□ 0915

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT A CARBON TAX WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1001, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 119) expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO). Pursuant to House Resolution 1001, the concurrent resolution is considered as read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 119

Whereas a carbon tax is a Federal tax on carbon released from fossil fuels;

Whereas a carbon tax will increase energy prices, including the price of gasoline, electricity, natural gas, and home heating oil;

Whereas a carbon tax will mean that families and consumers will pay more for essentials like food, gasoline, and electricity;

Whereas a carbon tax will fall hardest on the poor, the elderly, and those on fixed incomes;

Whereas a carbon tax will lead to more jobs and businesses moving overseas;

Whereas a carbon tax will lead to less economic growth;

Whereas American families will be harmed the most from a carbon tax;

Whereas, according to the Energy Information Administration, in 2016, fossil fuels share of energy consumption was 81 percent;

Whereas a carbon tax will increase the cost of every good manufactured in the United States;

Whereas a carbon tax will impose disproportionate burdens on certain industries, jobs, States, and geographic regions and would further restrict the global competitiveness of the United States;

Whereas American ingenuity has led to innovations in energy exploration and development and has increased production of domestic energy resources on private and State-owned land which has created significant job growth and private capital investment;

Whereas United States energy policy should encourage continued private sector innovation and development and not increase the existing tax burden on manufacturers;

Whereas the production of American energy resources increases the United States ability to maintain a competitive advantage in today's global economy;

Whereas a carbon tax would reduce America's global competitiveness and would encourage development abroad in countries that do not impose this exorbitant tax burden; and

Whereas the Congress and the President should focus on pro-growth solutions that encourage increased development of domestic resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to American families and businesses, and is not in the best interest of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 119, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank leadership for bringing this resolution to the floor for consideration. I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 119, which would express the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the U.S. economy.

This resolution will send a clear signal to the American people that we oppose policies that would drive up energy prices for families and for businesses. A standalone carbon tax generally would have such detrimental effects on the economy and would be an unwarranted and transparent grab for revenue.

The adverse economic effects of such a tax would be felt throughout the economy, falling hardest on the most vulnerable: the young, the poor, the elderly, and those living on fixed incomes.

An Obama administration proposal in 2016 for a $10 tax on every barrel of oil would have translated into an increase at the gas pump of approximately 25 cents per gallon for every American consumer. Similarly, a standalone carbon tax would increase the price of gasoline, natural gas, home heating oil, and electricity.

American families would feel the pain immediately when they buy gas or diesel to get them to their jobs every day. American families would also feel the pain when they turn on the lights or adjust the thermostat in their homes every day.

The cost burden of a carbon tax also would, correspondingly, increase the price of everything consumers buy every day—in short, everything from a carton of milk to a pair of shoes, to a bicycle, to an automobile.

The price increases on goods with fixed demand that would result from such a tax would directly harm millions of Americans whose incomes mean that they must budget carefully in advance to afford just the basic necessities of life.

In addition, a carbon tax would hit at a time when the industries that it targets are just now recovering from a very damaging economic period of our lives.

With a reformed Tax Code built for growth and rollback of burdensome regulations, American businesses and their workers are finally making a comeback, and we are seeing great optimism about our economic future. Now is not the time to debate placing additional burdens on industries that are trying to help us keep the lights on.

This resolution makes clear that we oppose policies that would drive up energy prices, damage the U.S. economy, reduce the American GDP, and hurt American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am discouraged to come to the floor today as we squander the valuable time of this body arguing over a pointless resolution that will accomplish nothing for the people of America, whether it is accepted or rejected—nothing.

Let's be clear about what this resolution does and does not do.

We are not arguing today over whether this body will or will not adopt a tax on carbon emissions. This resolution, and I am quoting, expresses the sense of Congress about a carbon tax.

So what we are trying to achieve, apparently, this morning is a discussion of the mood of Congress. Well, we should hold some hearings about the mood of Congress, because I would submit that it is not a very pleasant time to be working on Capitol Hill. Nothing in this exercise is going to have anything to do with a carbon tax. This is better suited to a high school debate than it is to the United States House of Representatives.

There are plenty of people across the country who need real help and real action from this Congress. Every day, American families, people far from this building, far from this city, are struggling with real problems and real challenges.

They feel their standard of living has not improved. They want to feel some security, security that their jobs will stick around—how about holding some hearings on pensions?—security that they can count on health insurance, security that one day they will be able to retire with dignity, security that they will be able to launch their kids into a successful and happy life.

