

another. It is the same and similar view expressed by our colleague Orrin Hatch in his floor speech last year.

We are called to stand up and fight for equal treatment and dignity of our fellow human beings—dignity and respect—to fight for people like my talented and compassionate son Carson and for all other sons, daughters, nieces, nephews, grandsons, granddaughters, friends, and neighbors, all out there who deserve to pursue a full, free, joyous, and loving life.

Today the Senate has an opportunity to stand up and make a very clear statement that we will not allow State government-sanctioned discrimination of LGBTQ people. We will not continue to allow that discrimination to continue, but we have to make that stand, and that stand can start right here. It has already started in the House.

The time is now to send a message. The time is now to send a message to all people—to all people across this country—that we in the U.S. Senate believe that all people deserve to live with dignity, free from the fear of discrimination.

As I prepared these remarks and I read through them and made changes, I thought about my old boss whose seat I now fill, Howell Heflin. It was in the 1990s that Howell Heflin from Alabama, a son of the South whose relatives fought in the Civil War, stood before this body and said that it was time to remove the Confederate battle flag from all Federal Government-sanctioned emblems. It was a bold statement. Now we have a son of the South standing up for what in the Bible Belt is that love and respect, a son of the South who is now talking about his family, talking about discrimination, and reaching out to people across the aisle and within my own party to say that it is time; it is time to make that move.

So I ask my colleagues to take this step with me, to do the right thing by calling on Leader MCCONNELL to bring this legislation to a vote in the U.S. Senate. Let all 100 Senators stand up and be counted one way or another. Every voice counts. Let every U.S. Senator say where they are by a vote on the Equality Act and to do it sooner rather than later.

This is a matter of civil rights, this is a matter of human rights, and this is a matter of being on the right side of history. We have an important opportunity right now to get it right. It is right now. It is the right time.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1803 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. COLLINS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

NOMINATIONS AND BORDER SECURITY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, to borrow from Yogi Berra, it is *deja vu* all over

again in the Senate this week. Once again, the Senate is taking up a lot of judicial nominations, and, once again, we will spend a lot of time considering noncontroversial nominees.

Now my colleagues across the aisle have started to complain about the Senate's focus on nominations. I am pretty frustrated myself, not because we are considering these nominees—it is our constitutional duty, after all—but because we are being forced to spend so much time on their nominations, but that is what my Democratic colleagues have obliged us to do.

Back in the day, most of the judicial nominees we are considering would have been confirmed without the time-consuming cloture vote process. By this point in President Obama's first term, Republicans had required cloture votes on just three of President Obama's judicial nominees—three, Mr. President.

Contrast that with today. As of June 5, Democrats have required cloture votes on 76 of President Trump's judicial nominees—76 to 3. Now, of course, some might leap to the conclusion that this is not obstruction for obstruction's sake. They might assume that President Trump has been nominating unqualified or deeply controversial candidates for judicial office, and the Democrats have no alternative but to obstruct and delay the nominations—except that is not the case because Democrats have repeatedly made it clear that they have no problem with many of the President's nominations by turning around and voting for the same people they have obstructed.

That is right. Again and again, Democrats have voted in favor of the very same nominees they have delayed. Take Monday and Tuesday's confirmation votes on two nominees for district judge. Democrats forced cloture votes on both nominees. Yet when it came time to confirm them, Democrats turned around and supported the nominations. One nominee received the support of 24 Democrats, including the Democratic whip, while the other nominee was confirmed with the support of 39 Democrats, almost the entire Democratic caucus.

Democrats aren't obstructing because they oppose all or even most of President Trump's nominees; they are obstructing because they still can't get over the 2016 election. It has been 2½ years since the last Presidential election—2½ years. We are closer to the next Presidential election than to the last. Yet Democrats still can't let the 2016 election go.

I realize their preferred candidate did not win, and I realize they are not fans of President Trump, but Democrats act like they are the only people who have ever lost an election, like they are the first to have to deal with a candidate they don't like.

To my Democratic colleagues across the aisle, I would like to say: Welcome to life in our democracy. Welcome to life in a free country. While it is never

fun, sometimes your candidate is going to lose. That is what happens when you have free elections.

