This is critical to providing a sense of security and stability to our allies in NATO.

Finally, DASKA also includes new sanctions pressure on Moscow, including on Russian oligarchs complicit in the spread of Russia's malign actions. In addition, it includes increased sanctions on Russia's energy and financial sectors.

The bill has specific sanctions on the Russian shipbuilding sector to the extent that Russia continues to interfere with the freedom of navigation in the Kerch Strait or anywhere else and was complicit in the November attack.

In the final analysis, we have a few peaceful tools of diplomacy to address malign actors around the world: the court of international public opinion, insofar as a government or a leader in question cares about such things; our trade and aid as an inducement to behavior change; then there is the denial of trade or aid or access to our financial institutions, which we call sanctions.

President Putin is willing to use his military as a means of first resort to advance his interests. We are not. Therefore, sanctions are our tool of peaceful diplomacy. They are how we send the message and how we seek to defend ourselves.

Now I must state that growing up in New Jersey, I learned that if you didn't confront the bully in the schoolyard, his reign of terror would never end. He would create a climate of fear. He would create a climate of intimidation until you whacked him in the head with a 2 by 4, until you said enough is enough, until you made clear that you and your fellow students wouldn't accept that kind of behavior. If you didn't stand up for yourself, the bully would press ahead.

Ladies and gentlemen, that is what we have in Vladimir Putin. He will continue to push and push until he meets resistance, until he meets a 2 by 4. That is what we have in DASKA.

We have a responsibility in this body, a responsibility shared by all 100 Senators, to protect our national security and the integrity of our democracy. It is our most solemn responsibility. Some may not care. Some may think we have done enough to deal with the Russian threat, but our intelligence experts disagree, Bob Mueller disagrees, FBI Director Wray disagrees, and clearly those living under the threat of Kremlin aggression in Eastern Europe disagree.

This body has come together before. I have seen it. We came together in 2017 to pass the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, or CAATSA, but since then we have struggled to get this administration to fully implement the law. Are we supposed to just throw up our hands and say, ''Oh, well,'' and hope they will see the light or are we supposed to demand nothing less than rigorous enforcement and take legislative action if needed?

I stand firmly for the latter, and I hope a majority of my colleagues will stand with me. It is long past time we send another message to the world and, most importantly, to the Kremlin that the Senate is prepared to defend American interests. We will not tolerate intrusions by a hostile foreign power. We will not leave our democratic institutions vulnerable to further interference. We will not allow any foreign adversary to meddle in our democracy.

The breadth of Russian interference laid out by the Mueller report demands the kind of comprehensive foreign policy response put forward in DASKA. The American people deserve a markup and a full vote in the Senate to make that happen.

I will just say, as the elected leaders of this country, we owe Americans action. We owe them fulfillment of our oath. We owe them a robust and unflinching defense of our democracy and our values. Enough with the delays. Enough with the excuses. Enough with the politics.

We have legislation ready to bolster our defenses. We have strong bipartisan support for it. Let's mark up the bill now. Let's send a clear and unequivocal message to Putin that we will not tolerate a repeat performance in 2020.

I would just say that this is not about President Trump. It is not about the last election other than that they attempted to influence it and that we should recognize and want to deal with it. But it is about preserving our national security, our democracy, and our interest in the world.

Putin is unbridled. This institution, Republicans and Democrats, have always joined together to meet Russia's challenge when Russia posed a challenge. The party of Reagan is absent. The party of Reagan is absent on this. If this had been going on during the Obama administration, I would have been peeling people off of the Capitol ceiling.

Let's get to work. Let's defend our interests. Let's stand up together. Let's send Putin a message. Let's defend our democracy.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Before I begin, let me say how nice it was to be with the Presiding Officer in her home State at the McCain Institute this weekend.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, pick up the paper these days, and it is hard to miss the headlines about corporate America getting serious about reducing carbon emissions. Companies are purchasing renewable power. They are moving into carbon-neutral office buildings. They are purchasing electric vehicle fleets. They are developing new technologies and products for the transition to a carbon economy. Many are forcing some degree of sustainability out of their supply chains. All of this is important work and the companies that are leading in these areas deserve real applause.