So, on this Thursday morning, the Republican leadership has brought up a sense of the mood of Congress on carbon. We could choose to bring forward legislation that actually would help American families today. We could help them meet many of the challenges that they have. Instead, we are using our precious remaining legislative days to hold an amateur hour on a debate about something that is not going to happen.

This is a vacuous gesture, empty in every form. It is a political stunt. It is not worthy of the time or the attention of this body.

When I go home and talk to my constituents and my neighbors, they want to hear what I, along with the Members of this Chamber, intend to do to ensure that their hard work still translates into a decent life.

Something around us is clearly out of step. There is a growing anxiety around the country that is bigger than our political differences and divide. It is a building sense that, at some point when we all perhaps were not looking, the system became stacked against ordinary people; the rules changed, and hard work isn't enough any longer to guarantee that you can make it in America.

The unemployment rate, for sure, is low, but 65 percent of Americans worry about having enough money to pay their bills. Yes, we can say this morning that downward pressure on wages, essentially, has kept those wages flat for the American people despite the fact that the unemployment rate is advertised at about 4 percent. One in five Americans has more credit card debt than emergency savings. Less than 40 percent of the people in this country have enough savings to cover a $1,000 emergency room visit or, for that matter, car repair.

It is plain to see in my own district. We have seen the challenges that the people back in western Massachusetts face every single day. Despite the talk of growth in the stock market—which, by the way, has been going up since October of 2009—their salaries have barely moved.

Home prices have gone up by 9 percent in our market last year. A gallon of gas costs 28 percent more than last year. Electricity bills in Massachusetts are up 21 percent over last year. Childcare, saving for college, and, again, retirement and pensions, healthcare premiums—Mr. Speaker, people are having trouble keeping up. Teachers have to pick up jobs waiting on tables or driving for Uber. Families need to juggle multiple jobs just to get by.

But today's economy, apparently, isn't hard on the top 1 percent in America. Last year, the average bonus on Wall Street—and listen to this number, average—$185,000. It rose 17 percent after our Republican colleagues passed their tax bill last year. That is three times what most American families bring home in an entire year.

It seems like things used to be easier. Do you know why? Because they were easier. Americans born in the 1940s had a 92 percent chance of earning a higher income than their parents had at age 30. Those born in the 1980s have a 50 percent chance of doing so. The tax bill that Republicans passed last year, without a single hearing in all of 51 days—and not, incidentally, with one Democratic vote—will make things substantially worse for these families.

People don't really need to hear these statistics. Intuitively, they know what has happened. Three out of four Americans are not confident that their children will grow up to be better off than they were, and they have every right to be worried.

Healthcare used to be easier to afford. The new Republican tax law raised premiums by 15 percent and weakened protections for millions of Americans with preexisting conditions.

Then Republicans wanted to slash $500 billion out of the Medicare program so that many of our family members who depend on it will be even more challenged.

What have families gotten from the Republicans on healthcare? Higher deductibles, higher costs, and plans that cover much less.

The cost of a 4-year degree at a public college has doubled since 1996. The basic ticket into the middle class is out of reach for too many of our young people today. The ones who do manage to scrape by far too often accumulate debt that makes homeownership or starting a family a long way off.

Other family budget essentials just keep climbing, too. As I noted, gas prices are up 27 percent from last year. Childcare costs rose for the fifth year in a row. This year, a week of infant childcare at a daycare center is $211.

Mr. Speaker, there are concrete actions that we might take right here in this Chamber to support these families. We could spend today working on college affordability. How about some pension hearings to talk about what is happening in the central States as well as the challenges that retirement faces for the American family? And how do we help more people afford that first home or help their parents, once again, prepare for a secure retirement?

We are nearly out of time to get things done in this Congress. We are down to less than 25 legislative days before the midterm elections. If we plan to do anything about the pressing issues facing Americans, this is the time to step it up. But, instead of trying to broker solutions or offer ideas, the Republican leadership has opted to hold a shadow debate.

It doesn't matter how this vote turns out. Let me repeat that. It doesn't matter how this vote turns out. The outcome is going to be identical. Nothing on this issue will change because of what we are doing this morning. Nothing will change.

That contentment with the status quo may be fine for my Republican colleagues, but it is not going to help the families whom I represent. In fact, it pretty much reinforces their doubts about the very work of Congress.

