



(0:30 "DENIAL") RESEARCH BACKUP

| VISUAL | AUDIO | RESEARCH BACKUP |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Chyron: El 97% de los científicos cree en el cambio climático</p> <p>ENGLISH TRANSLATION 97% of scientists believe in climate change.</p> | <p>Announcer VO: El 97% de los científicos les preocupa el cambio climático.</p> <p>ENGLISH TRANSLATION Announcer VO: 97% of scientists are concerned about climate change.</p> | <p>Pentagon: Climate Change Is A Threat To National Security; U.S. Must "Grapple Now With The Implications Of A Warming Planet," Free Of "Politics Or Ideology." In October the Defense Dept. released a report on the impact of climate change which said that "drastic weather, rising seas and changing storm patterns could become 'threat multipliers' for the United States, vastly complicating security challenges faced by American forces ... The report, described as a 'climate change adaptation roadmap,' included a foreword from Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel in which he urged the nation's military's planners to grapple now with the implications of a warming planet, even as scientists are 'converging toward consensus on future climate projections.' 'Politics or ideology must not get in the way of sound planning,' Hagel said. 'Our armed forces must prepare for a future with a wide spectrum of possible threats, weighing risks and probabilities to ensure that we will continue to keep our country secure.'" [Washington Post, 10/13/14]</p> <p>NASA Highlighted Scientific Consensus That "Climate-Warming Trends Over The Past Century Are Very Likely Due To Human Activities." According to NASA, "Multiple studies published in peer-reviewed scientific journals show that 97 percent or more of actively publishing climate scientists agree: Climate-warming trends over the past century are very likely due to human activities. In addition, most of the leading scientific organizations worldwide have issued public statements endorsing this position." [NASA Global Climate Change, Vital Signs of the Planet]</p> <p>97% Of Scientists Agree That Humans Are Causing Global Warming. A study of peer-reviewed scientific literature examining 11,944 climate abstracts from 1991-2001 matching the</p> |



| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | <p>topics ‘global climate change’ or ‘global warming’ found that 97.1% of articles expressing a position on anthropogenic (caused by man) global warming endorsed the consensus position that humans are causing global warming. [IOP Science, 5/15/13]</p> |
| <p>Joe Heck y Trump no creen en los estudios científicos sobre el cambio climático</p> <p><u>ENGLISH TRANSLATION</u> Heck and Trump don’t believe in studies about climate change</p> <p><i>Washington Post, 3/21/16; Public Radio International, 10/17/12; House Vote 651, 12/1/15; Trump Press Release, 5/26/16</i></p> | <p>Pero como Trump, Joe Heck niega esa realidad. Como Trump, Heck derogaría las leyes de aire limpio...</p> <p><u>ENGLISH TRANSLATION</u> But like Donald Trump, Joe Heck denies that reality. Like Trump, Heck would gut clean air laws...</p> | <p>Trump: I Am Not A Great Believer In Man-Made Climate Change.” In an interview with the Washington Post editorial board, Donald Trump was asked, “You think climate change is a real thing? Is there human-caused climate change?” Trump answered: “I think there’s a change in weather. I am not a great believer in man-made climate change. I’m not a great believer. There is certainly a change in weather that goes – if you look, they had global cooling in the 1920s and now they have global warming, although now they don’t know if they have global warming. They call it all sorts of different things; now they’re using “extreme weather” I guess more than any other phrase. I am not – I know it hurts me with this room, and I know it’s probably a killer with this room – but I am not a believer. Perhaps there’s a minor effect, but I’m not a big believer in man-made climate change.” [Washington Post, 3/21/2016]</p> <p>October 2012: When Asked If Climate Change Is Even Happening, Heck Didn’t Answer The Question, Instead Saying: “We Will Continue To See Climate Change That Goes Both Ways.” According to Public Radio International, “To clarify, I asked Heck if he believes climate change is happening. ‘Well, I think certainly over the millennia, we’ve seen changes in our climate both ways, and I think throughout the future millennia we will continue to see climate change that goes both ways. But the issue for this election is not what’s going to be happening in the next 200 years, it’s going to be what’s happening in the next 12 months.’ Heck answered most all my questions, on a range of topics, directly. But not this one.” [Public Radio International, 10/17/12]</p> <p>Rep. Heck Voted To Overturn The Clean Power Plan. In December 2015, Rep. Heck voted to “overturn” the Clean Power Plan. The bill, as</p> |