But—you knew there was going to be a ''but,'' and here it is—corporations alone reducing their own carbon emissions or designing new low-carbon technologies will not win the fight against climate change. If you want to fail on climate change while looking good, that will work, but if you actually want to win—if you want to keep us between 1.5 and 2 degrees in temperature increase—you will fail.

A new report, ''The Blind Spot,'' from the Environmental Defense Fund, makes crystal clear that individual corporate efforts to reduce their own carbon emissions will not be enough. Here is what it says: ''While voluntary actions by companies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions are important, only public policy can deliver the pace and scale of reductions necessary to avoid the worst impacts of climate change.''

''Public policy''—that is us. That is Congress.

EDF is not alone. Report after report has shown that we will fail without government action. But as engaged as so much of corporate America is in greening its own operations, they are almost totally absent from the halls of Congress when it comes to climate change—AWOL, no place.

So government sits, stalled by the fossil fuel industry, and does nothing serious. As a Senator, I am an inhabitant of this political ecosystem. I observe how this works. Consider this the field report of the biologist who lives in the jungle.

The sad reality of our political ecosystem is that post-Citizens United, the power of big industries seeking influence in Congress has exploded. Where previously, big special interests had muskets, Citizens United gave them artillery. On climate change, one industry, the fossil fuel industry, is deploying its artillery of big money and big threats here in Washington like nobody else.

It is no surprise. They are defending a $700 billion per year fossil fuel subsidy just in the United States, according to the International Monetary Fund. They have a huge interest—a multihundred billion dollar interest—in preventing legislation that would reduce consumption of their fossil fuels.

So they spend hundreds of millions of dollars on lobbying and elections. They fund dozens of phony front groups and trade associations to engage in all sorts of climate denial and obstruction. They hide their influence in dark-money channels. They pollute the public sphere as badly as they pollute the atmosphere.

In our political ecosystem, they are a big and dangerous predator. Ask

former Congressman Bob Inglis. Ask former Senate candidate Katie McGinty. The fossil fuel industry is a multitentacled, well-camouflaged, and deadly political beast.

And, then, there is the rest of the business community: retail, food and beverage, financial services, tech, consumer goods, and manufacturing. Most are taking steps to reduce their own emissions, but when it comes to doing something about climate change here in Congress, they just don't show up, and the result is entirely predictable.

In an institution like Congress, whose currencies are money and influence, if one industry spends on lobbies like a beast and there is no counterweight, that industry likely carries the day. That is simple political hydraulics. It is true in sports, and it is true in battles: If one side doesn't show up, the other side owns the field. And so the fossil fuel industry owns the Republican Party.

That is why it is imperative that the rest of corporate America start showing up on climate. Many of them are here. They do lobby. They just care about other things, and their silence about climate change is deafening. The good guys are just not on the field. They are scared of retaliation. They have other priorities. They don't want to be yelled at by the Chamber of Commerce. They are getting what they want and don't want to upset the applecart. There are lots of reasons, but it doesn't change the outcome. It is not just the EDF report.

I got today the New America report ''Prospects for Climate Change Policy Reform.'' They point out that in the past, business and government usually worked together to solve environmental problems. I quote them here: ''A cross-partisan model of environmental-business engagement held sway for decades on other issues; however, companies have been less willing to provide leadership on climate policy.''

No kidding. But the fossil fuel industry is here, and it exerts a relentless barrage of lobbying, electioneering, and propaganda pressure on Congress. And it owns the field. This statement from the EDF report is really its central message: ''The most powerful tool companies have to fight climate change is their political influence.''

So when they don't show up, it makes a difference. This is the message that corporate America needs to take to heart. Republicans are not going to break this artificial, fossil-fuel-funded, climate logjam here in Congress until corporate America—the corporate America they listen to—starts to demand climate action, not on a website, not in their purchasing standards but here in Congress.

