

The Koch brothers and their shadowy organization know the truth. Science has long been proven, but they don't care. They will sacrifice the future of our planet for bigger Koch profits. I join my colleagues today and tomorrow, calling attention to the web of denial financed by the Koch brothers and other fossil fuel interests. The Kochs' money and power amplified the climate deniers' voices.

The government belongs to the people. Our planet belongs to the people—not the Koch brothers, these multi-billionaires. It belongs to the people. The public deserves to know who is behind these deceitful efforts, to allow better informed decisions about understanding climate change, and we are going to continue doing everything we can to show the evil nature of the Koch brothers.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 5293, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 524, H.R. 5293, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

TRAGEDY IN DALLAS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, last Thursday night, hundreds gathered in downtown Dallas to engage in a peaceful protest. Dozens of police officers were on hand to make sure that these protesters could exercise their rights under the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and protesters even snapped pictures of themselves with the officers in a show of harmony, underscoring the peaceful nature of the event.

As we know now, near the end of the route, all this was shattered as a gunman opened fire on law enforcement officers in a targeted, senseless, and vicious attack. It was made clear early on, that the attackers' goal was to kill as many police officers as possible, and he made a calculated effort to do just that. To attack those who work day in and day out to keep our communities safe is absolutely revolting. It is an act of pure evil and the shameful work of a coward.

Today our country grieves with Dallas, the Dallas Police Department, who lost four of their own, and Dallas Area Rapid Transit, who lost an officer while protecting the community that night.

These officers did what all of our law enforcement officers potentially would be called to do; that is, they put their lives on the line. Some gave their very lives, and several others were injured in actions that can only be described as heroic. These officers were certainly worthy of the badge they wore, and their courage makes me proud to be a Texan. They could have turned around and run away from the sound of gunshots and commotion. They could have given up and decided their lives were more important than the lives of those they had vowed to protect, but they didn't. That is not who they are. They are made of better, braver stuff than that. In fact, these officers ran to the sound of gunshots without hesitation to protect the community they serve.

Dallas police chief David Brown recounted that many ran out in the middle of the gunfire knowing they were making themselves targets of the attack in order to get injured officers to safety and to medical help. Many used their own bodies to help shield protesters who were fleeing in terror.

That is what the men and women of the Dallas police force are made of—undeniable valor and unfailing courage. To say we are indebted to them for their service to the community is an understatement, but I want to thank each and every one of them who didn't hesitate to put it all on the line to defend and protect the people of Dallas.

Today and tomorrow, when the President comes to Dallas, our country will continue to mourn with the whole Dallas community. We grieve for the first named officer who was killed, Officer Brent Thompson. Officer Thompson was a newlywed who married a fellow officer just a couple of weeks ago. We grieve for the loss of Patrick Zamarripa, who bravely served three tours in Iraq and leaves behind a wife, a son, and a 2-year-old daughter. We likewise grieve for the family and friends of Lorne Ahrens, Michael Krol, and Michael Smith—three other officers who were killed. We offer our prayers for those who were wounded, including a woman who happened to be an African American who was shot in the leg while trying to shield her sons from the bullets. We pray for her and the several other police officers who were shot but survived as they begin the long road to recovery.

I mentioned the race of the woman who was shot to underscore that while the shooter said he intended to kill White police officers, his actions did not discriminate based on race. Everyone who was in the line of his sight that night was a target.

This is a national tragedy, the deadliest day for American law enforcement since the events of 9/11. Tomorrow I will join leaders in Dallas, President Obama, and former President Bush at the memorial service to honor the lives of those we lost and to pray for healing and peace for the city and for our country.

While it should not take an event like this to jolt our consciences, we

have to consider more ways to support our public servants who are tasked with the daunting responsibility of keeping order, enforcing the rule of law, and protecting our communities. One way we can do that is to support additional training for our law enforcement, like some legislation that I have introduced called the POLICE Act, which has passed the Senate unanimously. It would make millions of dollars available for law enforcement to pursue active-shooter training.

In other words, we have learned the hard way that by trained policed officers running to the gunshot, we can actually save lives while endangering, obviously, the lives of the police officers engaging in that active-shooter practice. But with training, these officers can minimize their own exposure and, hopefully, save more lives. I hope the House will pass this legislation soon so we can send it to the President's desk.

I also would note the contribution of my friend and colleague Congressman JOHN CARTER from Central Texas, who has sponsored legislation in the House. It is pretty clear that we don't have all of the answers. That goes without saying, but we know we can make a difference if we try. In addition, I plan on introducing other legislation soon that would help law enforcement go after the violent criminals who intentionally target police officers and give additional authorities to our law enforcement officers to help them better defend both the public and themselves.

As we continue to grieve and say our prayers, let's not neglect our work to support law enforcement so that they can better protect and defend our communities. Our law enforcement officers deserve our utmost respect for the essential, irreplaceable role they play in our communities.

Tragically, the officers we lost last week were killed and injured for simply doing their job; that is, for keeping the community safe. They were shot while actually protecting protesters so that they could exercise their constitutional rights of free speech and assembly. These officers didn't do anything wrong. They weren't responsible for any of the real or perceived injustices that have occurred in other parts of the country, but they were targeted by a twisted and demented mind who lost his own life in pursuit of this terrible crime. There is no—zero—justification for the taking of these lives.

As our country continues to grieve, I hope we will also unite to support those who put their lives on the line to keep us safe.

Madam President, I see a Senator wishing to speak, so I will yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I see that Senator CARDIN has arrived, so I will yield to him in one moment. But while Senator CORNYN is still on the floor, I want to express the

sorrow and sympathy of the law enforcement community in Rhode Island for the loss Dallas has sustained.

As anybody who has served in law enforcement knows, the two worst words an officer can hear are “officer down.” They don’t know who it is, but they know it is one of theirs, and it is a sign of a casualty among the brotherhood and sisterhood of the police department. Those Dallas police officers had to hear the same words over and over again on that deadly night: Officer down. Officer down. Officer down.

I think it has shocked the entire country, and I have certainly seen people come from all around the United States when we have lost police officers in Rhode Island. They come and stand in the freezing cold outside of churches where a funeral is going on. They come in groups wearing bands. They come to show their respect. It is not just the men and women of law enforcement in Dallas and in Texas who feel this, everyone across the country does. I wanted to express that to the people of Dallas, the law enforcement community of Dallas, and our friend Senator CORNYN of Texas.

With that, I will now yield to Senator CARDIN, who will speak on a different subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, first I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his extraordinary work on an issue that affects the United States and the global community, and that is the reality of climate change and the impact it is having on the United States and on the global community.

Senator WHITEHOUSE and I, along with eight other Members of this Senate, represented the United States at the COP21 conference in Paris in which over 190 nations came together on an action plan to deal with climate and climate change. That would not have happened but for U.S. leadership. I am proud of the work that was done by the United States in setting up a blueprint so we can deal with the impact of climate change in the international community.

We can talk about the specific aspects of climate change and the impact it is having on the security of America. We can talk about the number of climate refugees—people who are going to be forced to leave their lands because of the rising sea level. We can talk about the impact of famine by droughts and floods that are occurring as a result of climate change. We can listen to our generals talk about the impact it has on our national security.

I start by saying that this is an issue of international concern that affects America’s security. We can do something about it, and we have done something about it. U.S. leadership has brought about a game plan to deal with this issue. So it is particularly frustrating to see special interest groups that have a direct financial interest in

maintaining the status quo by continuing to use high-carbon productions in order to produce their products, and they finance groups that produce documents to justify the science deniers. That is a particularly frustrating aspect, particularly since we recognize how much we need U.S. leadership.

I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for bringing to our attention the different special interest groups interested in high-carbon emissions and maintaining the status quo of our climate. They have financed these groups to come up with studies that are really phony in order to justify their opposition to responsible legislation here in the United States and around the world that will lead us to a safer course on climate change.

This is particularly important for us in America. I will get a little parochial for one moment, if I might. The Chesapeake Bay is one of the most vulnerable regions in the Nation to the effects of climate change. According to a report from the Chesapeake Bay Program’s Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee, some of these effects, including rising water temperatures and sea levels, have been observed in the watershed, and the region is expected to experience further shifts in its environmental conditions.

As water levels rise, so will coastal flooding and erosion. Marshes and wetlands will be inundated with saltwater and will disappear faster than wetland plants can populate higher ground.

There was an article in our local paper talking about the islands in the Chesapeake Bay—Tangier and Smith. They are disappearing. These islands won’t be there in the future. And we already have islands that used to be inhabited in the Chesapeake Bay that don’t exist.

A loss of marshes and wetlands will mean a loss of the habitat that traps pollution and provides food and shelter to fish, shellfish, and birds, and a loss of livelihood to Maryland’s men and women who earn a living by fishing, crabbing, and oystering in the Chesapeake Bay. It has a direct economic impact in addition to the safety issue.

Strong rain and snowstorms can damage crops, erode soil, and increase flooding. Floods can damage ports, marinas, and historical monuments, and threaten buildings, sewer systems, roads, and tunnels. Meanwhile, a network of groups purporting to be unbiased has misled the public about the scientific certainty of climate change.

In Maryland, junk science is a thing of the past. I take the time to point that out. The now-defunct Annapolis Center for Science-Based Public Policy was founded in 1993 by a former vice president of the National Association of Manufacturers. In its own words, the center was a “national, non-profit educational organization that supports and promotes responsible energy, environmental, and health and safety policy-making through the use of sound science.” Nothing could be further from the truth.

In 1997, the Annapolis Center hosted a workshop discussing both the scientific and economic uncertainty of climate change and that a “firm, unqualified conclusion on the direction and rate of climate change” will come “many decades in the future.” That was their finding. For reference, Dr. James Hansen, who was then a scientist at NASA and is still one of the most world-renowned climate scientists, testified before Congress nearly a decade earlier as to the certainty of climate science. Fortunately, the Annapolis Center is not sending out this kind of misinformation any longer. They are no longer in existence. They closed their doors, thank goodness. They were funded by special interest to produce a document that they could use to try to prevent the progress that was being made on climate change with our policymakers, including Congress.