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>passed by the House, “would permanently block the main pillar of Obama's climate agenda, and while they know they can do little to stop the rules while Obama holds the veto pen, Republicans said they feel that sending a strong signal against climate action is important.” The resolution passed 242-180. [S.J.Res.23, Vote 651, 12/1/15; The Hill, 12/1/15]</p> <p>Trump Would “Rescind” The Clean Power Plan. In a May 2016 speech to the North Dakota Petroleum Council, Trump said that in his first 100 days in office, he would “rescind all the job-destroying Obama executive actions including the Climate Action Plan and the Waters of the U.S. rule.” [Donald Trump Press Release, 5/26/16]</p> <p>Clean Power Plan Was The “First-Ever National Standards That Address The Carbon Pollution From Power Plants.” “The Clean Power Plan will reduce carbon pollution from power plants, the nation’s largest source, while maintaining energy reliability and affordability. Also on August 3, EPA issued final Carbon Pollution Standards for new, modified, and reconstructed power plants, and proposed a Federal Plan and model rule to assist states in implementing the Clean Power Plan. These are the first-ever national standards that address carbon pollution from power plants.” [EPA, 8/3/15]</p> |
| <p>Heck les daría miles de millones en recortes de impuestos a las grandes petroleras</p> <p>ENGLISH TRANSLATION Heck wants to give billions in tax breaks to big oil companies</p> <p><i>H.R.1, Vote 109, 2/18/11; House Natural Resources Committee, 2/17/11; Taxpayers for Common Sense, July 2014; Donald Trump Press Release, 10/9/16</i></p> | <p>Y como Trump, Heck les daría miles de millones en recortes de impuestos a las grandes petroleras...</p> <p>ENGLISH TRANSLATION And like Trump, Heck wants to give billions in tax breaks to big oil companies...</p> | <p>Rep. Heck Voted To Preserve \$53 Billion In Tax Breaks For Big Oil. In February 2011, Rep. Heck voted against legislation that would have eliminated up to \$53 billion in tax breaks for oil companies. The amendment failed 174-251. [H.R.1, Vote 109, 2/18/11; House Natural Resources Committee, 2/17/11]</p> <p>2011: Heck Effectively Voted To Maintain Several Tax Benefits To Major Integrated Oil Companies For Two Weeks. In March 2011, Heck effectively voted against an amendment that, according to Congressional Quarterly, “would [have] prohibit[ed] any major</p> |
| <p>¿A quién protege JOE HECK? No a Nevada</p> | <p>...para proteger los bolsillos de empresarios contaminadores....</p> | <p>integrated oil company from being eligible for</p> |



| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p><u>ENGLISH TRANSLATION</u> Who does JOE HECK protect? Not Nevada</p> | <p><u>ENGLISH TRANSLATION</u> ...to protect the pocketbooks of polluters.</p> | <p>any tax benefit or relief under related provisions of the tax code.” The underlying bill, according to Congressional Quarterly, provided “funding authority for two weeks [...] to allow all government agencies and programs to continue operating at an annualized rate that is \$4 billion less than the comparable FY 2010 levels.” The vote was on a motion to recommit the joint resolution with instructions to report back the bill with the specified amendment; the House rejected the motion by a vote of 176 to 249. [House Vote 153, 3/1/11; Congressional Quarterly, 3/1/11; Congressional Quarterly, 2/28/11]</p> <p>2012: Heck Voted To Maintain Loan Guarantees For Fossil Fuel And Nuclear Energy Projects For One Year. In June 2012, Heck voted against an amendment that, according to Congressional Quarterly, that would [have] bar[red] the use of funds in the bill [the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013] to provide new loan guarantees under the demonstration project title of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which authorizes loans for fossil fuel, nuclear and other demonstration projects. The amendment also would [have] reduce[d] funding for the Innovative Loan Guarantee Program by \$33 million.” According to the CRS Summary of H. Amdt. 1200, the “[a]mendment sought to put a moratorium for FY 2013 on any new loan guarantees under the section 1703 loan guarantee program and reduces administrative costs which will not be necessary if the program is suspended by \$33 million.” The House rejected the amendment by a vote of 136 to 282. [House Vote 328, 6/5/12; Congressional Quarterly, 6/5/12; CRS Summary of H. Amdt. 120, 6/5/12]</p> <p>2012: Heck Voted Against The FY 2013 Democratic Budget, Which Ended Tax Subsidies For Oil and Gas Companies. In March 2012, Heck voted to oppose ending tax subsidies for oil and gas companies as part of the Democrats’ proposed budget resolution covering FY 2013 to 2022. According to Budget</p> |
|--|--|---|



Committee Democrats, “The Democratic resolution ends tax subsidies for the major integrated oil and gas companies – the five largest oil companies together earned more than \$1 trillion in profits during the last decade and don’t need these tax breaks.” The vote was on an amendment to the House budget resolution replacing the entire budget with the House Democrats’ proposed budget; the amendment failed by a vote of 163 to 252. [House Vote 150, [3/29/12](#); House Budget Committee Democrats, [3/28/12](#)]

