

They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in closed session during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 13, 2026, at 9:30 a.m.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 13, 2026, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 3627

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3627) to require institutions of higher education to disseminate information on the rights of, and accommodations and resources for, pregnant students, and for other purposes.

Mr. THUNE. I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2026

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, January 14; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 6938.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of my colleagues.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 550

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, the world is undeniably round; water

undeniably freezes at 32 degrees Fahrenheit; and equally undeniably, the climate is changing, and the changes in the climate are human-caused by fossil fuel emissions. Fossil fuel emissions are the primary cause.

These are facts, and they are demonstrated by sound science. Not only is climate change a demonstrated fact recognized by all sound science on the topic, but human beings have been aware of this scientific fact for over a century. The fossil fuel industry has worked to suppress that fact for nearly 60 years, but it is still a fact.

One hundred thirty years ago, in 1896, Swedish scientist Svante Arrhenius concluded that greenhouse gas emissions from human activities contributed to a global "greenhouse effect" driving global warming. That was 1896.

In 1968, at a celebration of the hundred-year anniversary of the fossil fuel industry, the physicist Edward Teller warned that greenhouse gas emissions from burning fossil fuels cause a greenhouse effect and that increased use of fossil fuels would cause global warming and severe sea level rise. His audience, obviously, was fossil fuel executives at that event commemorating the 100 years of the fossil fuel industry.

This chart is of the famous Keeling Curve, which shows the dramatic acceleration in CO₂ in the atmosphere beginning around 1950. You can see it start up in 1850, but it really kicked off after 1950.

This data, actually, from back here comes from scientists who collect core samples in glaciers, date the core samples, and can test the bubbles that are preserved in those ice core samples from ancient glaciers. I have actually been to the lab at Ohio State where a married couple of scientists had this immense freezer in which they had core after core after core of samples from glaciers, and very often, the glacier is now gone.

This chart shows the rise in global average temperatures from 1860 to now. While it jumps up and down a lot seasonally, the red line shows the average. As you see the CO₂ curve accelerating, you see the global average temperature also accelerating.

Between 1968 and 2003, fossil fuel interests, including American Petroleum Institute, Exxon, and Shell, commissioned scientific reports on climate change to look into this, all of which—all of which—concluded that climate change was happening, that greenhouse gas emissions from fossil fuel combustion were the primary cause of climate change, and that the impacts of this change in our climate would be severe.

The fossil fuel industry suppressed their own scientists' findings for decades, but in 2015, investigative journalists found and leaked the suppressed internal memos. These companies knew what their business was doing all along, and they chose to hide the evidence of their own scientists and do nothing.

Not only did they know, but their own scientists' work was stunningly accurate.

This is a chart from Exxon pulled from a 1982 Exxon memo. This line in black is the predicted rise, back when this was prepared, before 1982, in CO₂ concentrations. They start at 1960 and work their way to 2100. This is what Exxon predicted for CO₂ concentration increase, and this lower line is what Exxon predicted for temperature increase driven by the CO₂ concentration increase. The blue line is what actually happened with respect to CO₂ concentration. The red line is what actually happened with respect to temperature.

Those Exxon scientists pretty well nailed it. I mean, that is very, very close, to have actual results track the Exxon predictions. But that didn't get out even though Exxon knew because the fossil fuel industry suppressed all of this.

Today, NASA maintains that "there is unequivocal evidence"—unequivocal evidence—"that Earth is warming at an unprecedented rate" and that "[h]uman activity is the principal cause" of this warming. That is what NASA scientists say.

NASA scientists are pretty good. We are driving remotely controlled vehicles around the surface of Mars that got sent there by NASA, driving around collecting data and sending images back to Earth from Mars. When you can pull that off, you are a pretty good scientist.

This is what NASA said: "unequivocal evidence that Earth is warming" and that "[h]uman activity is the principal cause."

The United States has its own National Climate Assessments, which Congress actually mandated by law. They are the most comprehensive source for data on climate impacts in the United States. Five have been published since they were required by Congress—2000, 2009, 2014, 2018, and 2023. A sixth National Climate Assessment was due for 2028, but in 2025, the Trump administration fired all the scientists and researchers working on that project. They even shut down the website.

Why, you may ask, is the Trump administration suppressing science, firing scientists and researchers? Why won't the Trump administration protect the American people from greenhouse gas emissions? Why are they even trying to repeal the finding that these greenhouse gases are pollutants? It is pretty simple: fossil fuel industry pressure from fossil fuel industry front groups.

This is a graph I have used repeatedly on the floor before. It is put together by a scientist, Robert Brulle, who studies the science denial operation as a social and economic phenomenon. Each of these dots represents a group that propagates the fossil fuel industry's climate denial fraud campaign. As you can see, there are a lot of them. This is a big cloud of groups

whose job is to fool the American public, propagate climate denial fraud about what is really going on, and in some cases actually work on the political side to put dark money into our politics to corrupt America's response to this known danger. This web of denial, of fraud, of corruption costs American lives, and it costs Americans money, too.

By the way, voters are paying attention. A December poll found that 65 percent of American voters understand that climate change is increasing their cost of living. And we know that to be true. As chairman of the Budget Committee, I had hearing after hearing that demonstrated that.

What we see across the country is climate change driving extreme weather, sea level rise, heat waves, catastrophic wildfires, and toxic pollution. That not only drives illness and death, but it is right now as we speak undermining the insurance, mortgage, and real estate markets in places like Florida. Those parts are already in disarray. And when you can't get insurance on your home because the climate risk is uninsurable, nobody can get a mortgage on your home either, which means that when you try to sell that home, unless you are a millionaire swapping McMansions—if you are a regular person who needs a buyer who can get a mortgage on your property to sell it, it means your property becomes hard to sell. It means its value decreases.

And, in fact, in Florida you are seeing an insurance market that is in complete collapse, propped up by taxpayers to try to hold it together. You are seeing a mortgage market that is in disarray as people find they are unable to sell their properties. And Florida led the country last year in the decline in property values. It was the top State in property value decline.

This is coming at us, and it is coming at us hard. In other speeches, I have given surveys of the multiple, multiple warnings—not from green groups, not from environmentalists, but from people who understand the financial system and see this threat that is bearing down on us.

So fossil fuel's climate denial fraud is coming at American families' finances. It is real, and it is costing them.

So I have a resolution, and the punch line is very simple: One, climate change caused by fossil fuel combustion is not a hoax. I hope we can go with NASA on that. I hope we can go with Exxon on that. I hope we can go with real, measured observation of weather on that.

Second, the reality of human-caused, greenhouse-gas-driven climate change is sound science. That is essentially undisputed in the scientific community. There is a microscopic stable of people whose science usually means they show up here to testify for the fossil fuel industry to sow doubt. But once you get beyond that tiny stable of paid climate deniers, it is 99.9 percent. I mean, science is—that is as close to

unanimous as science gets on this, and I urge that this body should reflect that.

And, finally, the third, Congress should protect legislatively mandated climate research programs. Science is the headlights for society. Science predicts and tells us what is coming at us. You would be a fool to turn the headlights out on your car driving onto a dark road. We are fools if we turn off the science headlights of our government as we move into increasing climate danger.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 550; further, that the resolution be agreed to, that the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I just want to say that I am optimistic that the Senator from Rhode Island and I agree on our goals here: that we both think the environment is important, that we both want to leave this world cleaner, healthier, and safer than we found it. I think those are great goals. And having children and grandchildren that love the great outdoors, I want to leave this world better than I found it.

But I guess where we disagree is, How are we going to get there? As a family, we have done projects like we planted over 20,000 trees on our land. We have done several water projects where we preserved wetlands. We have eliminated invasive species. We have worked with and invested in Ducks Unlimited, which does some incredible things for the environment.

What is interesting, as we think about what are the biggest impacts on the environment and what the future holds, actually, the No. 1 predictor is the world economy—that if we have a strong world economy, the carbon footprint is going to be less. So we think about: Well, why is that? And we should answer the question: Why is that so? If there is a strong world economy, then the infrastructure can be built for energy production with a smaller carbon footprint.

I think of building pipelines for natural gas, for instance, as opposed to all these countries that are still burning coal, that are burning wood and diesel fuel, heating fuel. I can't even believe that still, in America, we are burning heating fuel because we won't let natural gas pipelines go across certain areas. So a strong world economy is one of the biggest impacts on our environment's future.