Listen, if you want to debate a carbon tax, let's hold some hearings. Let's hold some discussions about a carbon tax. Let's find out what it would mean for the economy. We might use that moment to test what offshore drilling does for oil as part of the carbon tax discussion or for the families in western Massachusetts. Let's find out what impact it would have on fossil fuel emissions and economic growth. Let's think strategically about how it might affect our geopolitics. If you want to have this debate, then let's have a real debate through hearings in the regular order.

This resolution is really meaningless. The outcome will be nothing, no matter what the final vote turns out to be. It is a waste of all of our time this morning, and we ought to be devoting that time to meeting the challenges that the American people expect us to meet.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL).

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for introducing this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this resolution. This anti-carbon tax resolution expresses the sense of Congress that a carbon tax will be detrimental to the United States economy and certainly is not a waste of anyone's time.

As a physician, typically, what I like to do is examine the risk and benefit analysis of any treatment plan, and I apply that same standard to a situation like this.

□ 0930

I want to know the risk and benefit of any new tax that might be considered. A carbon tax would raise costs on everything Americans buy, from electricity and gasoline to food and everyday household products, with little or any benefit.

Mr. Speaker, when we introduce a new tax or consider a new tax, I want to know who it would impact the most. Who I think this would impact the most is that single mom I delivered about 10 years ago. She has 2 children at home. She is working 60 hours a week. This is going to impact her more than anybody else, because she is just trying to get by with the income she is making.

This is going to drive the cost up for her children's school lunches. It is going to drive the cost up for her gasoline to get to and from work. That single mom will be impacted by this carbon tax.

This resolution will put Congress on record against a carbon tax, which would result in massive job losses, lead to higher prices for American families and small businesses, and jeopardize America's energy security.

Mr. Speaker, this President and this Congress have been fighting for American energy dominance, and a carbon tax would undermine that goal. I am so proud of what my producers back home have done in the oil and gas industry to have a cleaner product. What the refineries are doing today compared to when I was growing up, a little boy in El Dorado, Kansas, living between two refineries, I am proud of how the electrical generation has improved ecologically as well.

This resolution will affirm the position of Congress that a carbon tax

would counter the goals of American energy dominance, economic growth, and national security.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), a very important member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let's be real clear. There is not a carbon tax bill before us today. This is a political stunt, and this stunt comes at the same time that the Republican majority is undermining access to affordable healthcare for all our constituents.

They are working with this administration to sabotage the healthcare marketplaces and drive up prices, legislating away coverage and protections for our constituents. They have gutted resources that help people enroll in the plans that are best for them. They are expanding junk healthcare plans that don't provide care if you are sick or injured, that can charge more for preexisting conditions, that charge more for older people.

Their scam of a tax bill eliminated the individual mandate, driving healthier folks away from coverage. That means risk can't be spread and prices go up. Kids born with heart problems or young adults diagnosed with cancer will pay a penalty for the rest of their lives.

On top of all of that, the administration has frozen the risk adjustment payments, which prevent insurance companies from cherry-picking only the healthiest people to cover.

According to PricewaterhouseCoopers, Republican sabotage efforts will increase the cost of health insurance by as much as 24 percent this year alone.

These are some of the issues that are hurting the middle class now, and these are some of the issues that we should be focusing on. We should be holding hearings on these issues.

If you have concerns with other issues, have hearings on them. But don't bring some political malarkey on the floor and pretend that we are doing something for the American people.

This is a failure by the majority party. We should be working for our constituents on real bills that are before us now.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas for yielding and for bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support as the lead author of H. Con. Res. 119, along with my colleague from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

Mr. Speaker, the question is real simple, and that is, do we support or oppose a carbon tax? I think the case is very clear by anybody who looks objectively at what a carbon tax will do to the economy. It will be devastating to our manufacturing base. It will kill jobs. I think most devastating, Mr. Speaker, it would raise and increase costs for families all across this country.

If you look at this chart right here, it talks about the estimate, what this would do to families. There would be an increase by an estimated $1,900 per family on the cost of things that they buy all across this country.

The resolution is simple. It says: ''Be it resolved by the House.'' That is, it is the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to American families and businesses, and is not in the best interest of the United States.

''Yes'' or ''no,'' it is a clear ''yes'' vote if you are concerned about families. Why don't we talk about some of the groups in support. The Council for Citizens Against Government Waste says that: ''A carbon tax would harm the U.S. economy by raising the cost of all goods and services, imposing an unfair burden on the lower and middle class, and deterring new investment, thereby killing jobs.''