2014: Heck Voted Against Requiring Oil And Gas Permit Applicants To Forgo The Domestic Production Activities Tax Break In Order To Take Advantage Of Expedited Permitting Procedures. In June 2014, Heck effectively voted against an amendment that, according to Congressional Quarterly, “would [have] require[d] that leases issued under the bill include a clause specifying that oil and natural gas produced under the lease may only be exported if the Interior secretary determines that the exports will not increase the price of gasoline or home heating oil for U.S. consumers. It would [have] require[d] the Interior Department to adhere to timelines for permitting and notify reasons of permit denial only if the applicant agrees not to claim the domestic production activities tax deduction.” The underlying bill, according to a separate Congressional Quarterly article, “would establish a five-year program for oil and gas leasing. The bill would double the cap for offshore oil and gas revenue sharing to \$1 billion and require at least 25 percent of eligible federal land be made available each year to lease for oil and gas exploration. Under the bill, the Interior Department would be required to make available for oil and gas exploration and development at least 50 percent of the unleased coastal areas that have the most potential for energy production.” The vote was on a motion to recommit the bill to the House Natural Resources Committee, with instructions that it be reported back immediately with the specified amendment.



The House rejected the motion by a vote of 177 to 235. [House Vote 367, [6/26/14](#); Congressional Quarterly, [6/26/14](#); Congressional Quarterly, [6/26/14](#)]

Donald Trump’s Tax Plan Would Save The Biggest Oil Companies Nearly \$4 Billion Per Year In Taxes. A 2014 Taxpayers for Common Sense report stated that a “statutory rate of 35 percent” in federal income taxes applies to “large U.S.-based oil and gas companies. However, “thanks to a variety of special tax provisions, these companies were also able to defer payment of a significant portion of the federal taxes they accrued during this period.” Between 2009 and 2013, ExxonMobil reported \$42.766 billion in pre-tax income; ConocoPhillips reported \$20.206 billion; and Chevron reported \$31.188 billion. Together, these companies earned \$98.66 billion in pre-tax income between 2009 and 2013 (or, \$19.732 billion per year). Taxed at the 35 percent corporate rate, these companies would have owed \$6.91 billion in corporate income taxes over those five years. Donald Trump wants to reduce the corporate income tax from 35 percent to 15 percent. If these companies’ corporate income tax rate was reduced to 15 percent, they would have paid \$2.96 billion over those five years. Donald Trump’s corporate tax plan would save three of the biggest oil companies a total of \$3.95 billion per year. [Taxpayers for Common Sense, [July 2014](#); Donald Trump Press Release, [10/9/16](#)]

Trump Promised To Slash Regulations And Cut Taxes” For The Oil And Gas Industry. In September of 2016, Time reported: “Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump continued his effort to woo the oil and gas industry in a speech Thursday with a promise to slash regulations and cut taxes.” [[Time, 9/22/2016](#)]

Trump Called For “Opening Federal Lands For Oil And Gas Production,” And “Opening Offshore Areas” For Drilling, Too. During a September 2016 speech at the 2016 Shale



| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | <p>Insight Conference, Trump said that his “America first” energy approach meant “opening federal lands for oil and gas production, opening offshore areas, and revoking policies that are imposing unnecessary restrictions on innovative new exploration technologies.” [Donald Trump Speeches & Events YouTube, 9/22/16 (30:00)]</p> <p>Trump Supported Tapping Into “Oil Reserves, And Natural Gas On Federal Lands,” Adding, “I’m Going To Lift The Restrictions On American Energy.” During a September 2016 speech at the 2016 Shale Insight Conference, Trump said, “America is sitting on a treasure trove of untapped energy – some \$50 trillion in shale energy, oil reserves, and natural gas on federal lands, in addition to hundreds of years of coal energy reserves. It’s all upside for this country – more jobs, more revenues, more wealth, higher wages, and lower energy prices. I’m going to lift the restrictions on American energy, and allow this wealth to pour into our communities.” [Donald Trump Speeches & Events YouTube, 9/22/16]</p> <p>Heck’s Federal Campaigns Received \$321,766 From The Oil and Gas Industry. [OpenSecrets.org, accessed 10/5/16]</p> <p>Donald Trump’s Presidential Campaign Has Received \$288,449 From The Oil And Gas Industry. [OpenSecrets.org, accessed 10/6/16]</p> |
| <p>Heck y Donald Trump: Políticas peligrosas para Nevada</p> <p><u>ENGLISH TRANSLATION</u> Joe Heck and Donald Trump: Dangerous Agenda for Nevada</p> | <p>Joe Heck y Donald Trump: Políticas peligrosas para Nevada</p> <p><u>ENGLISH TRANSLATION</u> Joe Heck and Donald Trump: Dangerous Agenda for Nevada</p> | |
| <p>Paid for by LCV Victory Fund, www.lcvvictoryfund.org, and not authorized by any candidate or candidate’s committee.</p> <p><u>SPANISH TRANSLATION</u> Pagado por LCV Victory Fund, www.lcvvictoryfund.org. No autorizado por ningún candidato o</p> | | |



LCV VICTORY FUND

| | | |
|----------------------|--|--|
| comité de candidato. | | |
|----------------------|--|--|

Paid for by LCV Victory Fund, www.lcvvictoryfund.org, and not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee.