

Naval bases, such as Norfolk or Key West, are already at risk for flooding. In fact, Norfolk frequently deals with nuisance flooding, and that risk will only increase as storm surges increase in magnitude and tides continue to rise. Inland bases will experience other weather volatility, such as extreme heat and wildfires, all of which can impact their ability to train, and ultimately impacts readiness.

The displays of dominance in the Arctic will grow, where new sealanes will connect continents more directly than ever before. The changing global climate, Mr. Speaker, will also lead to greater instability in the form of economic migration, increased competition over resources, and possibly more failed states, which we know to be breeding grounds for extremism and terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that a changing climate will alter our joint battle space. So when the U.S. Congress instructs the Department of Defense to take these threats seriously and evaluate the risk posed to our national security by climate change, we need exactly that. Our intent is clear, and there can be no room for misinterpretation.

Last week, The Washington Post reported that during revision of the Department's January 2018 Screening Level Vulnerability Assessment Survey report, Department of Defense officials omitted information pertinent to how our military installations report their vulnerability to sea level rise, how climate change is affecting the operating environment in the Arctic, and the potential risk to the Department's ability to conduct training and testing activities that have important impacts on our readiness.

While I appreciate the need to update reports when it is appropriate and necessary, it is unacceptable to attempt to bend congressional intent for political convenience. The Department of Defense must answer tough questions as to what motivated these changes, if not a skewed political narrative. In fact, the issue of climate change and its impact on national security has become more bipartisan over the last several years.

In fact, last year, in the National Defense Authorization Act, Congress instructed each service within the Department of Defense to assess the top 10 military installations likely to be affected by climate change over the next 20 years. We also instructed combatant commanders to incorporate the effects of a changing climate into their strategic battle plans.

Forty-six Republicans joined with Democrats to support this language on the floor of the House, and I expect that when this report is delivered to Congress later this year, it will make candid assessments in line with the clear language we supported in that floor vote and that was signed into law by the President.

Mr. Speaker, we must ensure that the Department remains resilient and

is prepared to address the effects of climate change on threat assessments, resources, and readiness, as well as to conduct operations both today and in the future. Congressional oversight plays an undeniable role in that process.

Mr. Speaker, the dangers of climate change on our national defense are real, and we support the researchers on the front lines of these critical threat assessments. Together, we can continue to craft a sane and sober strategy to defend the United States from a variety of threats, including climate change.

That is the expressed intent of Congress for the upcoming climate report, and is a necessity as we prepare for our Nation's future.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT LET PEOPLE GO HUNGRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues have a point. It is really terrible that some people take advantage of free food and drink to continue their slothful lifestyles. I agree. This conduct must stop.

Of course, Members of Congress can attend lunches and receptions with free food and drink every single day, sleep on the taxpayer's dime in their offices, and have the taxpayers do their laundry, too.

The House has been in session for a measly 50 days this year, and I have compiled at least 54 receptions, which is just the tip of the iceberg of free food and drink available to Members.

But even estimating a modest \$10 for a glass of wine and a plate of appetizers, that means that a Member who attends a reception every night the House is in session, has received a benefit of over \$500 just since the beginning of this year.

That is about the same amount of money as the maximum monthly food stamp benefit for a family of three, except Congress Members are nibbling on pork sliders, and French Brie, and pate, while these poor families are expected to feed each family member three meals a day for 30 days. That breaks down to about \$5.60 for each meal, or about \$1.87 per person per meal.

Now, I am sure none of my colleagues would think that they are better than working people who struggle to keep a roof over their heads and food on their tables. And I am sure all of us are happy to be subject to the same rules that we vote on in this Chamber. So here is my modest proposal: The congressional electronic benefits transfer card, or congressional food stamp card. We will put a little cash in it—say \$1.87 per reception—and Members can figure out how to make their monthly reception budget stretch to fit their wining-and-dining needs.

Maybe we will have Members carrying their single glass of wine from

one reception to another, or maybe they will blow their whole allotment on one plate of shrimp, or maybe—just maybe—we will see more Members of Congress showing empathy for the most vulnerable in our society.

Now, to be clear, there is nothing wrong with private organizations spending their own money on outreach to Members of Congress. I have certainly attended my share of receptions, as has everyone else here. But what is truly repellent in this debate, is the rank hypocrisy.

Here we sit, we get paid \$174,000 a year to work 4 days a week here at the U.S. Capitol, and we are considering a bill that would take food assistance away from millions of Americans. Members of Congress can literally walk down the hall for free appetizers any time of the day or the week.

Yet, Republicans are proposing to deny 265,000 children school meals. Congress can't pass an infrastructure bill or DACA, but we can debate a bureaucratic and ineffective work requirement for people struggling with hunger.

Perhaps if my colleagues ran out of funds on their congressional food stamp card and got a bit peckish, they would remember that in one of the richest countries in the world, we should not let people go hungry. Period.

How can we be debating on whether to starve children whose parents are struggling with low-paying or unstable jobs? You know what should be an unstable job? Giving corporations \$2 trillion in tax cuts while slashing basic food assistance to 20 million children, 5 million seniors, and 1 million veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this disgusting bill. And for those who don't, I will pray that you regret every bite of free shrimp cocktail and every sip of free wine.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 9 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida) at noon.

PRAYER

Monsignor John Zenz, Holy Name Parish, Birmingham, Michigan, offered the following prayer:

Be true to Your name, O Lord, and may we also be true to Your name, O Lord.

You give life to all things and make them holy. Keep us true to Your gift of life.