Why don't we listen to what the American Farm Bureau Federation said about a carbon tax: ''Agriculture is an energy-intensive sector, and a carbon tax levied on farmers and ranchers would be devastating.''

Then, Mr. Speaker, let's listen to what Grover Norquist from Americans for Tax Reform said: ''A carbon tax would kill American jobs by the millions.''

Why would we want to allow the possibility? Believe me, there are some people in Washington who are talking about trying to bring a carbon tax. To act like, oh, there is no talk about it at all, clearly, there are people here in this Chamber that want to impose a carbon tax. Let's be clear about how devastating that would be to the American economy.

Everybody gets to take a position on this today, Mr. Speaker. You are either for a carbon tax or against it. I would urge strong support for H. Con. Res. 119.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I wonder what the Farm Bureau says about the tariffs on agricultural products across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), my neighbor and good friend, a well-informed member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, let me associate myself with the remarks of Mr. NEAL and talk about what a fraud this whole process has become.

I have great respect for the gentleman from Louisiana, but can you imagine never having a hearing on this. Let me tell you who would like to come to that hearing: Jim Baker, a devout, you know, liberal. You have George Shultz, Martin Feldstein, Greg Mankiw, Hank Paulson, Art Laffer, Gary Cohn, Rex Tillerson, to name a few, who say that Congress ought to at least be open to looking at a carbon tax.

According to the other side, it is a choice between a carbon tax or not a carbon tax. They don't talk about passing on the benefits to the consumer. They don't talk about the transition that is needed or strengthening the pension funds or even from the standpoint of an infrastructure bill that they have never addressed in 8 years while China moves ahead of us every single day. Nothing gets done in the House of Representatives.

Here we have a fake debate and fake legislation that is going nowhere instead of actual, real hearings. We don't have real hearings on Social Security and its outcome. We don't have real hearings on gun violence. We don't even have real hearings here on the state of what is going on with this administration and the FBI and our intelligence people.

This is the sad state of affairs that we find ourselves in. So if you see frustration on this side of the aisle, it is primarily because, in the most demonstrative democracy in the world, not even a hearing, a suggestion about bringing experts to talk about what this could possibly do. What a sham.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I came down to the floor today to address the resolution we have talked about regarding the carbon tax, but since then, I think something else has come up.

We just heard one of my colleagues, I think, kind of belittle Uber drivers and waiters and waitresses. I tell you, when I take an Uber, I don't think it is something that you have to resort to, to take that job. I think it is a very hard job, going all about the city, being able to get along with sometimes difficult people, working nights. Waiters and waitresses, same thing. I have worked in kitchens. I don't think one should say that one has to resort to these jobs.

It is kind of a thing that some Congressmen have around here that I don't like. They become removed, and they sometimes think that they are more important than people doing other jobs.

I think those are both fine jobs. I respect the Uber drivers who drive me around this city. I used to work in a kitchen, and I respect the waiters and waitresses. I don't believe one should describe working as an Uber driver or a waiter and a waitress as something people have to resort to. They are fine jobs.

Now, I guess I came down here for the carbon tax. I will point out that I think the carbon tax, if implemented and people throw it out there, the carbon tax will fall on the average guy the most. It is something that falls on people who drive a car, which will be a regressive tax. It falls on people who heat

their homes, which will be a regressive tax.

It bothers me, particularly when disproportionately it comes from the party that purports to represent the average guy, that when they think of a new tax to apply out there, they are going to promote a tax that disproportionately affects the average guy, because everybody has a heat bill, almost everybody has a car.

I think, among the other things that would cause a damper on the American economy, I don't like taxes that disproportionately hit the average guy.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody was demeaning the work that people do, on this side. I think we were talking about the challenging nature of our economy. I don't think the gentleman would dispute the fact that the gig economy has created a downward pressure on wages.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), the voice of Chicago and a well-known and well-regarded member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express strong opposition to this resolution, which is nothing more than political posturing. This nonbinding resolution does nothing to control increases in healthcare premiums.

Republican actions have wreaked havoc in the healthcare market, driving up healthcare costs for Americans, especially older Americans. This nonbinding resolution does nothing to limit skyrocketing drug prices after giving tens of billions of dollars in tax cuts to the drug industry.