Accelerating the transition to a low-carbon economy will produce many benefits with regard to sustainable economic growth, public health, resiliency to natural disasters, and the health of the global community.

My colleague in the House, Congressman DELANEY, and I have filed resolutions in the House and Senate affirming the establishment of a national goal of more than 50 percent of America’s electricity production coming from clean and carbon-free electricity by 2030. This is doable. Despite the misinformation that has been put out by these special interest-funded groups, we can do much better on the use of noncarbon sources to produce our electricity. Our “50x30” resolutions are co-sponsored by 30 Senators and 103 House Members. The resolutions are also endorsed by the Union of Concerned Scientists, Green Latinos, Green for All, Climate Hawks, and the House Sustainable Energy and Environmental Caucus.

I am proud of the legitimate, science-based work of groups like the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science. I applaud its hard work and the positive news of an improved score on the Chesapeake Bay report card for 2015. We are making progress. Why? Because we are following science-based solutions to deal with reducing carbon emissions.

I am proud of recent efforts to divest in fossil fuels in Maryland. The foundation that oversees the Maryland State university system’s \$1 billion endowment announced June 28 that it will stop investing directly in coal, oil, and natural gas companies—a victory for a student-led movement to direct more of the portfolio clean energy. The University System of Maryland Foundation, which helps fund scholarships, endowed professorships, and more, said it would sign on to a United Nations pledge to be more socially aware of its investments and appoint a staff person to identify opportunities in renewable energy.

I am also proud of the work of the Maryland board members of the U.S.

Chamber of Commerce. They have adopted proactive climate policies or practices.

This should not be controversial. This is good for business, not bad. For example, board member Xerox Corporation, headquartered in Germantown, MD, is doing its part to reduce the financial risk of climate change. It signed the American Business Act on Climate Pledge and pledged to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions and energy consumption by 20 percent by 2020. It is good for the environment, it is good for dealing with the impacts I have mentioned, and it is also good for business. This pledge is sponsored by the White House, and 154 businesses signed, voicing support for a strong outcome in the Paris climate negotiations.

Another example is the Maryland State Retirement and Pension System. It is a proud member of the Ceres Investor Network on Climate Risk, a voluntary network of companies that have committed to improve their environmental and social performance and to publicly report their sustainable strategies.

These and many other examples across Maryland demonstrate—contrary to what the chamber of commerce has said—that there is a business and economic case to be made to take steps to fight climate change.

Unless we all act, we will continue on a trajectory that leads to a grim future for us and our children. The first step that must be taken is the recognition that climate change is real and that it is happening right now so we can work cooperatively to come up with creative solutions rather than continuing unproductive arguments about whether everyone agrees the science is settled.

The types of activities we have seen should have no place in American politics. It is one thing to have disagreements on how we can resolve problems; it is another thing to say that the science points in an opposite direction than it does, particularly when it is funded by special interests that have a financial reward for trying to prevent science from dictating the policies—or leading us to the policies—in this country. I am proud to be part of the effort Senator WHITEHOUSE has brought to the floor to expose these types of organizations. I am pleased that the organization that existed in Maryland no longer exists. I am proud of the great work that is being done.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL WOLFE

Madam President, before I yield the floor, I wish to point out the incredible help I have had in my office from a detailee, Michael Wolfe. Michael is a Brookings fellow who has worked in my office. His home agency is the EPA, where he is the senior program analyst in the Office of Air and Radiation. He has worked at the EPA since 2004, dedicating most of his professional career to serving the American people.

I know how fortunate my colleagues and I are when we get detailees from

the executive branch to work in our offices. They provide extremely valuable help. Michael Wolfe has been an incredible resource to our office. He has been part of my team, and he is a civil engineer by training, which is something we desperately could use in my office. He was instrumental in my work on water infrastructure this year. He has also worked tirelessly to protect the clean water rule, the Chesapeake Bay agreement, and increase access to public lands in Maryland.

While Michael is incredibly smart, the first thing one notices about Mike is that he nearly always smiles. Even on tough days, he brightens up our office. It has been a pleasure to know him. He will be leaving our office next week, and I wanted to take this time to personally thank him for his service to the Senate.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, we expect that the Senator from Delaware will be here shortly, but in the meantime, let me begin with a few remarks.

This is the 144th time I have come to the floor to urge Congress to wake up to the threat of climate change. This week, something new is happening. I am joined by colleagues who will help me shine a little light on the web of climate denial and spotlight the bad actors in the web who are polluting our American discourse with phony climate denial.

This web of denial, formed over decades, has been built and provisioned by the deep-pocketed Koch brothers, by ExxonMobil, by Peabody coal, and by other fossil fuel interests. It is a grim shadow over our democracy in that it includes an electioneering effort that spends hundreds of millions of dollars in a single election cycle and threatens any Republican who steps up to address the global threat of climate change.

Just one of those electioneering groups, the Koch brothers-backed Americans for Prosperity, has openly proclaimed that if Republicans support a carbon tax or climate regulations, they would be “at a severe disadvantage in the Republican nomination process.” It would mean their political peril. When that threat comes from a group that has openly and notoriously pledged to spend \$750 million in an election cycle, that is a threat that serves notice on the political class to behave, and regrettably the political class too often does behave in the face of that kind of money.

I see that Senator COONS has arrived, and I am delighted to yield the floor to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I wish to thank my great colleague, the Senator from Rhode Island, for his tireless efforts to keep climate change on this Chamber’s radar. One day I hope that

we can move it from our radar to our to-do list and ultimately to the history books.

Today I am pleased and proud to join my colleagues to speak about something I thought we had established in grade school but apparently bears repeating; that is, the importance of science. It is troubling that today in the 21st century, there is any doubt about the importance of real, sound science in many facets of our lives. It is troubling that we still need to defend science here on the Senate floor.

Scientific discovery and invention are the engine of our economy. Science leads to transformative technologies and new ways of thinking in a wide range of fields, including health care, manufacturing, agriculture, clean energy, and national security.

Scientific inquiry is also the foundation of good public policy. It shapes and informs how we inform global threats such as ozone depletion, an issue on which the international community has made real progress. Science must play an equally central role in how we address climate change.

When we want to know what to do about a public health or environmental crisis, we turn to science. For example, rigorous, careful data collection and analysis are critical to understanding long-term trends. Data can show the effectiveness of a medication in treating a disease, for example, or the ability of a new material to withstand extreme conditions over time. And data can help us make good decisions based on those trends. Never have we had a greater ability to collect and analyze data than today. That is why more than ever in today’s world, science should drive policy, not the other way around.

In a number of areas, I have worked with my Republican colleagues on bipartisan bills that help substantially advance scientific inquiry, from encouraging citizen science projects to improving public-private partnerships with our national labs. So why is climate science so threatening to some?

Sadly, there are far too many organizations in existence today that have it backwards. These organizations have attempted to distort science for purely political ends because the facts threaten the bottom line of those who have created and sustained them. These organizations claim to use sound science to support policy objectives, but their actions indicate that the only science they find sound is the kind that sounds like profits.

One of these organizations is the now-defunct The Advancement of Sound Science Coalition, known as the TASSC—an organization that played a key role in obscuring the facts around the dangers of tobacco use. TASSC was originally founded back in 1993 under the guise of promoting “sound science in policymaking.” In reality, as was later uncovered in the documents that came to light in the course of litigation against the tobacco industry,

TASSC actually had the opposite goal. The year it was founded, it stated in private documents at the time that one of its goals was to lay the groundwork to help Phillip Morris advance its agenda of promoting tobacco use nationally and at the State and local level. How? Let me quote from one of these discovered documents: by “encouraging the public to question—from the grassroots up—the validity of scientific studies.”

These are not the statements of an organization devoted to scientific inquiry and data-driven policy.

Let me be clear. The problem doesn't lie in industry hiring scientists to argue their case. That is well within the rights of industry and of any organization in our country. The problem is when groups like this one misrepresent their very motives, hide their sources of funding and industry ties, and push out misleading or even incorrect information under the guise of “sound science.”

We all know today that smoking tobacco is profoundly harmful to our health. Yet these same organizations, the ones that decades ago promoted “science” that hid the truth about tobacco and threatened public health for far too long, are now in sadly too many cases doing the same with climate change.

Fortunately, today, this group I am discussing, TASSC, is now defunct. But its former executive director, Steve Milloy, is still an active climate change denier who helped draft the 1998 “Global Climate Science Communications Action Plan.” It included the statement: “Victory Will Be Achieved When Average citizens ‘understand’ . . . uncertainties in climate science; recognition of uncertainties becomes part of the ‘conventional wisdom.’”

Quite simply, his goal was and continues to be to persuade people, using incorrect, scientifically unsound information, to doubt the science about climate change, one of the greatest global challenges we face. His policy goal is to halt action on climate change, and he is using science incorrectly to achieve this political end. Frankly, this is irresponsible and it flies in the face of the foundation of the scientific method.

As someone who trained in chemistry in college, I am familiar with how scientists are trained to formulate hypotheses, carefully construct experiments to test those hypotheses, and without bias or preformed assumptions, then draw conclusions about those hypotheses. Starting with the answer and considering only evidence that supports the answer—that is not science; that is politics.

The very existence of groups like TASSC and others that my colleagues will speak about this evening and tomorrow make clear that we must work even harder to defend and support science throughout our society.

That means providing robust funding for our national lab system.

That means establishing a Federal effort to coordinate research in a new

subfield of chemistry that I have been excited about promoting.

That means supporting the use of crowdsourcing and citizen science methods in Federal agencies.

That means supporting policies that will support industry-relevant training in engineering, including advanced manufacturing.