And so what impacts the world economy? I think one of the things is energy. The world needs energy that is not only affordable, but it needs to be reliable and clean. It has to be all those things. And we can do that. But if you

have energy production that is not affordable, that is not reliable, then people aren't going to use it, and countries aren't going to use it.

So we need this bridge. We need this bridge, and I think the solution long term is probably some form of nuclear energy. I think it is probably small modular reactors, which have zero carbon footprint. They are walkaway safe. They are not quite ready for prime time, but we are getting closer every year. And I think, within 5 to 10 years, we will have these small modular reactors powering communities and powering data centers and all those great things.

I think we have to keep in mind that it is so expensive to transport electricity. If you transport natural gas to make energy, it is a tenth of the cost that it is to transport electricity. So, again, we have to think about the equation as well as clean, but we also need to think about affordable and reliable.

I think the challenge for those of us who are actually scientists is to go back and think about all the predictions that have never, never come true from the climate alarmists. In 2013, Peter Wadhams said we would be ice free by 2015. In 2007, the IPCC said the Himalayan glaciers would disappear by 2035; it was later retracted. In 2019, everyone's climate alarmist favorite, AOC, said the world is going to end in 12 years if we don't address the climate change. We are not quite to 2031, but we are getting there.

It doesn't do any good to be an alarmist. We need a practical approach to our environment—a practical, pragmatic, economical approach—and I look forward to the day when my friends across the aisle want to sit down with Republicans and have a real conversation about how we get there.

And, again, I am just committed to leaving this world cleaner, healthier, and safer. I don't believe that we can go along with my colleague from Rhode Island's resolution here, and for that reason I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, let me just remind everyone who is listening what this resolution resolved—three simple points: One, climate change is not a hoax. Two, climate science is actually sound science. And, three, we shouldn't turn off our research headlights that tell us what is coming at us.

That was all. All we had to agree on was basic facts. So when my friends on the other side can't agree on facts that are so basic as climate change is real, the science is sound, and we should keep our headlights on as we drive into this unprecedented new hazard, it is hard to see how we move on from there.

I agree very much with my friend from Kansas that energy that is affordable, reliable, and clean is our common

goal. And I will give an example because the developers of Revolution Wind have told me that our offshore wind facility is going to send power ashore at 9 cents per kilowatt hour into a grid whose average price is 18 cents. It is literally half the price to get power off Revolution Wind than it is to pay for the primarily natural-gas-fueled power that drives the New England grid. It is a 50-percent cost reduction; so it is affordable. Reliable? The wind blows like crazy out on the ocean; it is highly reliable.

In fact, Iowa, which has the biggest wind component of its electric grid, has actually treated wind as reliable baseload energy because where one turbine might not be spinning, there are plenty of others that are. So the people who plan for making sure that the lights don't go out—technical people—actually treat wind as reliable baseload energy through formulas that that ISO has developed.

And clean? Yes, it is clean. It burns no fossil fuel.

And yet the Trump administration twice has tried to shut down that project—twice. Just yesterday, they got blown up in Federal court for the second time when they tried for the second time to shut down that project. After \$5 billion had been invested in it, they wanted to shut it down.

So we have the way to go forward, but the administration doesn't want to go forward. They want to sabotage a wind project that will bring power onto the grid at about half the current grid cost.

Our attorney general in those proceedings proposed an affidavit and, in his pleadings, said that Revolution Wind would save hundreds of millions of dollars for New England customers.

The Trump Cabinet is running around pretending that that is not true. They pretend that it is expensive. They lie.

They had a chance to come into court, where it is a little harder to lie, and say: Oh, no, you are wrong. Your affidavit asserting hundreds of millions of dollars in savings when this comes online is wrong, and here is our case for why 9 cents is bigger than 18 cents or 9 cents isn't real—or whatever it is that they wanted to say.

They didn't. They didn't pipe up at all because they couldn't, because it is not true, and every grid operator proves that by calling up clean energy first because it is less expensive.

Again, these are technical people. They don't have a point to make. Their system calls the least expensive energy up first, and once you get through nukes and hydro, you are into solar, wind, and battery. And it is only once you are through all of that that you then get into the fossil fuel plants, because they are more expensive, and every grid operator can prove that to you in the way they actually operate our electric grids. They call up clean energy first because it is less expensive, period.

So it is unfortunate that here we are with this web of denial controlling so much of what happens in this building—fossil fuel industry dark money slashing through this building—and we can't get agreement that climate change is not a hoax, that climate science is sound science, and that we shouldn't turn off our research headlights as we go into the future.

Before I yield, let me just point out that the University of Kansas teaches climate science. The University of Kansas teaches climate science. It even teaches about this stuff. It has a course called "Anti-Environmentalism and Climate Change Denial in America," in addition to a "Climate and Climate Change" course, a "Climate Change and Hazards Planning" course, and a "Climate Science" course.

When your home State university is teaching the science of climate change, you ought to be able to agree that climate science is real and that climate change is not a hoax.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

ENERGY COSTS

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his leadership and his clarity, and I want to underscore one of the most basic points that has to be made. And this is how times have changed.

We have changed what we are talking about because energy systems change, prices change, needs change, and the load changes. Right? But hearing the Senator from Kansas, it could have been 1998 or 2008 or 2018. It is the same talking points, and it is literally not true anymore.

There was a time when you could actually credibly say: Look, I understand there is a planetary emergency. But coal is so cheap. People are struggling. We have to balance the planetary emergency with the need for people to be able to cool and heat their homes and keep their lights on and all the rest of it.

All of that is out the window. Why? Because clean is cheap and cheap is clean. Clean energy is now the cheapest kind of electricity that we can get on the grid in any kind of reasonable timeframe.

There was a time where it was coal. That is definitely more expensive now. There was a time where it was gas, but the cost of gas keeps going up and up and up, for a couple of reasons—because we are exporting a lot of our gas but also because the turbines needed to convert natural gas into electrons—there is a huge backlog of them.

So we have an industrial renaissance happening in certain States, and we have all of this AI data center load coming up, and we have your normal American economy stuff happening. There are not enough electrons on the grid.

What happens when there is not enough of something? The people sell-

ing that thing raise the price. And that is exactly what is happening.

That is not a rhetorical flourish. Like, they have overnight prices. They have people whose job it is to find how we are going to meet everybody's needs, so when you flick that switch, everything just works. There are technicians in front of probably three or four screens figuring out "OK. I am going to buy this. This is the overnight price. This is the backup," all that.

What has changed over the last couple of years is that solar energy is it. Even if you don't care at all about the climate, you should still love solar energy. Why? Because nobody should be enthused about paying more for electricity.

What Donald Trump has done is very unique in American history, maybe even in world history—I am not too sure. It is normal for a President of the United States to try to alleviate economic pain for the citizens of the United States, and this is certainly the first President that I have experienced in the U.S. Senate but honestly the first President that I have even been aware of who is intentionally raising the price of something that we all need.

It is Secretary Burgum's order, and it is the way Secretary Wright is behaving, and it is the way Lee Zeldin is behaving, and it is the way people in the White House are behaving. They want to create a shortage of electricity. Why? First, they have ideology against solar and wind. Trump has a particular idea about wind and golf courses and birds or whatever. But they viewed, 10 years ago, solar as a kind of ideological project, as like a nice to have, United Nations, utopian view of the world.

Well, listen, solar is the most pragmatic thing we can put on the grid. Solar is really the only thing that is ready quickly. Why? Because nuclear energy has tremendous potential but is at least an 8- to 12-year timeframe, so we are talking about the 2030s. Geothermal also has tremendous potential, but they have not worked out all of the technical issues. And again, that is really a 2030 to 2040 play.

In the short run, we have a shortage. In the short run, we have a shortage, and Donald Trump is making it worse. Now, why would you make it worse? Well, when there are shortages of something, the people selling the thing get to charge more, and they are charging more.

So you, as the consumer—and again, I care deeply about this planetary crisis. It is actually the main reason I am in the U.S. Senate. I care deeply about this. But even if you don't, nobody wants to pay more than necessary on their electricity bills, and this national solar ban is making everybody pay more.

One in four Americans struggles to pay their electricity bills—one in four Americans. So what is Trump doing about it? Well, it is definitely worse than nothing.