I am not suggesting that Democrats should start rubberstamping every item on the President's agenda. They have serious philosophical disagreements with the President's policies, and it is right that they should air them, but to reflexively oppose everything the President says or does simply because he is the President is deeply irresponsible. There are serious consequences to pointlessly delaying nominees, such as backlogs in our court system or a government that isn't functioning the way it should because of vacancies in leadership positions.

There are even more serious and immediate consequences to obstructing other measures. Right now, Democrats are holding up desperately needed funding for the serious humanitarian and security crisis at our southern border simply because it is the President making the funding request. The security of our country and the well-being of tens of thousands of immigrants are at stake, and Democrats are refusing to address the situation because they don't like the President.

In the first 8 months of this fiscal year, nearly 411,000 unaccompanied children and families have crossed our southern border, more than in any previous full year. Resources are stretched to the breaking point. Shelters are overloaded, and providing adequate medical care is becoming more and more difficult. Federal agencies are simply running out of money. Money appropriated for the care of unaccompanied children could run out by the end of this month. That means caregivers for these children would have to work without pay, and private organizations with Federal grants to care for these children would go without their funding.

Democrats like to style themselves as the party of openness and compassion, and yet they are willing to ignore a humanitarian crisis of massive proportions out of political spite—not to mention the serious security issue.

The Department of Homeland Security is being forced to divert resources to deal with the humanitarian crisis pulling more than 700 Customs and Border Protection Officers from legal points of entry to assist with the surge of migrants.

I don't think there is a Member in this body who wouldn't agree on the importance of fully staffing our ports and cargo processing so we don't create new vulnerabilities, but Customs and Border Protection is left with little choice.

After 2½ years of unprecedented partisanship and obstruction from Democrats, I would like to think that the Democrats would finally turn their focus to the business of government. Unfortunately, I think it is more likely that their obstruction will continue and that we will see a lot more pointless delays when it comes to nominees

and more difficulty getting Democrats to work with us on legislation.

I do hope—I do hope Democrats can hold their relentless obstruction long enough to provide humanitarian relief along our southern border and to address the increasingly precarious security situation. It doesn't seem like too much to ask.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I came here to make my climate remarks, but I can't resist the opportunity—both as a Senator who actually gets quite a lot of bipartisan legislation passed with my Republican friends but also somebody who sits on the Judiciary Committee—to point out that there actually are quite a few firsts happening that I think help explain why the floor has become a battleground for so many of these nominees.

One first has been that this is the first time, I think, in anybody in the Senate's lifetime experience in which the blue slip is not honored for circuit court judges, in which a judge on the circuit court of appeals associated with the Presiding Officer's State of Oklahoma or my State of Rhode Island—we get rolled. We do not have the ability to approve or disapprove those judges. That is a long tradition of the Senate summarily thrown out.

This is the first time, I think in the history of the United States, in which the selection of judges is being done by a private group funded with anonymous money. That is a very bizarre way to go about picking judges. That is the way it is taking place right now. In fact, the gentleman named Leonard Leo from the Federalist Society who is doing the picking was admitted by Trump's legal counsel to have been insourced for the selection process. That is a first. We never had a private organization pick our Federal judges funded with anonymous money.

Finally, there are some qualified appointees to the bench. I voted for a considerable number, when I thought they were qualified. The problem is, when the unqualified ones come through, they get stuffed through just like anyone else. It is a rarity when we get somebody so flagrantly unqualified as the lawyer who did not know what a motion in limine was—a standard motion before any trial in a Federal court—had no idea what it was. It was actually a Republican Senator who was able to determine that and asked further questions because, frankly, it is pretty astounding to want to be a trial judge and not know what that is. So there have been some firsts, and if we could go back to where we were beforehand, I think we would see a smoother process.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. President, I am here today for my weekly "Time to Wake up" speech.

We know a lot of things now. We know our atmosphere is filling with

carbon dioxide to a point unprecedented in the history of the species on our planet; we know global temperatures are climbing and warping the weather across our country and around the world; we know our oceans are warming and acidifying in a way that the geologic record shows is a precursor to massive ocean die-offs; and we know the kind of action we must take to stop these changes and to avoid their worst consequences. We have known this, in fact, for a very long time.