In this political ecosystem, the inhabitants know when something is real, and they know when it is corporate greenwashing, or well-intentioned peripheral stuff they can ignore. Members know who is serious.

The fossil fuel industry is deadly serious. The EDF report says that any evaluation of corporate climate policy must include an analysis of its lobbying and political spending as it relates to climate. EDF is right. Corporate America needs to be accountable for the results that it pays for, and that includes whether or not companies fund anti-climate trade associations.

This is another dirty Washington secret. Many companies subcontract lobbying and electioneering activity to trade associations. Two of the biggest trade associations—the National Association of Manufacturers and the very biggest, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the proverbial 800-pound gorilla—have spent decades denying that climate change was even occurring and obstructing any effort to reduce carbon pollution—decades of denial and obstruction.

Too many companies with good climate policies support them with the result that those companies' functional climate presence in Washington is opposite to what they say their policy is and opposite to what they say on their website.

The group InfluenceMap looks at corporate lobbying and ranks corporations and trade associations by their influence on climate policy. Of the 50 most influential trade associations around the world, InfluenceMap shows the Chamber and the National Association of Manufacturers to be the two worst—the two most opposed when it comes to reducing carbon pollution. Here they are, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, right at the bottom—the very worst.

Look at those companies that are greening their own operations but are supporting the Chamber and the National Association of Manufacturers. Look at the companies that don't show up in Congress to lobby for climate action and, instead, lobby through these two who lobby against the climate action those companies claim to support. Those companies' net lobbying presence in Congress is against climate action, whatever they may claim to support. Their net lobbying presence in Congress is against climate action—directly opposed to the policies they claim to support.

There is an accountability moment that needs to come for those companies, unless they honestly believe that climate change is a hoax, that it is not real, we don't need to worry about it, and obstruction is OK. If that is their position, they are getting proper representation from the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, but if they are telling the world—and their shareholders and their customers—that they take climate change seriously, they have a little explaining to do about supporting these two enemies of climate progress, particularly, if they are not showing up in Congress to counter the denial and obstruction they are paying for.

For years, companies that go out and brag to consumers and investors about how green they are simultaneously fund climate denial and obstruction via those two trade associations. That has to stop. In fact, more and more consumers and investors are beginning to call on companies to stop this corporate doublespeak. You can't have a good climate website and fund these two organizations and face your shareholders and say you are serious.

Consumers who buy a Coke or a Pepsi don't want to be supporting the Chamber's decades-long campaign against climate action. Investors in Coca-Cola and Pepsico don't want these companies to put their reputations at risk by funding anti-climate groups. Investors don't want these companies to ignore climate change when climate change may upend their water-dependent businesses.

Coca-Cola features a powerful statement about its commitment to climate action on its website. ''Climate change is a profound challenge,'' it says, ''and we are partnering with other businesses, civil society organizations, and governments to support cooperative action on this critical issue. . . . We also recognize climate change may have long-term direct and indirect implications for our business and supply chain.''

In 2018, Coca-Cola disclosed that it gave the chamber at least $85,000—probably a good deal more.

PepsiCo is even more explicit about the need for climate action. I quote them:

> Implementing solutions to address climate change is important to the future of our company, customers, consumers and our shared world. . . . We believe industry and governments should commit to science-based action to keep global temperature increases to 2 Celsius above pre-industrial levels.''

In 2018, PepsiCo disclosed that it gave the chamber at least half a million dollars.

Coke and Pepsi's own trade association, the American Beverage Association, also gives money to the chamber.

So here are these two consumer-facing, climate-supporting companies, and both of them contribute directly to the Chamber of Commerce, and they run money through their own trade association, the American Beverage Association, into the Chamber of Commerce. And there it lies as the worst of the pair of lobbying organizations blocking climate action.

What is the net effect of all of that? The net effect is that, for all their good work reducing their own carbon emissions and reducing their supply chain's carbon emissions, here in Congress, Coke and Pepsi are net opposed to climate action.

