

Just a few days ago, the International Atomic Energy Agency released their report, which was supposed to be a comprehensive overview of Iran's nuclear program and their past military dimensions of that program. Because of Iran's obstruction, the report is far from comprehensive—as we were promised.

The International Atomic Energy Agency report essentially concludes what many of us have known for a very long time. Iran was working toward developing nuclear weapons capability and they have continually lied and continually misled the international community regarding that program. The International Atomic Energy Agency also concluded that Iran's nuclear weapons program was in operation until 2009, several years later than many believed.

President Obama repeatedly stated that the nuclear agreement was based on unprecedented verification. Yet it is very clear from the International Atomic Energy Agency report that Iran had no intention of cooperating with the requirement that they come clean on their nuclear program. In many areas, the International Atomic Energy Agency indicated that Iran provided little information, misleading responses, and even worked to conceal portions of that program.

Many of the questions around the Parchin military facility remain unanswered. This report from the International Atomic Energy Agency states:

> The information available to the Agency, including the results of the sampling analysis and the satellite imagery, does not support Iran's statement on the purpose of the building. The Agency assesses that the extensive activities undertaken by Iran since February 2012 at the particular location of interest to the Agency seriously undermined the Agency's ability to conduct effective verification.

An effective verification was what we were promised. The Iranians were actively working to cover up and destroy any evidence of their weaponization efforts at Parchin. On many occasions, Iran refused to provide any information or simply reiterated previous denials. Iran refused to cooperate and instead continues to deceive the international community on the military dimensions of its nuclear program. Some may wonder why we should even care about this. It matters because a complete and accurate declaration of all nuclear weapons activity is a critical first step in the verification regime and the safeguard process that the International Atomic Energy Agency will be asked to enforce and something we put our confidence in. I shouldn't say ''we'' because I didn't vote for it—but something this country puts its confidence in this Agency's ability to enforce. There must be a baseline declaration to ensure effective international monitoring going forward.

It also matters because President Obama entered into an agreement, along with our allies, to provide sanctions relief in exchange for Iran giving up its efforts to develop nuclear weapons. It matters because it is clear we do not have ''perfect knowledge''—which we were promised—of what Iran is up to, as Secretary Kerry has claimed. It also matters because since the agreement was finalized, Iranian leadership has not changed their behavior. If anything, they have increased their hostility. Here are some examples of hostility: On October 10, Iran launched a long-range ballistic missile. This is clearly in violation of Security Council Resolution 1929. Then, on November 21, Iran launched another ballistic missile.

It is clear that Iran has no intention to comply with the ballistic missile restrictions of this deal. These are blatant violations. How are we supposed to have any faith in this agreement or Iran's intent to comply? Iran did not comply with the International Atomic Energy Agency. They have continued to test ballistic missiles. They continue to hold Americans hostage. A Washington Post reporter has been imprisoned for more than 500 days and was recently convicted of unspecified charges in a sham trial. Iran has no intention to honor any of their obligations under this deal. It is naive to think otherwise. As a recent Wall Street Journal editorial put it, ''The larger point is that the nuclear deal has already become a case of Iran pretending not to cheat while the West pretends not to notice.''

I hope President Obama and his administration finally wake up and quickly recognize Iran's track record of noncompliance. Iran cannot and should not be rewarded with sanctions relief. The international community should not reward Iran with sanctions relief while Iran doubles down on its confrontational and uncooperative behavior. They should not be given hundreds of billions of dollars while continuing to defy and deceive the international community.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 579

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I am on the floor this afternoon to talk about S. 579, which is called the Inspector General Empowerment Act, but it really ought to be called ''Let the inspectors general do their jobs.''

As I look back on my time as a State auditor and I think of all I learned about how government works well and how government behaves badly, I have a special point of respect for inspectors general because of the work I did as an auditor. I believe they are our first line of defense against waste, fraud, and abuse of taxpayer dollars. We should be helping them every way we can to do their jobs.

I want to thank Senator JOHNSON, the chairman of the committee I serve on that has primary jurisdiction on government oversight, and I want to thank Senator GRASSLEY for his long championing the cause of inspectors general and the GAO and all of the noble public servants who are out there every day trying to uncover government behaving badly.

This bill serves three main purposes. It provides additional authority to inspectors general to enhance their ability to conduct oversight investigations. It reforms the process by which the Council of the Inspectors General integrity committee investigates accusations against IGs, which is very important. IGs need to be above reproach. Any whiff of politics, any whiff of unethical conduct, any whiff of self-dealing—we have to empower the Council of the Inspectors General to deal with that in a way that is effective.

It restores the intent of the 1978 Inspectors General Act to ensure that IGs have timely access to documents they need to conduct good, comprehensive oversight audits and investigations.