The Chicago Fire Department was in to see me this week, and they talked about the high cost of drugs. For example, the cost of nitroglycerin tripled over 4 years from $37 to $120. The cost of naloxone more than doubled during this time period. If the Chicago Fire Department is having trouble paying for pharmaceuticals, then you can imagine what smaller entities would be experiencing.

This resolution does nothing to increase jobs, nothing to help parents afford the high cost of childcare and college. It is indeed a do-nothing resolution. That is exactly what it does. I will vote against it.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of my colleague's resolution, H. Con. Res. 119, which expresses the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States.

A carbon tax is a tax on the American consumer and our economy. A carbon tax would significantly—I want to repeat that—significantly drive up the cost of the fuels that drive our way of life, and result in millions and millions of jobs lost.

This burden would be unfairly shouldered by the lower and middle class incomes. The nonpartisan—I want to say that—the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, CBO, in 2013 stated: ''A carbon tax would increase the price of fossil fuels in direct proportion to their carbon content. Higher fuel prices, in turn, would raise production costs and ultimately drive up prices for goods and services throughout the economy.''

A study from the National Association of Manufacturers found that a carbon tax could drive up gasoline costs between $6 and $14 per gallon, and lead to as many as 21 million jobs lost, a continually shrinking economy, and lowering our Federal revenue, all without doing anything to improve global greenhouse gas emissions.

□ 0945

Just yesterday, the House passed my amendment to prohibit funds from implementing the Obama administration's social costs of carbon rule.

The facts are clear. A carbon tax is not the way to protect our environment and economy. The social costs of a carbon tax far outweigh the potential benefits.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), a very knowledgeable woman from the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 119. This resolution is nothing more than an election year stunt by Republicans to distract from the growing list of issues they failed to address this Congress.

Let me be clear: This vote is a sham. If Republicans truly wanted to debate the merits of a carbon tax, they would allow the Ways and Means Committee to hold hearings with expert testimony and robust discussion. In fact, multiple members of our committee have already introduced bills that tackle the ever-pressing issue of climate change, which is impacting the health and well-being of American families and future generations more and more each day.

This is not just a Democratic concern either. There is even a Republican carbon tax bill expected to be introduced in the coming days.

Instead, here we are, wasting what little time we have left this Congress, debating a pointless resolution while there are urgent problems waiting to be resolved. Congress should be passing legislation to address the double-digit increases in healthcare premiums caused by the repeal of the individual mandate by the GOP tax scam or reuniting immigrant children with their parents.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, this vote is a wasted opportunity and just another example of Republicans placing political expedience over regular order.

As a member of both the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition and the bipartisan Climate Solutions Caucus, I would love to participate in a real debate about how we can address climate change. My constituents are clamoring for us to act. But if Republicans are going to continue to ignore and deny the existence of this crisis, the least they can do here, in Congress, is to use this time to legislate, not electioneer.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning in strong support of the resolution, and I thank my good friend and colleague from Louisiana, STEVE SCALISE, for bringing it to the floor.

The carbon tax is one of those endlessly recycled bad ideas. A carbon tax would put a tax and increased costs on coal, oil, and gas carbon dioxide emissions from power plants and other sources.

In simpler terms, a carbon tax is a tax on productivity. As anyone with the slightest familiarity with economics will tell you, the more you tax something, the less you get of it. It is just common sense.

Late last year, Congress was able to deliver historic tax reform. Just 7 months after we passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, nearly every economic indicator is showing record-breaking success.

The free market has been unleashed again, and our economy is thriving as a result. We are on pace for a quarter of economic growth that we haven't seen in more than a decade.

Imposing a job-killing carbon tax minimizes the gains we have made and will stunt our economic growth. Of course, the carbon tax would run counter to the goals of American energy dominance and national security, another priority this administration and this Congress have been able to make great progress in.

A carbon tax would have a negative effect on consumption, investment, and jobs; increase the cost of coal, natural gas, and petroleum products; and lead to lower real wage rates, lower labor productivity, and decreased worker incomes.

Imposing a carbon tax on hard-working Americans sets the Nation backward. After all the accomplishments we have made in the last year and a half, that is something we simply should not tolerate.

A carbon tax asks the entire Nation to make enormous sacrifices, and the only thing we get in return is falling behind our competitors in the global marketplace.

We have a broad array of leaders across the spectrum in the economy who support and agree with these principles.