All of these are efforts that I have been involved in and that enjoy bipartisan support. My colleagues know that I make an effort to promote pragmatic, bipartisan policy ideas. Science should not be a partisan issue, and neither, frankly, should climate change.

Climate change is all too real for those of us who live in low-lying coastal States like my home State of Delaware, where flooding has already devastated homes and communities up and down the State. The science is clear: This severe flooding is only going to increase as temperatures continue to rise around the globe and as the sea level rises as well.

We live in an era of unprecedented scientific and technological advantages. The NASA Juno spacecraft mission to Jupiter; the ability to use 3-D printing to manufacture custom products, specifically prosthetics; the evolution of new developments in robotics and genomics—these advances capture our imagination, and they can change our world. These developments happen because America's best trained scientists and engineers have spent decades undertaking rigorous and innovative research and applying their findings to address the big questions of our world.

Certainly the challenges of climate change are daunting and urgent, and so we should be focused on using the best science available to tackle these challenges with the best policy solutions possible—not convincing people who prefer denial and deception that the science isn't even real.

I wish to thank my friend and colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE for his tireless leadership in addressing climate change and for assembling today's important colloquy.

If I might, with the forbearance of my colleague from New Mexico who I see has come to the floor, I wish to take just a few more minutes to address an unrelated but urgent topic.

TRAGEDY IN DALLAS

Madam President, before I invite one of my colleagues to continue today's colloquy, I just want to say a few words about the tragic events in Dallas. Just four days ago, a peaceful protest in Dallas that brought together protesters and police in an example of the very best of our Nation was torn apart by a cowardly and savage act that reflected the very worst. Five police officers were murdered, leaving their families, friends, and country in shock, in mourning, and in search of answers, and six of their colleagues were injured.

Last week was a very difficult one for America. From Dallas to many other

cities, including Baton Rouge and St. Paul, MN, far too many lives were cut short by violence, far too many families will never be whole again.

But as our President said this weekend, America is not as divided as we may appear. We are united in mourning the tragic deaths of Brent Thompson, Patrick Zamarripa, Michael Krol, Lorne Ahrens, and Michael Smith, and in mourning Philando Castile and Alton Sterling. We are united in our grief for their families and communities.

We are united in our respect and admiration for police and first responders, the overwhelming majority of whom do their dangerous jobs with bravery and selflessness.

But we are also united in our awareness that we have so much more work to do to strengthen the relationship between law enforcement and the communities they serve and protect. We are united in our understanding that moving beyond this tragic and unacceptable status quo—to heal our wounds and build toward a national community of respect and compassion—will challenge us in ways both new and uncomfortable.

But as Franklin Roosevelt said in an address exactly 80 years ago today: “There are no limits to this Nation's capacity to obtain and maintain true freedom, no limits except the strength of our Nation's desire and determination.”

I am confident our desire and determination will build an America in which police officers can serve their communities, worrying only about how to make their communities safer, not whether they will come home that night.

Our desire and our determination can and should build a Nation in which every American can live, work, play, and worship free of concerns about discrimination, a Nation in which all of us are able to abide by the law as written with a law as lived. We must do better and we will do better.

I thank my colleagues for the opportunity to join in this colloquy, and I wish to yield the floor to my colleague from the State of New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. UDALL. Madam President, I thank the Chair for the recognition. Let me also, as my other colleagues have done, thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his leadership on climate change, global warming, and the work he has done in that area.

I was also part, with Senator COONS, of the Paris 10 who went to Paris and did everything we could to let the rest of the countries in the world and their representatives know, as Senator COONS knows very well, that we are in this for the long haul and we are going to make sure that it happens and that the United States will continue with all of the good policies that have been put in place.

Senator WHITEHOUSE has shown particularly good leadership in the area of exposing a sophisticated network of climate deniers, a network of special interest groups and front groups that have all rallied around the slogan of being climate deniers. I rise to join my colleagues to draw attention to what we are calling the web of denial—inter-connected corporations and special interest groups spending millions of dollars misleading the public about the harmful effects of climate change.

Contrary to what these groups want the American people to think, climate change is a fact, it is a reality, and we have to deal with it. Carbon dioxide, a greenhouse gas and a byproduct of fossil fuels, is a major contributor to global warming. This is not some ideological belief I share with some of my colleagues. We wish global warming did not exist and that it was not threatening our health, our livelihoods, and the environment, but it is real, and New Mexico and the Southwest are in the bull's-eye. We are seeing it in the form of more frequent droughts, increasingly severe wildfires, and rising temperatures. There is no doubt and the data cannot be denied. Scientists cannot be ignored. We can see it before our eyes in New Mexico and across the country in so many different areas.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the National Academy of Sciences, and independent researchers at our most esteemed universities have written extensively about this link between greenhouse gases and the warming of the Earth.

Scientists at Las Alamos and Sandia National Labs in New Mexico are key parts of this scientific effort. We trust these institutions to perform the scientific research that is critical to our Nation's national security. They ensure our arsenal of nuclear weapons is safe and secure. So when these scientists tell us that manmade climate change is real and poses a serious threat, we should listen and take them seriously.

The evidence has been mounting for decades. The research has been thorough and unbiased. Countries around the world have been pressing to address this challenge in a global manner. So why are people still trying to foster a debate? Why are they asking if global warming is really happening? That is what we are here to discuss—the web of denial.

There are many who have different agendas that are not rooted in truth or science, and those agendas are playing out in our politics in the most disgraceful way possible, through the dark money that is poisoning the system and spreading lies to benefit a few. It started when industry became concerned that this link could harm the bottom line. Over the years, industry groups have spent millions of dollars to influence the debate through dark money and front groups. Many of my colleagues have talked about this today and many more will talk about

it tomorrow. The evidence of this strategy is profound.

An early example is, the Information Council for the Environment, or ICE, and the Greening Earth Society. These groups sound technical and environmental, but they aren't. They were cooked up in the boardrooms of fossil fuel industry executives—people who put profits over public health. They were designed after focus groups and market data convinced them the public trusted scientists more than politicians, more than political activists, and certainly more than industry press people. These groups, founded by the Western Fuels Association, aimed to shape the global warming discussion at a crucial time in the early 1990s, as the world was gathering in Rio and Kyoto to hammer out agreements and tackle the problem.

ICE ran several print and radio advertisements asking: "If the Earth is getting warmer, why is Kentucky getting colder?"

Another quote: "If the Earth is getting warmer, why is the frost line moving south?"

"Who told you the earth was warming, Chicken Little? And how much are you willing to pay to solve a problem that may not exist?"

These questions and claims were misleading and false, but they helped to stir up the public. The public was looking to trust independent scientists and analysts, not industry front groups. Even more concerning is the way global warming deniers have refocused their strategies at discrediting scientists and researchers.

We have seen a terrible trend. As the public has become more aware of these front groups, they have changed their tack. Now they are working to discredit and disavow the credible scientists who are out there, charging that scientists have hidden agendas, wanting more research dollars and more Federal funding. I find this absurd and ominous.

The funding for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the National Academy of Sciences, and university researchers is transparent. The money is there for the public to see. None of these folks is getting rich. They don't have profits to protect. They are providing the public with data and with research, but it is getting harder and harder to stop these outside groups from spreading their smear campaigns. These groups have an interest in making sure Congress never gets anything done to prevent climate change, and they are using our broken campaign finance system as a tool to keep it that way.

We used to have sensible laws on campaign finance. We used to have an enforcement agency, a watchdog over the Federal finance system. The laws have been gutted by the Supreme Court's devastating decisions, whether it is Citizens United, McCutcheon, or many other misguided decisions. The enforcement agency, the Federal Elec-

tion Commission, has become completely dysfunctional and mired in gridlock, leaving super PACs and special interests free to pollute the political system with unlimited dark money and always to protect someone's bottom line. That is the way Western Fuels Association and so many other companies have put pollution above public health.

We need to fix the system. A few months ago, several of my colleagues and I got together to discuss the state of our democracy. The question we asked ourselves was this: What can we do to repair this damage, to return the government to the people—the government by and for the people. The product of these meetings was the bill we introduced last month, the We the People Act. It will bring dark money out of the shadows and create a real watchdog to enforce campaign finance laws and rein in the influence of special interests and lobbyists.

The "we the people" reform package includes my constitutional amendment to overturn Buckley, Citizens United, and other decisions. It will allow Congress and the States to enact real reform, to get the flood of money out of our political system, laws that five conservative Justices on the Supreme Court can't overturn.

I know the political climate of an election year makes bipartisanship unlikely, but I will reintroduce the "we the people" reform package in the next Congress and hope my Republican colleagues will join me.

Poll after poll shows that our constituents across the political spectrum want reforms tackling climate change, eliminating dark money from our political system, and standing up to groups that distort public perception. It is time we listened. Our democracy, our environment, and the planet are at stake.

I see Senator WHITEHOUSE is here and there may be others. Once again, I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his leadership. I think one of the things he has done in our caucus, on the floor, and being constantly vigilant about it is, how many of these groups are out there networking with each other. It is a very sophisticated operation that has to be exposed if we are going to get down to what is happening and get down to what we need to do.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, for purposes of the floor, I would like to say I understand Senator SULLIVAN from Alaska will be coming, and I will end my remarks so he can speak as soon as he arrives, but in the meantime, I would like to intersperse my remarks between the various speakers who come. So Senator SULLIVAN should not be disconcerted if he sees me speaking. I will draw to a rapid conclusion and allow him the floor and I will reclaim it at the conclusion of his remarks.

When I finished my remarks a moment ago, I was describing the polluter-funded front group that with one hand threatened to spend \$750 million in this election cycle and with the other hand threatened to cause “severe disadvantage” in the Republican nomination process and “political peril” to people who crossed them in their denial of climate change. That raises the obvious question: Why all that money? Why all those threats? Well, the threats are there and the money is that big because the stakes are very high.

The International Monetary Fund, which is a generally respected organization filled with very intelligent people, has determined the fossil fuel industry receives nearly \$700 billion in what they call effective subsidies in the United States alone every year. How hard would you fight to protect an effective subsidy of \$700 billion a year? No wonder throwing \$750 million around seems like a wise investment by the big polluters.

The fossil fuel industry has another problem, which is that it faces worldwide consensus about the urgent need to address climate change, consensus from the American public, consensus from every single major American scientific society, consensus from a vast number of major American companies. Essentially, the heraldry of American corporate leadership signed on to the Paris Agreement—every single U.S. National Lab, the scientists who have been mentioned before from NASA and from NOAA, whom in every other respect we count on.

Imagine the NASA scientists who have put an explorer onto the surface of Mars, and they are driving a rover around the surface of Mars right now. Do we think they might know a little science? And yet when they tell us climate change is a serious threat, suddenly we can't pay any attention to that any longer because you have the Koch brothers, with all their money, telling everybody don't listen. You also have America's national security, military, and intelligence leaders warning us of the threat. You have the Pope calling on us to take action and most world leaders.

So if you are the fossil fuel industry, what do you do? You come to Congress, to the chokepoint for legislation, and you put a chokechain on the Republican Party so you can snap it to heel. In support of that, they perpetrate this web of climate denial.

This is actually a graphic of the web that was done by one of the academic researchers who specializes in this area. Why do they do this? Well, to do their best to fool the public about the risk of climate change, to provide talking points to rightwing talk radio, to take advantage of a lazy media's impulse to offer both sides of the story, even when one is false, and of course to hide the hands of the fossil fuel protagonists who are behind the scenes.

So it is long past time we shed some light on the perpetrators of this web of

denial and expose their filthy grip on our political process. It is a disgrace, and our grandchildren will look back at this as a dirty time in America's political history because of their work.

I am grateful to my colleagues who are joining in this effort, today and in the days to come, to help spotlight the lengths to which the Koch brothers and other fossil fuel fronts go to advance their economic self-interests by sabotaging America's response to the climate crisis.

As we look into this, we are aided by a growing body of research examining the web of denial and examining how the actors in that web propagate climate denial. So let's listen to some of the experts.

Drexel University professor Dr. Robert Brulle calls the web of denial in his research “the climate change counter-movement.” In his 2013 paper, “Institutionalizing delay: foundation funding and the creation of U.S. climate change counter-movement organizations” Professor Brulle describes that movement as a constellation of organizations—as you see here depicted in a graphic from that very paper—that, he says, “engages in a wide variety of activities opposing any legislative attempts to enact mandatory restrictions on carbon emissions.”

The green diamonds—here, and here, and here, and here—are the big funders: fossil fuel billionaires' foundations, for instance, the American Petroleum Institute, and so on.

The blue circles—here, here, and here—are the who's who of climate denial groups. The Heartland Institute is in here, for instance. They are that classy bunch who compared folks concerned about climate change to the Unabomber, just to give you a sense of what sort of people they are. There is the Hoover Institution; there is the Heritage Foundation; there is the Cato Institute; there is the Mercatus Center, to name just a few of the climate saboteurs on Dr. Brulle's graph.

Brulle's research describes these groups as part of what he calls—and I will quote him here—“a deliberate and organized effort to misdirect the public discussion and distort the public understanding of climate”—“to misdirect . . . and distort.”

The coordinated tactics of this network in its effort to misdirect and distort, said Brulle—and I will quote him again—“span a wide range of activities including political lobbying”—we certainly see plenty of that here—“contributions to political candidates,” plenty of that—“and a large number of communication and media efforts that aim at undermining climate science.”

This is Professor Brulle's depiction of the web of denial. This chart is from a 2011 study by Professors Riley Dunlap of Oklahoma State University and Aaron McCright of Michigan State University, describing the behavior of the major actors in what they call the “climate denial machine.” That is their quote. Remember, Professor Brulle

calls it the “climate change counter-movement.” These two researchers call it the “climate change denial machine” and, of course, we call it the “web of denial.”

I see that Senator WARREN has come to the floor. I will gladly yield to her and resume my remarks when there is again room on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for yielding. I just want to talk a little bit about data. I believe in data. I try to find good information about issues and use that information to inform my work. We need good data. But can we trust the think tanks and public policy groups that hold themselves out as offering solid independent research?

The work at these think tanks and public policy groups is increasingly funded by wealthy corporate interests, and the line between objective scholarly research and pay-for-play studies is becoming blurred. The problem is compounded by the fact that corporate financial support often occurs in the dark. Think about it this way: Companies are required to disclose their expenses when they directly lobby lawmakers. But these same companies are allowed to make huge secret contributions to think tanks, even if they have the same goal of influencing those same lawmakers.

Today, climate deniers have an increasingly difficult time selling their anti-science positions. So a small industry of think tanks has emerged to give the veneer of plausibility to their bizarre views. Take a look at just one organization, the Science and Public Policy Institute. The Science and Public Policy Institute describes its mission as providing “research and educational materials dedicated to sound public policy based on sound science.”

That seems pretty reasonable. But where is this sound public policy and sound science actually coming from? Well, for several years, the chief science advisor at the Science and Public Policy Institute was a man named Willie Soon, one of the most notorious climate change deniers around. Armed with scientific credentials and a part-time job at the Smithsonian Institution, Soon churned out paper after paper, disagreeing with the overwhelming scientific consensus that human activities are driving climate change.

Eventually it was revealed that—surprise, surprise—Soon had accepted \$1.2 million from the fossil fuel industry. Exxon, the American Petroleum Institute, the Charles G. Koch Charitable Foundation, and coal giant company, Southern Company, made payments to Soon, payments that he rarely disclosed when promoting his climate change denial research.

In other words, Soon was raking in fossil fuel cash by producing research helpful to the fossil fuel industry. Great deal. Willie Soon left the Science

and Public Policy Institute a few years ago.

These days, the most prominent figure at the organization is Christopher Monckton, the think tank's chief policy advisor. So let's ask the question here: Who is Christopher Monckton? Oh, boy, Christopher Monckton is a former politician from the UK. He has presented himself as a member of the House of Lords, a claim that is so off base that the House of Lords was forced to do something that it had never done before, and that is issue a statement saying: No, he is not part of the House of Lords, and he should stop lying about it.

Monckton used to represent the ultraconservative, anti-immigrant UK Independence Party that recently led the Brexit campaign. In fact, Monckton thought Brexit was such a good idea that he has also called for a Texit, as he puts it, pushing for Texas to secede from the United States to protect itself against Muslim and Latino immigrants.

Monckton is clear about where he stands on climate change and on the people who are concerned about it. He said that global efforts to fight climate change are part of a "totalitarian" plot to create a "world government," and he has compared climate change activists to "Hitler youth."

To be clear, these allegations of government overreach are coming from someone who believes that reading the Koran out loud should be a prosecutable offense in the United States and who once called for everyone with AIDS to be rounded up and permanently quarantined.

Now he has backed away from that last idea, but don't worry. Monckton has found a new idea to address AIDS. He claims to have invented a miracle cure that can treat everything from HIV to multiple sclerosis to the flu. You can't make this stuff up.

The fact is, Monckton is not a climate scientist or a scientist of any kind. His degrees are in classics and journalism. Actual scientists who have taken a look at his work have found his conclusion to be completely made up.

So why does it matter that scientific posers like Christopher Monckton and industry-funded hacks like Willie Soon are running around saying crazy things about climate change? Well, I will tell you why it matters. It matters because by attaching themselves to the Science and Public Policy Institute and other credible-sounding think tanks, people start to take them seriously.

You don't think so? Monckton has testified in front of Congress three times, each time representing the Science and Public Policy Institute. A former chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee called him "one of the most knowledgeable, if not the most knowledgeable, expert from a skeptical point of view on this issue of climate change." Soon's work has been repeatedly cited by influential climate

change deniers, those in Congress and elsewhere.

As Senator WHITEHOUSE has pointed out, Monckton, Soon, and the Science and Public Policy Institute are part of a much larger network of pseudo-scientific researchers and organizations who get paid to spin a web of denials about the science behind climate change. It is a network that has been funded by the fossil fuel industry and by its friends.

But there is no getting around it. Climate change is real. It is caused by humans. If we are going to address it in a meaningful way, we need to take decisive action now. This is why the fake science think tanks are so dangerous. They throw enough fake facts into the process to justify inaction, enough fake facts to excuse inaction, enough fake facts to let every politician in the pocket of Big Oil or Big Coal keep right on blocking meaningful action while the earth slowly chokes on its own filth.

It is time to stand up to the fossil fuel industry and its well-funded PR efforts and say enough is enough. Our children's futures are at stake. We will not sit on the sidelines while big fossil fuel companies call the shots here in Washington.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I thank Senator WARREN for her terrific remarks. When I left off speaking, we were talking about the—not just the web of denial of organizations that have been propped by the polluters to look as though they are real and to broadcast phony science, but also to know that people are on the hunt looking for them.

I had begun to talk about the academic researchers who are treating this web as a social phenomenon—as a bizarre sociopolitical phenomenon—and beginning to look at how it works. I mentioned first Dr. Brulle of Drexel University, and then we were looking at the work of Dr. Dunlap and Dr. McCright—Dr. Dunlap from University of Oklahoma and Dr. McCright from Michigan State University.

Let's look for a minute at what they say in their publications. When you listen to this, consider today's blockaded Senate Chamber. I will quote them.

It is reasonable to conclude that climate change denial campaigns in the U.S.—

This stuff—have played a crucial role in blocking domestic legislation and contributing to the U.S. becoming an impediment to international policymaking. Because of the perceived threat posed by climate change to their interests—

To the fossil fuel interests—actors in the denial machine have strived to undermine scientific evidence documenting its reality and seriousness. Their success in these efforts weakens an essential component of societal reflectivity when the need is greater than ever.

With that quote, I will yield the floor. I see my friend Senator SULLIVAN has arrived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise to join my colleague from Rhode Island and other colleagues this evening who are talking about the critical issue of climate change, especially the facts around climate change but also the fact that there are many who would deny the facts. This is a very important issue to the Commonwealth of Virginia. Climate change is not an abstraction. Climate change is not a next-year or next-decade issue. Climate change in Virginia is a today issue.

Earlier today, I was in Norfolk, VA, which is in the Hampton Roads area, near the Chesapeake Bay and the Atlantic Ocean. Norfolk, and the surrounding communities, is the largest concentration of naval power in the world. It is the center of American naval operations, the headquarters of the U.S. Atlantic fleet, and it is already having to spend millions of dollars to elevate the piers where aircraft carriers come and go due to sea level rise. The Hampton Roads area is listed as the second most vulnerable community in the United States to rising sea levels after New Orleans.

This is a challenging issue in a lot of ways. I have friends who live in these communities who recently bought homes, but now their homes aren't marketable. For most Americans—certainly for me—my home is the most valuable asset I own. If you have that, and then you suddenly can't sell it because climate is changing, sea level is rising, flooding is more recurrent, and no one will buy your home, it is a very serious issue.

In addition to the effect on individuals and businesses because of sea level rise, the effect on the naval station is significant. Current estimates are that rising sea levels in Norfolk will take the main road entrance into the center of American naval power and have that under water 3 hours a day by 2040 just because of normal tidal action. In times of storms, it would be worse. Imagine an America that counts on that Navy, counts on that naval presence around the globe having its largest base inaccessible because of sea level rise.

We have an interesting community. One of the most unique parts of Virginia is a small island, Tangier Island, in the center of the Chesapeake Bay. It has been continually inhabited since the 1600s as a community for water men and women, the folks who have traditionally made their living by going out and catching crabs, oysters, and fish. This is a small island, a few acres. It is one of the only places you can go in the United States where you can hear English spoken as Shakespeare would have spoken it, with a language that is an Elizabethan language. The community is very isolated in that way, and so you hear this beautiful English spoken there. The community has many wonderful virtues to it, but the Chesapeake Bay is coming

up around this community and eroding it.

I received a letter from a middle school student within the last month—a handwritten letter that might have been the most heartfelt communication I have received in 4-plus years in the Senate—saying: What are you doing about sea level rise? What can you do to help us deal with these issues so Tangier, as an island, does not completely disappear? So for these reasons and many others, in Virginia, we take this very seriously and we have to deal with it.

I will tell you something else about Virginia. Virginians believe in science. The Virginia political figure we most admire was the preeminent scientist of his day, Thomas Jefferson. He was a scientist.

Virginians overwhelmingly believe in science. Seventy percent of Virginians accept the scientific consensus that human activity is causing climate change and that it is urgent we do something about it. Seventy percent of Virginians believe in that proposition.

I am here because my friend from Rhode Island asked me to come and talk about the fact that there is an organized effort—not just a battle about the policy about climate science—to knowingly try to misrepresent the status of climate science and suggest that climate change is not occurring. They are denying it exists, they are denying it is a concern, and they are working against any reasonable solutions.

Of course, we have to be open to points of view, reasonable differences of opinion, and have a debate, but when the science is settled on some things and people in an organized way—who know better—are trying to fight against it, we should be suspicious.

So a group of Senators are speaking today and tomorrow to discuss these organizations that constitute what my friend from Rhode Island has termed a “web of denial,” an organized effort to deny science.

Let me just talk a little bit because a number of these deniers are companies that at least have PO boxes or nonprofit organizations that at least have PO boxes in Virginia. The same Virginia where Tangier Island is disappearing, the same Virginia where the Navy is having to spend to shore up their infrastructure, also has some shadowy organizations that are trying to deny the real science involved.

There is an organization involved called the Science and Public Policy Institute, and it purports to summarize available academic literature. Here is a quote:

They further note that decadal variability in sea level is observed, but to date there is no detectable secular increase in the rate of sea level rise over the period 1950–2000. They also report that no increase in the rate of sea level rise had been detected for the entire 20th century.

This is a group that throws in a few “sciency” words like “decadal variability,” but what they are really say-

ing is there is no sea level rise. This is at odds with the conclusions of virtually every scientist who studied this issue, including scientists at Virginia universities—Old Dominion University and at the Virginia Institute of Marine Science at William & Mary. Those scientists say sea level rise has risen a foot since industrialization, and the range of future sea level rise on the Virginia coast is anywhere from 1½ additional feet to 7 feet by the year 2100. They will acknowledge some question about it is going to be 1½ feet, is it going to be 7 feet, but they don’t challenge the basic science surrounding sea level rise. So which is it—1½ feet to 7 feet or you don’t need to worry it? Don’t worry, be happy.

Without getting a Ph.D. in atmospheric science and building your own quantitative models, how do you know who is right? Here is a clue. Look at who funds these organizations. In the case of ODU and William & Mary, the Virginia Institute of Marine Science—which is one of the most preeminent marine sciences organizations in the Nation, with Scripps in San Diego and Woods Hole in Massachusetts—it is not hard. They are State universities. They are funded by the general assembly of Virginia, which are two Republican houses. They are reaching a scientific conclusion that says climate change is serious, but with the Science and Public Policy Institute, it is a bit nebulous, and it is kind of hard to figure out.

There are online sources that enable you to track how organizations are funded through foundations with ties, frankly, to the energy. According to one of these sources, called “DeSmogBlog,” one of this major funders of this institute, the Science and Public Policy Institute, is called the Donors Capital Fund, which has distributed \$170 million to various conservative causes and describes itself as being “dedicated to the ideals of limited government, personal responsibility, and free enterprise.”

A New York Times article from as far back as 2003, documents a connection between this foundation and an organization that also has a point of view, ExxonMobil. ExxonMobil is a funder or, in the past, has been a funder of this organization.

Why doesn’t ExxonMobil or a conservative organization just publish the material on their own Web sites under their own bylines? My guess is, they have scientists who actually know the science. There has been recent information about ExxonMobil. They understand the climate science. They couldn’t publish this under their own byline and meet their own standards of truthfulness, but they are providing funding to an organization that is denying climate change. In other words, the organization is just a delivery vehicle for information that is meant to be seen as impartial scientific information, but it is, in fact, not impartial at all. So when you see one group saying

there has been no sea level rise and another saying there has been a lot and we could be in for more, if you are wondering which one to believe, take a look at who is funding the research.

Here is another organization, the Virginia Institute for Public Policy: “Regulations prescribing a reduction, or even a complete cessation, of Virginia’s CO₂ emissions will have absolutely no effect on global climate.”

If there are Virginia regulations that even eliminate Virginia CO₂, it will have no effect on global climate. This is an interesting quote because it is not technically a lie because it is literally true. Virginia’s share of world CO₂ emissions is infinitesimal. So if Virginia eliminated it all, it wouldn’t affect the entire globe in a measurable way. But that is like saying: One vote? Your vote is not going to make the difference or one cigarette will not hurt you so go ahead and have one.

This argument is a kind of a classic hide-the-ball argument that makes a statement that is technically true, but it essentially is promoting a false point of view that, oh well, we shouldn’t do anything about it. Again, it is the use of a literal truth that is basically designed to pitch a message that is grossly misleading.

So let’s ask about this group, the Virginia Institute for Public Policy, who funds a group that would say something like that? Again, the Donors Capital Fund that funded the first organization I discussed, as well as the Chase Foundation of Virginia and the Roe Foundation, which support a list of conservative causes.

If you call an organization the Virginia Institute for Public Policy, it sounds kind of neutral and, again, probably trying to do a good thing, but if you go back and look at who is funding it and you again find the funding sources are heavily linked to energy industry groups like ExxonMobil, then you understand they are not quite as impartial as their name would suggest.

Here is another quote from the CO₂ Coalition:

Concerns about carbon dioxide being a quote-unquote “pollutant” are not valid. Climate change is proceeding very slowly, and the likely increase in temperature for the 21st century is about 1 degree Celsius or less.

Well, yes; is that technically true? The temperature of the Earth has increased by about 1 degree since industrialization, and 197 countries just signed an agreement in Paris last year to try to limit any further increase to no more than 1 degree additional.

So this group makes it sound like 1 degree, who cares about 1 degree? Well, a 100-degree fever is only 2 degrees more than normal, but it is enough to make you pretty sick. It is actually 1.4 degrees more than normal. It is enough to make you pretty sick.

The number of 0.8 sounds tiny in the abstract, but if that is your blood alcohol content, that gets you a DUI in Virginia. The number sounds small. Oh, gosh. Why would that make a difference? That gets you a DUI because you are impaired.

So, yes, the group using the one temperature, 1 degree in temperature, makes it sound like it is not that big of a deal—but it is that big of a deal.

This is the last one I want to discuss before I close. This is kind of a doozy because it is from an open letter to Pope Francis on the topic of the Pope's environmental encyclical. The group is called the Cornwall Alliance for the Stewardship of Creation. Nothing like going big if you are going to pick a name for yourself. I am glad there is somebody who is trying to be a steward of creation. Their quote starts with a quote from the 19th Psalm.

The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament proclaims his handiwork.

Beautiful aspect of the first verse in Psalm 19, but then the group goes on to declare in their own words this:

By using fossil fuels to generate energy to lift billions of God's precious children out of poverty, we liberate from the tomb of the earth the carbon dioxide on which plants and therefore all the rest of life depend. In light of these considerations, we believe it is both unwise and unjust to adopt policies requiring reduced use of fossil fuels for energy.

So somebody is really using Scripture to argue that making our energy production cleaner, safer, and cheaper violates the Christian tenet of caring for the poor.

I am a Christian, and many of us in this body have a deep-faith background in one faith or another, but I will use a non-Christian phrase to describe that argument. It takes a lot of *chutzpa* to claim your religious faith and compassion for the poor drives you to support pollution-intensive energy, especially when the organization refuses to reveal how it is funded.

In closing, we certainly don't want to imply that all groups that have an agenda or have a point of view are motivated by funding sources, but the web of denial the Senator from Rhode Island is asking us to come out and talk about tonight is one that includes a number of organizations that are climate deniers, and they are denying science that in my view they actually know to be true.

There comes a point when the truth becomes so hard to deny that those who deny it are simply not credible. And you have to then ask the question: Why are you denying it?

I assert that most of these organizations understand the science, they accept the science, and they realize it to be true. So why do they deny the science? The answer is greed. That is the basic answer. Many of the organizations we are discussing are funded primarily by fossil fuel interests. If they can delay, even by 1 year or 2 years or 5 years or even 6 months, the enactment of policies that would move us toward fewer fossil fuels, it will hurt their bottom line.

So rather than come up here and argue about what the right transition should be, they are handing funds over to organizations that are trying to confuse the American public about science itself.

Let me close and read from Pope Francis's encyclical, since the Cornwall Alliance for the Stewardship of Creation cherry-picked the piece. I am going to read it as a quote:

Is it realistic to hope that those who are obsessed with maximizing profits will stop to reflect on the environmental damage which they will leave behind for future generations? Where profits alone count, there are can be no thinking about the rhythms of nature, its phases of decay and regeneration, or the complexity of ecosystems which may be gravely upset by human intervention. Once we start to think about the kind of world we are leaving to future generations, we look at things differently—

As to future generations, we look at things differently—

we realize that the world is a gift which we have freely received and must share with others. Since the world has been given to us, we can no longer view reality in a purely utilitarian way, in which efficiency and productivity are entirely geared to our individual benefit. Intergenerational solidarity is not optional, but rather a basic question of justice, since the world we have received also belongs to those who will follow us.

Science and faith have a number of things in common, but one of the most important things they have in common is that their first duty has to be to the truth. I hope all actors in the political process, whatever their views, will remember that and have that same commitment.

I thank the Chair, and with that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, my colleagues from Virginia and Rhode Island, for whom I have a lot of respect, have been on the floor talking about an important issue—what my colleague from Virginia called a “today issue.” Well, I would also like to talk about a today issue as well, and one that I think certainly the American public is interested in.

In the past week we have had a lot of today issues. As a matter of fact, in the last week there have been new developments globally relating to our national security, the defense of the United States, and the importance of our military in ways that are pretty dramatic. I would like to list some of these, and this is literally in the last 7 days.

Today, Secretary Carter announced from Iraq, where he is right now, that the United States will be deploying another 560 troops in our fight against ISIS. A lot of us support additional troops, and the Secretary announced that. On Friday, at the NATO summit, President Obama announced that the United States will be deploying 1,000 U.S. troops and a separate brigade headquarters to Poland as part of an effort by NATO to strengthen its eastern flank against Russian aggression. The President was actually quoted in the *Financial Times* extensively. He stated: “This may be the most important moment for our transatlantic alliance since the end of the Cold War.”

Then he talked about all the different national security crises—ISIS,

the terrorist attacks in Orlando, Paris, and Brussels, conflicts from Africa to Syria, and Russia's aggression in Ukraine. This is the President speaking to the *Financial Times*. These are today issues. I also call them today issues.

On Saturday, North Korea launched another submarine-based ballistic missile off the country's eastern coast. It didn't go that far, but they are learning. Madam President, you and I were over there recently. They are learning. That is a continuing threat.

Then, last Wednesday, before the President went to the NATO summit—which, by the way was a successful summit, and I applaud the President and Secretary Carter for that summit—the President announced that he plans to leave 8,400 American troops in Afghanistan, more than he originally planned to keep, to combat the Taliban. Again, a lot of us applauded that decision. It could have been more, but it certainly is better than the trajectory he was going on, which was to go to zero.

During an Armed Services Committee hearing last week, former NATO Ambassador Nicholas Burns and the former Supreme Allied Commander, Marine Gen. James Jones discussed the report that was coauthored by the Atlantic Council, again talking about the importance of NATO's building up our military forces not only on the eastern flank but in the Arctic—an area in which, as Alaska's Senator, I am very interested—where the Russians have dramatically expanded their military footprint in exercises.

Over the weekend, in the *Wall Street Journal*, it was reported that even after reaching the Iran nuclear deal, Iran continued trying to illegally procure nuclear equipment from Germany. So we have the Iranian threat, which definitely is not going away after the ill-gotten and misguided nuclear deal by the President.

Tomorrow morning, there is going to be big news. There is expected to be a tribunal ruling on what is going on in the South China Sea. Again, the Chair and I were there recently, in that region of the world, in Singapore, for the Shangri-La Dialogue. To Secretary Carter's credit and Admiral Harris' credit, we have had two carrier battle groups out there recently—two. That is very important.

So this is what has happened in a week. This is what our military is facing in 1 week. So what did this body do? What did the Senate do as it relates to actions in terms of our military and dealing with all these threats of just 1 week? What did we do? Led by the Senate minority leader and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we filibustered spending for our troops. That is what the Senate did. We filibustered spending for our troops. That is right. We blocked funding for our military, which has to deal with all these issues.

Now, I know it was in the dead of the night. I think it took place around

midnight. I am sure some of my colleagues were hoping nobody saw it. But this is not like an anomaly. As a matter of fact, this was the fourth time the minority leader led my colleagues on the other side of the aisle into filibustering the Defense appropriations bill that funds our troops and keeps our Nation safe. Let me repeat that. This bill has been filibustered not once, not twice, not three times but four times in the last year.

This is the bill the minority leader likes to filibuster more than anything, and this is despite the fact that when this bill came out of the Committee on Appropriations, it had huge bipartisan support. I think only three members of the committee voted against it. This year it came out of the committee unanimously.

So what does this bill do? We just talked about the threats that everybody agrees exist. I will just cover a few of the highlights. First, and very importantly, it is actually consistent with the bipartisan budget agreement of 2015. So any discussion of how it is not fitting what we agreed to is not true. It is consistent with that.

Readiness. We all know we need readiness for our military. It funds \$212 billion in terms of base operations and maintenance accounts, training—enormously important—and shipbuilding. A significant portion goes to shipbuilding to make sure we have a strong navy. It is similar with regard to aircraft procurement to have a strong Air Force—significant billions of dollars of funding for our Air Force. It even has, for the first time, funding for an icebreaker, which more and more of my colleagues in the Congress are recognizing as critical to our national security.

Missile defense. With the growing threat from North Korea and Iran, there is significant funding for missile defense and the National Guard and Reserve equipment account. The Presiding Officer has been a leader in the National Guard and Reserve. There is almost \$1 billion for the National Guard and Reserve equipment account, which is lacking.

Of course, there is military pay. The Defense appropriations bill fully funds an Active-Duty end strength of 1.2 million members of the military and a Reserve component end strength of 800,000, and it funds a 1.6 percent pay raise.

Those are some of the highlights of the bill we need, and some of the highlights of the bill that was filibustered in the wee hours of the evening last Thursday night.

Our Nation needs this bill. Our troops certainly need this bill. Our allies need this bill. We have held hearings in the Committee on Armed Services. The Chair will remember when Secretary Kissinger came and testified that the United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of World War II. Even the President, last week in the Financial

Times, stated that this is possibly the most important moment in terms of the security of the transatlantic alliance since the Cold War.

The Presiding Officer and I actually had the honor of recently going to see the new Secretary of the Army review the troops and review the Old Guard. She and I proudly represented the Senate. We have a new Secretary of the Army who is going to do a great job. The Chief of Staff of the Army, General Milley, spoke during that. He said one of the most important things the Senate and the Congress can do in the next 5 weeks is to make sure there is a budget for the U.S. military and for the U.S. Army. That is what he said. So he certainly laid out what he thought was important.

As a matter of fact, serving together on the Committee on Armed Services, the Presiding Officer and I hear this from every single admiral and general, including Secretary Carter: Fund the troops—certainty.

But the minority leader thinks it is fine to block funding for our troops. Maybe he knows more than Secretary Carter. Maybe he knows more than General Milley. Unfortunately, he has made a habit out of doing this. In my short time in the Senate—1½ years—this is the bill the minority leader has decided to filibuster more than any other bill. Since I have been here, he has done that four times. Think about that.

I hope the American people are watching. Four times in a year the bill that gets picked on more than any other bill is the one that funds the troops and our national security, and it happened again in the wee hours of the night last week.

So why does he do this? I have no earthly idea why he does this. If you asked Americans back home in Iowa, Alaska, or in any State—Democrats or Republicans; it doesn't matter the party—the people would say that national defense and funding our troops is probably the most important thing we do. It is certainly one of the top one or two. But the minority leader last year said the Defense appropriations bill is "a waste of time." Last week he put out a statement saying he needed a commitment that this bill abides by the bipartisan budget deal.

Well, guess what. The bill does abide by the bipartisan budget deal. There is no one making the argument that it doesn't. So I have no idea. I have no idea why he singles out funding for our brave men and women in uniform, thousands of whom, by the way, are serving overseas in combat—yes, in combat, right now. We are not going to fund them, though. We will filibuster that. Maybe he can come down and explain it.

Here is something else I really don't understand. I mean, I really don't understand this. Why is it that so many of my colleagues follow his lead on this—to filibuster funding for America's military not once, not twice, not

three times but four times? Why are my colleagues following his lead? I don't know why. But what I do know is that we should not be heading out on a 2-month recess without voting again on funding our troops—without voting to fund our troops—especially given all the challenges I just listed here. We know they are there. The President was talking about them. We talk about them. But we don't want to fund the troops?

We owe it to the American people and to our troops to have a vote on this Defense appropriations bill again. Let my colleagues come to the floor and explain why they are going to vote to filibuster this bill again, because when we bring it up again—and I certainly hope we do so this week—if they vote to filibuster it again, that will become the fifth time inside of a year.