However, the fossil fuel industry, just like the tobacco industry before it, whose apparatus it appropriated for this purpose, used phony manufactured doubt as its weapon of choice to fight against climate action. For decades, the fossil fuel industry and its armada of phony front groups waged a deliberate campaign of lies, propaganda, and political pressure. At the vanguard of this effort was ExxonMobil—America's largest and most influential oil company.

Internal reports uncovered by InsideClimate News show just how well Exxon privately understood the climate science, even before the public was aware of the issue.

This graphic shows the cover page of an internal Exxon briefing, prepared by Exxon scientists in 1982—to inform Exxon management about what they termed "the CO<sub>2</sub> greenhouse effect." The report says it was not to be distributed outside the company.

Exxon scientists reported to Exxon management in this 1982 report that there is "little doubt" that atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations were increasing and increasing due to fossil fuel burning. They state in this report that the resulting greenhouse effect "would warm the earth's surface, causing changes in climate affecting atmospheric and ocean temperatures, rainfall patterns, soil moisture, and . . . potentially melting the polar ice caps."

That was in 1982.

In 1982, Exxon also projected future global temperature increase based on their own expectations of fossil fuel burning. The Exxon modeling projected that by 2019, atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> would reach between 390 and 420 parts per million. This in a band of 170 to 200 parts per million that had prevailed through the entire history of our species on the planet for millions of years. They predicted we would jump out of that boundary to between 390 and 420 parts per million, and they predicted then that global average temperature in 2019 would be around 1 degree Celsius warmer.

Fast-forward from 1982 to today. It is 2019, and guess what. CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations are currently 415 parts per million. And guess what. Temperature has, in fact, increased about 1 degree Celsius. In 1982, Exxon scientists almost perfectly predicted how fossil fuel burning would warm the world and told Exxon management in this report. The scientists understood the damage this

warming would go on to cause, and they knew it was bad.

Exxon scientists predicted to the company that temperature would increase 2 degrees Celsius by 2050 and 3 degrees Celsius by 2080.

Among the report's warnings is this:

There could be considerable adverse impact including the flooding of some coastal land masses as a result of a rising sea level due to melting of the Antarctic ice sheet. . . . Such a rise would cause flooding on much of the U.S. East Coast, including the state of Florida and Washington, D.C.

Exxon's 1982 report stated that unrestrained carbon emissions have the potential to cause "great irreversible harm to our planet." "Irreversible." Interestingly, that is a word Donald Trump and his family used about climate change in 2009 when they signed this full-page ad in the New York Times calling climate science irrefutable and saying that the effects of climate change would be "catastrophic and irreversible." Yes, those Trumps.

Exxon understood that there was natural variability in the climate system. Before humankind began emitting massive amounts of carbon pollution into the atmosphere, global average temperature fluctuated by around half a degree Celsius on either side of its long-term average. This natural variation allowed Exxon to claim that an increase in global temperatures of up to half a degree Celsius could be due to natural causes.

This chart from the Exxon report explains that the signal would become undeniable—no half-degree-Celsius excuse—the signal would become undeniable that this was human-caused warming around the year 2000.

Exxon also understood that we needed to act quickly to head off the worst harm. Here is what Exxon's scientists told the company: "Once the effects are measurable, they might not be reversible and little could be done to correct the situation in the short term." Exxon scientists knew what had to be done: "Mitigation of the greenhouse effect would require major reductions in fossil fuel combustion."

In 1982, 37 years ago, Exxon understood climate science very well. They understood the uncertainties. They knew how much global temperature could increase. They pegged it nearly perfectly. And they knew the damage climate change would do, and they told Exxon management.

What did management do with this knowledge? Did they invest in low-carbon energy to develop the technologies needed to avert a future catastrophe? Did they work with governments on policies that would reduce carbon emissions and climate risk? Did they use their political might to move carbon capture front and center? No. Instead, they set out on a campaign to sow false doubt about climate science, to attack climate scientists, to block any good climate policy, and, of course, to extract and sell ever more fossil fuel. They knew it would be at the expense of the rest of society. They knew