Harry Alford, president of the National Black Chamber of Congress, said: ''Our great Nation is at a crossroads. We can continue to reduce regulations and watch our economy rise with the recent tax reform. Bringing unnecessary hurdles before us like a

carbon tax will preclude that growth and hurt our economy immensely.''

I have pages and pages of these.

Heather Higgins, CEO of the Independent Women's Voice, said: ''A carbon tax would be devastating to millions of American women and their families, causing their electricity bills and transportation costs to skyrocket, as well as suppressing their wages.''

Chet Thompson, president of the American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers, said: ''Energy is the engine of progress. Making it more expensive will hurt our economy and disproportionately impact middle- and low-income families who can least afford it.''

If we had time, Mr. Speaker, I could be here all day. I have pages and pages of these quotes in support of the principle that we are advocating here this morning.

Mr. Speaker, we have to support this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do that.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a well-regarded member of the Ways and Means Committee. We are certain he will add clarity to this debate.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in this very troubling week, when these same Republican enablers here in Congress have endangered our national security by failing to confront Donald Trump's surrender to Vladimir Putin in Helsinki, today, we again witness their total indifference to another very serious national security concern. Unfortunately, just as their refusal to stand up to Trump's denial of this ongoing Russian aggression won't make it go away as a grave threat to our democracy, neither will their ignoring the national security challenge of climate change eliminate reality.

In recent years, the war, the challenge, that these Republicans have been most willing to fight is the war on reality. They particularly find troubling any scientific fact that conflicts with their last campaign rally or their rigid ideology.

This Administration actually prohibited the Centers for Disease Control from including, in its budget documents to Congress, the terms ''evidence-based'' or ''science-based.'' They don't want to rely on science as fact. They have questioned and harassed scientists across America so much that you have to begin to wonder whether they still believe in gravity.

Across America, we are seeing, with our own eyes, what they refuse to acknowledge: soaring temperatures, severe and erratic records being set in our weather, massive 100-year floods that seem to recur every 100 months, deep freezes, and ravaging hurricanes that dumped 60 inches of rain in one short period of time on the City of Houston.

Often at the same time that these disasters are occurring in other parts of America we see: record droughts, and wildfires destroying thousands of acres, livelihoods, and homes. All across the country, particularly in the southern States, seldom seen diseases, like West Nile virus and Lyme disease, are afflicting more and more of our neighbors.

During the lifetime of my grandchildren, I know that my home State of Texas, America's number one greenhouse gas polluter, is on schedule to become a very different place, with more of the State looking like the Sonoran Desert. At the same time, our coastal areas, like those that stretch all the way to New England, will find themselves submerged and major metropolitan areas subject to serious harm from storm surges.

Meanwhile, we will see, not in the future, but right now, thousands of premature deaths every year because of air pollutants that are associated with carbon emissions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, around the world, the very severe impact of climate change has already been identified as a major contributing factor to the disaster in Syria, conflict in Africa, and what is becoming a growing number of climate refugees. Trump's own Defense Secretary has acknowledged the need to address climate change and the impact on our military.

The Scientific American has reported that climate change presents a significant and direct risk to the U.S. military, its readiness, operations, and strategy.

We must treat this as a national security threat. When you have a security threat, you don't just rely on one weapon. A carbon tax that is revenue neutral, that does not take any new tax revenue than the tax it replaces, is one of the tools that should not be rejected without even having a hearing to evaluate it.

The likelihood of a carbon tax in our future will not be changed by this silly resolution. But as Republicans continue to reject all ways, any ways, of addressing the climate change national security challenge, the future of our planet and our families remains endangered every bit as much as they endanger us by yielding to Vladimir Putin.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY), who was an original cosponsor of this resolution.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank Majority Whip SCALISE for his work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, as the lead cosponsor on this legislation, I, obviously, rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 119.

Throughout the years, despite what we are hearing from the other side, there have been numerous efforts promoting a carbon tax. There have been bills debated in committees; hearings held; and, subsequently, time devoted on the House floor. None were passed. Carbon taxes, however, create uncertainty in the marketplace.

Such a tax might reduce the amount of energy produced from coal and natural gas. I understand that. But as you have heard, it will also raise the cost of everything else Americans consume: gasoline, diesel fuel, food, clothing, and supplies. All would become more expensive.

We heard also that CBO and Stanford studies have warned that a carbon tax is the most regressive tax that could be implemented. And its impact on the poor and the middle class is at a rate of twice others.