Thankfully, some companies are beginning to realize that they can't just sit on the sidelines here in Washington and let the fossil fuel industry own Congress. Little Patagonia, the outdoor clothing manufacturer, has led the way. Bravo, Patagonia. Danone,

Mars, Nestle, and Unilever have announced a sustainable food policy alliance to pursue a price on carbon in Congress. Separately, Microsoft recently announced that it was going to lobby Congress for a price on carbon. But the fact that those companies are the exceptions I can name shows how bad the presence of corporate America is on this issue here in Congress.

I will give Microsoft some extra credit. Microsoft also stood up in Washington State to support a ballot initiative to put a price on carbon emissions. Starbucks, Amazon, Costco, and Boeing—big, supposedly green corporations in Washington State—stood by and let themselves get rolled by Big Oil, led by BP—''Beyond Petroleum,'' ha—when Big Oil spent $30 million to defeat the measure.

By the way, it is the oil CEOs who have been saying: Oh, we know our product causes climate change. We are serious about doing something about it, and what we are going to do to be serious about it is to support a price on carbon.

That is what they say. What do they do? Look at BP. Look at the oil spending in Washington. They go right in and spend their money to fight the very policy they say they support.

I know of no path to success on climate that does not include pricing carbon. It is also the right thing to do because failing to price carbon is bad economics. It is a market failure. So if you are a true free market person, you ought to get behind a price on carbon. If you are just a fossil fuel person, then OK, but admit it. There really is no path to success on climate change that does not include pricing carbon. That may be an unpleasant fact for some, but it is a fact.

Staying between 1.5 and 2 degrees Centigrade world temperature increase is another fact. We can't miss that target, but we will. We will miss that target if this corporate doublespeak doesn't change.

Work like this new report from EDF, and InfluenceMap's analysis of how these trade associations like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers obstruct climate action, may help convince corporate America that it is time to step up, get on the field, and demand that Congress take real action to limit carbon pollution.

Corporate America needs to go to its trade associations and say: Knock it off. No more U.S. chamber of carbon. No more national association of manufactured facts.

Corporate America is paying for this nonsense, and corporate America can stop it. The two-faced game of having a good climate website but having your presence in Congress be against climate action has got to stop.

Corporate America—the political force Republicans listen to—has the responsibility and the power to break the fossil fuel-funded logjam in this body. They could do it tomorrow if they wanted to. You take the leaders of corporate America in the sectors that I listed and you march them right down to the leader's office, and they say to him ''We are done with you, we are done with your candidates, and we are done with your party until you knock off the obstruction,'' and we would be out on the floor debating climate change within a week.

When corporate America takes up its responsibility and uses its power to break the fossil fuel-funded logjam in this body, change on this issue will come swiftly, and we will see bipartisan support for climate action emerge.

I was here in 2007, in 2008, and in 2009. In all of those years, there was constant bipartisan activity on climate. The pages would have been awfully young back then. It is nearly 10 years ago now. They would not recognize what is going on. I think there were five different bipartisan climate bills in the Senate—serious ones—that would have really done something significant to head off the climate crisis. All of that stopped dead in January of 2010. It was like a heart attack and a flat line on the EKG—stopped dead because the Supreme Court decided Citizens United. That opened the floodgates of political money into our politics. The fossil fuel money jumped on to that immediately. I think they saw and predicted that decision. I know they asked for it, and they were ready at the starting gun. From that moment when the fossil fuel industry dropped in on the Republican Party and said, ''Nobody is going to cross us on this any longer. You are all going to have to line up on climate denial. We will take out Republicans who cross us. We will do it to Bob Inglis, and we will do it to others. You are done with bipartisanship on this issue,'' that is when it stopped.

If the fossil fuel industry would knock it off or if these front groups like the chamber and the National Association of Manufacturers would knock it off or if the rest of corporate America would simply get in here and push back, show up, outpressure them, we could go back and we could be bipartisan in a week. We are not there yet. Most of corporate America is still avoiding this issue in Congress, but they could really make a big difference. That makes it very much still time to wake up.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:41 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 8, 2019, at 9:30 a.m.