

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### NORTH PACIFIC FISHERIES CONVENTION IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 405, S. 1335.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1335) to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of the High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean, as adopted at Tokyo on February 24, 2012, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sullivan substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 4003) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The bill (S. 1335), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

#### ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 2016

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 18; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein, and with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half; that following morning business, the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 2577; finally, that all time during the adjournment and morning business count postclosure on the Blunt-Murray amendment No. 3900.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of

the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHOUSE.

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

The Senator from Rhode Island.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I thank the chairman for giving me this time at the end of the day and congratulate her on the progress that has been made with my senior Senator, JACK REED, on this bill.

This is the 137th time that I have addressed this body, asking us to wake up to the threat of climate change. While we sleepwalk, our atmosphere and oceans continue to suffer the damage caused by carbon pollution. As we do nothing, more and more Americans demand action. Look at the new findings from Yale and George Mason Universities. Despite years of industry climate denial propaganda, 75 percent of all registered voters—88 percent of Democrats, 78 percent of Independents, and 61 percent of Republicans—support regulating carbon dioxide as a pollutant; 74 percent of registered voters—88 percent of Democrats, 74 percent of Independents, and 56 percent of Republicans—say corporations and industry should do more to address global warming, and 68 percent of all registered voters—86 percent of Democrats, 66 percent of Independents, and 47 percent even of Republicans—believe fossil fuel companies should be required to pay a carbon tax and the money should be used to reduce other taxes, such as income taxes, by an equal amount.

So why does this Chamber sit idly by and not even have that conversation? Take the fossil fuel industry. For years Big Oil and its allies funded outright denial of man-made climate change. Now they have shifted strategies, from denial to dissembling—saying one thing but doing another.

Take ExxonMobil. In 2007, the oil giant committed to stop funding the front groups that promote science denial. Here is what they said: "In 2008, we will discontinue contributions to several public policy research groups whose positions on climate change could divert attention from the important discussion on how the world will secure the energy required for economic growth in an environmentally responsible manner."

This sounds like a step toward responsible corporate behavior. A casual reader might believe that ExxonMobil would in fact stop funding groups with anti-scientific climate positions. One might think that, but one would be wrong.

According to publicly available company documents, in 2014, ExxonMobil funded several organizations that promote climate science disinformation, including the American Legislative Exchange Council, which peddled legislation to State legislatures that include a finding that human-induced global warming "may lead to . . . possibly

beneficial climactic changes"; the Hoover Institution, whose senior fellow is not a climate scientist, argued that climate data since 1880 supports a conclusion that it would take as long as long as 500 years to reach 4 degrees centigrade of global warming; the Manhattan Institute of Policy Research, where a senior fellow writing about climate change said: "The science is not settled, not by a long shot. . . . Furthermore, even if we accept that carbon dioxide is bad, it's not clear exactly what we should do about it"; the so-called National Black Chamber of Commerce, whose President and CEO, Harry Alford, played the debunked denier card, that "there has been no global warming detected for the last 18 years. That is over 216 months in a row that there has been no detected global warming." By the way, NASA just reported that April was the hottest April ever recorded, just like every one of the past 7 months was the hottest ever recorded for that month. Let's not forget our friends at the Pacific Legal Foundation, whose senior attorney attacked EPA's authority to even regulate CO<sub>2</sub>, in part, because it is a "ubiquitous natural substance essential to life on Earth."

Saying one thing and doing another—ExxonMobil is publicly saying it is separated from the climate denial outfits, but it is still subsidizing their work to undermine public understanding of climate change. This doesn't even count whatever they may be doing behind the dark money curtain that wretched Citizens United decision gave them.

The hypocrisy turns even worse in fossil fuel industry lobbying. An ExxonMobil executive recently stated: "When governments are considering policy options, ExxonMobil believes a revenue-neutral carbon tax is the most effective way to manage carbon emissions."

I have a revenue-neutral carbon tax bill, along with Senator SCHATZ, and I can assure this body that ExxonMobil is not lobbying in support of it. Every Member of Congress knows that all the massive political infrastructure of the fossil fuel industry is adamantly opposed to any meaningful action.

Shell Oil issued a report just last week that states: "Economy-wide carbon pricing—whether through carbon trading, carbon taxes or mandated carbon-emissions standards—provides an efficient and cost-effective way of aligning incentives and motivating action across the economy to reduce carbon emissions."

Top executives of six large European oil and gas companies, including Shell, BP and Statoil, issued a joint letter calling on governments "to introduce carbon pricing systems where they do not yet exist at the national or regional levels. . . . [W]e and our senior staff will seek to engage and share our companies' perspectives on the role of carbon pricing in several important settings," which includes "in our meetings with Ministers and government representatives."