This is a simple resolution stating that a carbon tax would be detrimental to American families and businesses, and it is not in the best interest of this country.

Now, just last Congress, this very same resolution passed 237–163, and it is our hope that this year's effort will reflect the same bipartisan level of support.

Thanks to tax cuts and regulatory reform, America's economy is clearly on the rise. Implementing a carbon tax at this juncture could very well put the brakes on that progress.

So instead of reverting to put an ideologically driven tax on everything, there are better ways to address environmental concerns. We could invest strategically in research and innovation to deliver clean energy technologies, like has been done at NET Power, Petra Nova, or Longview. We could provide incentives, like 45Q, to capture and utilize carbon emissions. Or, lastly, we could advance energy efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, America doesn't need more taxes. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, to my friend RICHARD NEAL, I understand the frustrations of this debate and some of the processes, but this gives us a chance to come down to the floor and just talk about the basic policy of: Is a carbon tax good, or is it not good?

I can't speak to the process. All I can talk about is the policy.

Congressman DOGGETT was down here talking about national security issues. I deal with this quite a bit in my role as the chair of the Baltic Caucus and doing some NATO Parliamentary Assembly things.

Let me just speak briefly about a concern of what a carbon tax does in international energy fights and disbursements.

Here I hold a picture—and I wanted to get it on the chart, but I wasn't able

to—of an LNG terminal called Independence. Now, this terminal is in Lithuania, and they are able to decrease their reliance on Russian natural gas because they have built this import terminal.

□ 1000

They are able to now have two folks in which to import natural gas, thus relieving themselves of being extorted by the Russian Federation. A carbon tax would increase the cost of our exported goods to countries like Lithuania, making them more susceptible to energy extortion by the Russian Federation.

So in an international debate of an energy policy which the Russian Federation does extort—how do I know this? I know this because, in the early days of the reestablishment of freedom, a U.S. company bought a refinery in Lithuania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARCHANT. I yield the gentleman from Illinois an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SHIMKUS. So the Russians didn't like a U.S. company buying an old refinery, so what did the Russians do? They turned off the flow of oil.

So just in the international world, if we want to help our allies decrease their reliance on imported crude oil from the Russian Federation or, in this case, liquefied natural gas, a carbon tax will make that more difficult. So that is why I think it is important that we have this debate on the international perspective.

I also know that a lot of the organizations that are important to me—the American Energy Alliance, Americans for Tax Reform, the Farm Bureau, Western Energy Alliance, American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers, National Black Chamber of Commerce, Competitive Enterprise Institute, and FreedomWorks—all support the resolution that says a carbon tax is kind of the wrong way to go because it increases costs on everybody, from the goods that we sell till we transport them to the market, across the board.

So I appreciate the time. And again, we want to be the world leader in oil and gas exports, and a carbon tax will prohibit us from being able to do that.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to compliment the previous speaker, my friend, Mr. SHIMKUS, on the notion of process, calling up the notion of process.

So here we have had a debate where we have sparred for the better part of an hour, and we are debating a topic on which there have been no hearings.

Now, let me guess. This is consistent with how the tax bill was done in, incidentally, 51 days, without a hearing or without a witness.

So we are being asked to vote on something today, here, on which there has been no opportunity to place the magnifying glass of critical scrutiny on the proposal that is in front of us because, the truth is, what is in front of us is a question about the mood of Congress.

I think all 435 of us could testify to what the mood of Congress is right now, so I don't think it would be one of the more challenging events that we would confront.

But the idea that this is brought in front of the Congress without any opportunity for anybody to examine the underlying legislation and the thrust of what the regular order might impel contributes to the frustration that the American people feel about the institution and its priorities.

So as we have wrapped up this debate over a piece of legislation that will accomplish zip, zero, nothing, it literally does not matter how the vote turns out because the sole purpose of this resolution is to express, once again, the mood of Congress.

I am happy to express the mood of Congress any time that they want, happy to have a hearing on the mood of Congress if that is what they think might get us to a more sound proposal of energy independence, the use of renewables. But no, instead they bring up a piece of legislation here that is going to test how we feel about things this morning.

I think that the mood we should focus on is the mood of the American people. The people I talk to are under stress. They are tired. They are exhausted from working one, two jobs. Labor participation rates at 62.9 percent, 2 million people with opioid addictions, I wonder what their mood is as they listen to the discussion that we have had here on this floor.