What we need to do is to bring back a longstanding tradition that used to exist in the Senate, which was the bipartisan funding of our military. That is certainly what we are all focused on. That is what we thought we were going to do when we got the budget deal. That is what we thought we were going to do when we saw these very big bipartisan numbers coming out of the Appropriations Committee. Yet, every time we try to bring this bill to the floor—this year and last year—the minority leader filibusters it. The American people are watching. The American people are watching.

A recent Politico article talked about this. A defense analyst from the Heritage Foundation said:

I think this is pretty disappointing, but sadly not surprising. . . . There used to be a bipartisan consensus that defense was a priority, but sadly I think that consensus no longer exists. . . . With the Senate Democrats stopping DOD [appropriations], the Pentagon will at least have to wait until after the election for its budget, and maybe even into the next calendar year [to get its budget].

That is because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are filibustering this bill. How does that help our troops? How does that help the national defense of the United States? Somebody please come down here and explain this to me. I agree with this analyst where he said this is sad.

I hope we will bring this bill to the floor again and drop what has been happening, which is playing politics with our troops and funding our military.

I will conclude by saying that after the Vietnam war, the Democratic Party gained a reputation as the anti-military party of America, and they struggled for years to shed that reputation. I don't think having any of America's major political parties being viewed as anti-military is good for us as a nation.

Support for our military should never be a partisan issue, and I proudly serve—with the Presiding Officer and

others—on the Armed Services Committee and the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I know for a fact that my colleagues on those very bipartisan committees—Democrats and Republicans—support our troops, support national defense, and support the military. And I know many of my colleagues in this body—many on the other side of the aisle—have served with distinction in the military for decades and are strong supporters of our men and women in uniform. I have seen it. I have seen it my entire short time in the Senate. But four filibusters blocking funding for our troops inside of a year certainly makes one wonder what is going on with the leadership of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when it comes to supporting our troops. I hope they come down and explain it this week.

What we need to do this week is vote again on the Defense appropriations bill and do the right thing. We all know what the right thing is and the American people know what the right thing is. We need to fund our troops, we need to keep them safe, and we need to keep our country safe.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I am here to speak on the Koch brothers, but first I want to say briefly to my good friend from Alaska: Instead of playing political games, if he wants to pass a defense bill, we all know what has to be done in a bipartisan way. You don't just take a bill, throw it down, and say "Take it or leave it." That is what happened last year. We worked in a bipartisan way. Defense spending got an increase. So let's stop all the rhetoric and politicizing this issue. Let's work together and get it done.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Now, Madam President, I want to talk about the issue before us, and that is the amazing influence of the Koch brothers—two people—on what is going on in this country and particularly when it comes to climate change. I thank Senator KAIN, who spoke before me, and particularly Senator WHITEHOUSE, who has not only organized these speeches but has been the leader in our caucus on focusing on this issue, and it is getting good resonance with the American people.

We have talked. We have failed to act on a number of issues in the last few weeks—Zika, funding the opioid crisis, sensible gun safety measures, a Supreme Court nominee and other judicial nominees. It is stunning how little we have done our job. But probably at the top of the list which deserves attention is that Congress has not done its job on climate change. Why? Why? It is so apparent. Just look at any map of the globe. Senator KAIN and Senator WHITEHOUSE are exactly right about the reason: far-right groups dominated by the Koch brothers. They hide where they send their money, but they dominate it all. They and other

deep-pocketed energy interests have funded campaign after campaign against action on climate change. We know that the NRA has a stranglehold on gun reform. Well, the Koch brothers have a stranglehold on any legislation on climate change—at least as long as our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are in the majority in either House.

One of the key strategies—how do they do this? Lots of different ways. We have seen those ridiculous commercials. They are afraid to say who they are. They have these ads; lots of poor people, minorities; oh, the Koch brothers are hurting—are helping. Koch Industries. And then they have one little sentence: Get rid of regulations. That is all they say. So they have lots of different mechanisms for hiding what they believe but profoundly influencing America.

One of the ways they have done that is by funding think tanks and academic institutions to deliberately cast doubt on the signs of climate change in order to protect their own financial interests. The Koch brothers earn their billions leading the private oil, chemical, and manufacturing conglomerate Koch Industries. In short, they are the premier anti-environmental, pro-pollution duo of the 21st century, and over the past two decades, they have mastered a strategy meant to confuse the American people about climate change by funding "think tanks" and "university programs" that adhere to their anti-science agenda.

Take the Mercatus Center at George Mason University. They should call it the Koch Center. Charles Koch sits on the board. Over the last decade, it has received tens of millions in funding from the Koch brothers and \$300,000 at least from Big Oil. So it should come as no surprise that the Mercatus Center publishes research that closely mirrors the ideology of the Koch brothers and routinely advocates for policies that are in their business interests, especially climate change denial. They cloak their views in an academic guise, but if you just examine it, you know what is going on: Mercatus Center, funded by the Koch brothers, talks against climate change. Do we think that is objective? I don't. Let's look at some of the activities of the center. In 2001 they suggested that global warming would be "beneficial" and would "stimulate plant growth and make humans better off." These are the Koch brothers.

During the early years of George W. Bush's Presidency, the Wall Street Journal reported that 14 of the 23 regulations targeted for repeal by the administration were suggested by—guess who. The nonpartisan, objective, non-funded Koch brothers' Mercatus Center, including rollback of EPA pollution rules. In 2006 the Mercatus Center attacked the bipartisan work to reduce tailpipe emissions and implement new efficiency standards for automobiles and trucks. In 2007 Mercatus was able

to install staffers at the Bush Office of Management and Budget in charge of regulations. In 2009 Mercatus attacked the Obama administration's plan to monitor greenhouse gas emissions.

Some might be thinking, so what? It is just a few academic papers and policy recommendations. Why does it matter? It matters because this private sector-funded research is being used to give the false impression that there is a legitimate academic debate about climate change, and then that debate is used by colleagues as an excuse for no action. It is no different from how the tobacco industry funded research that minimized the health dangers of smoking cigarettes so they could turn around and argue: There is no conclusive evidence that cigarettes are dangerous. No need to regulate us.

Millions of people died because of that. And millions of people are getting ill and many millions more will lose their jobs and we will lose our globe because of what the Koch brothers are doing. We now know how deceptive and cynical their strategy was. Well, that was the tobacco industry. It is happening today, and it is having the same serious consequences.

Ninety-seven percent of climate scientists agree that climate change is happening. Democrats know that climate change is happening and want to do something about it today, but congressional Republicans, following their Koch brother funders, holding up studies by the Mercatus Center, funded also by the Koch brothers, refuse to act and even deny it exists.

I would say to the Koch brothers: At least be honest. If you really believe what you say, why not come clean? Why not put out a commercial that says: "Koch brothers. We don't believe in climate change. Koch Industries. We don't believe that we should regulate the environment." Put that on TV so when we are watching "Morning Joe," we don't have these glossy ads that give the exact opposite impression. Do you know why? They know no one is going to believe them. They want to use their money as power, secret power, and one of the secret power ways they use that money is through institutions like the Mercatus Center.

Before all of us can come together on climate change and do something significant—it is not easy—we have to start agreeing about how immediate and incredible the challenge is. With things like the Mercatus Center throwing sand in the gears, that becomes more difficult—not for legitimate reasons but because special interest money cloaks its beliefs in academic centers that stall progress.

Anyone who participates in this should be ashamed of themselves—not just the Koch brothers but so many others who put out these studies and take the money. Shame. Future generations and our generation are going to pay the price.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I understand the majority leader will be coming to close out the Senate shortly and then allow us who are speaking to continue after that. I see Senator SCOTT here, so let me yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

A FAMILY CONVERSATION

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, I believe our Nation is in desperate need of a family conversation. The American family as a whole needs to sit down, come to the same table, and talk with our relatives. That means each of us talking to each other about the challenges we have seen in our Nation over all of last week—a challenging week in America's history, without any question; a challenging time period for Americans all over this country, without any question; protests, riots; challenges we haven't seen in a very long time.

We stand here today at a crossroads. Our Nation is experiencing turmoil we haven't seen in generations—decades since we have seen this type of turmoil all around the country. My heart breaks for all of us.

This week on this floor, I will give a series of speeches in hopes of illuminating some of the issues before us, as well as what I believe are essential steps toward closing both the wounds newly opened and others that have actually never healed. In other words, there are wounds that have existed for more than a generation, and it is time for the American family to work together to heal some of these wounds.

Last Friday, deep in the heart of Texas, we saw both the best and the worst of humanity. Only in America would you see police officers alongside protesters who were protesting police brutality. If you take a step back and picture it for just a moment, here is a scene of police officers protecting protesters who are protesting police brutality. In this picture, we don't see tension or animosity; we see smiles. We see police officers working, taking pictures, and making sure that everyone was having the appropriate time and, for some, even an enjoyable experience with law enforcement.

But then the shots rang out. Police turned very quickly to protect those protesters, and protesters helped police identify where the shots were coming from. Somehow at the exact same time, Dallas came together and at the exact time was torn apart. In what appears to be one man's warped mind, retribution became his answer to frustration, and his hate left five police officers dead and seven other officers wounded. We continue to mourn for them and their families today. We must not—we must not—become a society where revenge is the rule of the day.

Our Nation is dependent on the rule of law, and to enforce the law, we need honest, hardworking men and women to take up the shield. For the over-

whelming majority of cops, it is a calling. It is not a job. It is in the fashion of Romans 13—a chapter that speaks very clearly about the fact that government officials wearing a sword can be ministers; in other words, sharing love and affection and appreciation for those they guard and having the ability to provide punishment when necessary. We are talking about men and women who work for a very low wage all over the country and who see their job as a calling. So many of them—the vast majority—do it so well.

Law enforcement officers simply want to do two things: protect and serve. We cannot allow the actions of a few to overwhelm the good of the majority. To illustrate this, I want to share a few stories so we can put in frame, put in focus the sacrifice and the commitment that so many officers exhibit every single day throughout our Nation.

My first story is a story of a young lady named Jillian Smith, a young African-American female police officer from just west of Dallas in Arlington, TX. In December 2010, Officer Smith responded to a domestic violence situation. She arrived and met a beautiful 11-year-old girl and her mother, both fearful.

I want to stop for a moment and make sure we get the frame.

Here comes an officer, Officer Smith, who shows up to make sure the folks who called were safe. The people who called were an 11-year-old girl and her mother. They were fearful the mother's boyfriend would show up and do something dangerous. And dangerous—he did do something incredibly brutal.

Officer Smith, hearing gunfire, in an instant jumped on top of the body of the 11-year-old. As the bullets rang out, she kept herself on top of that 11-year-old girl. The girlfriend's boyfriend would end up killing the mother and then killing himself. Before he did so, he killed Officer Smith. Without a second thought, Officer Smith did what so many law enforcement officers do instinctively—protect those who are exposed. Officer Jillian Smith, a true American hero, gave her life to protect the life of an 11-year-old girl she had never met before knocking on that door.

This story and other stories aren't unusual. They want to serve and protect. We saw this same heroism last Friday evening, as told by Shetamia Taylor. Miss Taylor was at the protest. She was there exercising her first constitutional right. Then the sniper started shooting.

Miss Taylor had gone there with her four sons. She, for the lack of a better word, freaked out. Bullets were flying. She ran to cover her one son. According to her account of the situation, before she knew it, there was a cop who was covering her and her son. The next thing you knew, another cop was at her feet and another cop toward her head. In the midst of a sniper shooting at cops, she found herself surrounded, cov-

ered by police officers who were just doing their job, risking their lives for this mother and her son.

What a picture: the best of America, very clear; the sniper, the worst of America, is just as clear.

Miss Taylor made a very good point when discussing what happened. Here is her quote. She said: "These are the people you call when you're in a situation. . . . What are we gonna do if they stop policing?"

Let me ask the question that Miss Taylor asked one more time. What are we going to do if they stop policing? Who are you going to call?

These are the stories that should give us faith in law enforcement. While we certainly have issues that demand solutions—and I, too, have had some issues with law enforcement that I am going to share in my next speech on Wednesday. I will be giving three speeches. This is the first one. In the next one, I will talk about some of the issues that so many folks have experienced. I want to spend time on this, but this is a moment in time when we should stop the camera, create a frame. Let's focus on the fact that our law enforcement officers are true American heroes, period.

When you are looking for a hero, sometimes you look for athletes; maybe that is not the best place. You look for entertainers; maybe that is not the best place. You look at Congress—9 percent approval rating; that is probably not the right place. But our men and women who put on a law enforcement uniform—these folks are real American heroes.

In my State of South Carolina, officers like Greg Alia, who gave his life last year in Columbia, SC; officers like Allen Jacobs, who gave his life in Greenville, SC; and in Charleston, Joe Matuskovic, who was killed by a man shooting through a door—body slumps over, and my mentor, whom I have spoken about for so long, John Moniz's son—I call him a brother from another mother—was the first deputy on the scene and dragged the lifeless body of his friend, his colleague, from that door, trying to get that body completely out of harm's way.

To me, as I said a few seconds ago, Brian Moniz, sheriff's deputies, and police officers are our heroes, and we should focus on that for a moment. We must come together. We must find solutions. We must get to a point where the American family—our family—has a real conversation about the issues that divide us, the differences of our experiences, yet remain a single family with a single mission and make sure that every part of the American family feels valued.

I am starting tonight with our law enforcement, the part of the family we depend on, as Miss Taylor so perfectly stated. If we do have this necessary, painful conversation as an American family, we can say with a new freshness, "God bless America." We

can say with new focus to our American heroes, “God bless our law enforcement community.”

I don’t expect to give such a speech without having some folks respond positively and some even negatively. But this night, this day, knowing that tomorrow in Texas our current President, our former President, and a number of folks throughout the State of Texas will be together in a part of our family territory, celebrating the sacrifices, mourning the loss, but doing something that needs to be done. It is simply this: not coming as a Democrat, not coming as a Republican, not coming as a Black American, not coming as a White American, not coming as a Hispanic American, but coming to a family gathering for family funerals—plural—which hopefully will start a family conversation that I will look forward to continuing on Wednesday.

Madam President, I thank you.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I wish to commend the Senator from South Carolina for an extraordinary speech. I look forward to hearing the two subsequent speeches that the Senator from South Carolina is going to make on the subject. No one better expresses in stronger and more persuasive terms what needs to be said in the wake of these tragedies than the Senator from South Carolina, and I congratulate him on his outstanding remarks.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS LAS VEGAS CHAPTER

Mr. REID. Madam President, today I wish to recognize the 60th anniversary of the American Institute of Architects, or AIA, Las Vegas chapter.

Established in 1857, the AIA works to elevate the architecture profession throughout the United States. In Nevada, a small group of architects joined together to promote a high standard of architecture and started the first AIA chapter in Las Vegas in 1956. At first, the chapters were so small that individual members took turns acting as president. The organization has grown into one of the leading professional organizations in my State, and the Las Vegas chapter recently elected exceptional leaders from its membership, including the current president, Brett Ewing, and the president-elect, Jon Sparer.

The Las Vegas Chapter of AIA has played a distinct role in the expansion of Las Vegas and Clark County. With the incredible growth in Nevada, architects have played a key role in design-

ing iconic properties on the Las Vegas Strip and housing developments throughout the valley. AIA members developed many of the same entertainment venues that accommodate tourists and provide essential jobs for Nevadans. The creative genius of architects was essential to transforming Las Vegas into the “Entertainment Capitol of the World,” which welcomes more than 50 million visitors annually.

Members of the AIA have made a significant and positive contribution to the security, arts, culture, beauty, and livability of our community. Southern Nevada is a better place to live and work because of the efforts of AIA Las Vegas. I appreciate and admire the dedicated professionals of the AIA, and I wish them continued success for years to come as they design the future of Las Vegas.

TRIBUTE TO CYNTHIA LUMMIS

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, each year the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame asks for nominations of farmers, ranchers, and others who contribute to the agriculture industry in Wyoming. After the nominations are received, a panel of three judges selects those who will be added to the hall of fame. This year U.S. Representative CYNTHIA LUMMIS is one of the hall’s inductees. I think it’s fitting that CYNTHIA is being added to the hall of fame’s roster on its 25th anniversary because her participation, encouragement, and support of our State’s farmers and ranchers deserve to be recognized on a momentous occasion for the Hall itself.

CYNTHIA has a long background in agriculture, beginning on her family’s ranch on Crow Creek. Growing up, she learned about the importance of being a good steward of the land, how to tend her family’s livestock, and how to make good use of all the resources that were at her disposal. She also participated in 4-H, raising shorthorn cattle. Over time CYNTHIA became a skilled horseman, and she used that talent to good effect at the world’s largest outdoor rodeo: Cheyenne Frontier Days.

In fact, CYNTHIA was such an important addition to the “Daddy of ‘em All” that she is also being inducted into the Cheyenne Frontier Days Hall of Fame this year. It is worth noting that her parents, Doran and Enid, and her whole family have already been inducted into that hall, but this year, CYNTHIA will be recognized for her singular contributions, from repairing parade costumes to serving as “Miss Frontier.” CYNTHIA is fully deserving of that honor, and this is just another example of the mark she has left on every corner of our State.

At the University of Wyoming, CYNTHIA received degrees in animal science and biology and was a member of the rodeo team. She then became the youngest woman ever elected to the Wyoming Legislature and also earned a law degree from UW. She put that degree to use as a clerk for the Wyoming Supreme Court and in private practice.

After serving 14 years in the Wyoming House and Senate, where she focused largely on agriculture and natural resources issues, CYNTHIA served as Governor Geringer’s policy director and was then elected State treasurer. While serving as treasurer, CYNTHIA became the first woman on the Cheyenne Frontier Days board of directors. For all of these reasons and more, CYNTHIA was named a 2005 Outstanding Alumna for the University of Wyoming College of Agriculture.

But CYNTHIA wasn’t done fighting for Wyoming or the agriculture industry. In 2008, she took the next step in her political career and was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. CYNTHIA has proven to be up to the challenge of being our State’s lone voice in the House, and I have been proud to work with her.

Through all of this, CYNTHIA has been active in the operations of the Lummis family ranch. I am sure she will continue to work on behalf of the State and the industry that she has loved her entire life.

I want to extend my congratulations to CYNTHIA for everything she has accomplished and for her induction into the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame. She would be the first to say she couldn’t have done it alone, so I also want to recognize CYNTHIA’s family and in particular her daughter, Annaliese, and her husband, Al. For years, CYNTHIA and Alvin were a team that took on the issues that will direct the future of Wyoming and our Nation, and I know Alvin would be so proud of her recognition in the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame.

REMEMBERING SERGEANT DAVID THATCHER

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I want to recognize SGT David Thatcher, a member of the Greatest Generation and a true American hero, who sadly passed away on June 22, 2016, in Missoula, MT. Born on July 31, 1921, in Bridger, MT to homesteaders, Joseph and Dorothea Thatcher, David grew up in Montana during the Great Depression.

David enlisted in the U.S. Army Air Corps and in 1942 volunteered to go on a secret mission that ultimately became the Doolittle Raid on Tokyo. He was a crew member on plane No. 7, the Ruptured Duck, which crash landed in water off China after their bombing mission. His heroic efforts saved the lives of his badly injured crew members, and with the help of local Chinese guerillas, he helped his crew evade Japanese troops and make their way to safety.

Sergeant Thatcher’s actions and those of all of the Doolittle’s Raiders were nothing but heroic, yet Sergeant Thatcher was a humble man and did not feel he did anything great. He just felt he was doing his job. Doing his job, however, helped to win a war and maintain our freedom as a nation. Sergeant