They are anxious about their future. They are feeling squeezed because, for years now, the economy has been leaving them a little bit further behind. And I say that about wage growth.

Wages have flatlined for the better part of almost 13 years in America. And now, even as we see some glimmer of hope, the truth is the cost of gasoline and the cost of inflation is going to stagnate their wages again.

So paychecks have been stuck at the same level, and all the things that families need to get by have been getting more and more expensive. Housing, healthcare, college, childcare, utilities, those bills keep growing, but the salaries somehow don't keep up.

Why don't we have a hearing about the mood of people who have not seen any real wage increases—then we would get a better flavor for the debate that we are having today—rather than the mood of Congress on a piece of legislation that has had no hearings and no vetting?

So what about a hearing on the mood of our retirement system?

What about a hearing on the mood of a child's education?

Why don't we begin to talk about some of those issues? Why don't we just have some hearings on some of these issues?

Young people are going tens of thousands of dollars into student loan debt just to try to get a decent start in life. What about their mood?

Seniors are seeing their fixed incomes stretched until they break, forcing far too many to choose between paying for their prescription drugs and their groceries. Let's have a hearing on their mood.

Parents cope with high childcare costs that can eat up most of their paycheck, but the small margin that is left over is important to keep that family going. Let's have a hearing about their mood.

The people I talk to, they are not asking for too much. Their expectations for their families aren't out of line. Nobody is asking for a handout. They are asking for a hand up for opportunity.

Everybody is working hard, but people feel like they are running as fast as they can up the down escalator. Let's have a hearing on how they feel about those costs.

It takes us an unreasonable amount of effort to stay in exactly the same place. Getting ahead feels more challenging and more difficult all the time.

Last December, Republicans passed a catastrophic tax bill that gave away $2.3 trillion over 10 years—without a hearing, without a witness—in 51 days. What about the mood of the American people as they examine it? And we have seen the mood in public polling.

The legislation we have today could have offered some relief to low- and middle-income families, but Republicans chose to leave them out in the cold. In fact, it did so little for the average family that their cuts won't begin to keep up with the rise in healthcare premiums or, for that matter, gasoline prices at the pump.

Instead, the tax bill heaped giveaways on people who are already completely comfortable and thriving—more concentrated wealth.

The people who elected us sent us here to do a job on their behalf, and we ought to take into consideration their mood. They have hired us to get things done for them, and we all take, I hope, that responsibility seriously.

Our activity today has been unworthy of the trust they have placed in us. It has really been a hoax. They have just wasted all this time arguing over a sense of Congress about a carbon tax and the mood of Congress. I could have told them what the mood was here; they just have to ask me.

This is going to be a pointless vote, meaningless in stature, and there will be no outcome whatsoever. This is political theater. It is not governing like responsible Representatives.

I urge my colleagues in the majority to focus this body on accomplishing things in the future that really might help people who sent us here to do precisely that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

For many years now, Republicans in Congress have been clear: A new standalone carbon tax will raise consumer costs and hurt the economy. It is not a solution to any challenge but, rather, it would create additional challenges.

If American businesses and workers in industries are targeted by a carbon tax, they will suffer economically under such a policy. They are just now recovering from the recession that we went into, and they are just now, because of the tax bill that was passed this past year, just now beginning to see a brighter economic future. We should not debate putting new obstacles in front of them at this time.

Together, we should be focused on working to advance policies that hold down energy costs, improve the U.S. economy, its GDP, and create jobs. That is what we did last year, and that is what we are doing today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1001, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 180, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 363]

YEAS—229

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cloud
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—180

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rooney, Francis
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Costello (PA)
Lujan Grisham, M.

NOT VOTING—17

Bergman
Black
Brady (PA)
Cárdenas
Crowley
Ellison
Fudge
Garrett
Granger
Hanabusa
Jones
Lawson (FL)
Peterson
Richmond
Royce (CA)
Speier
Walz

□ 1037

Messrs. CARBAJAL and GOTTHEIMER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. LONG changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for missing this vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall No. 363.

Stated against:

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay'' on rollcall No. 363.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6147) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Illinois opposed to the bill?

Mr. QUIGLEY. I am opposed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Quigley moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6147 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 151, line 10, after the dollar amount pertaining to the ''Fund for America's Kids and Grandkids'', insert ''(reduced by $380,000,000)''.

Page 215, line 15, after the dollar amount pertaining to the ''Election Assistance Commission'', insert ''(increased by $380,000,000)''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill which