is important. I hope we can make it happen in this Congress.

OPPOSING GREEN NEW DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include materials on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lead a Western Caucus Special Order to voice our vehement opposition to the Green New Deal before it is put out of its misery by a vote in the U.S. Senate later this week.

With an estimated price tag of $93 trillion over the first 10 years, the Green New Deal costs more than four times the U.S. public debt. The Green New Deal is a Soviet-style takeover of our entire economy that will radically transform America into a country that will be very bleak and unrecognizable from the country that we know and love today.

The proponents of the Green New Deal like to make it out to be a program to improve our environment, but in reality, it is just a socialist experiment on a grand scale.

Included in the Green New Deal is a job guarantee, even if you don't want to work; a housing guarantee; a healthcare guarantee; and an education guarantee. The cost of these guarantees will put a major burden on the American taxpayer, with the healthcare guarantee alone costing taxpayers $32 trillion in the first 10 years.

None of these guarantees have anything to do with improving our environment but, rather, are socialist talking points dating back centuries. In fact, only 15 percent of the estimated cost of the Green New Deal applies to the environment.

Pair this additional tax burden with the cost of complying with all the new one-size-fits-all regulations included in the Green New Deal, which is estimated to cost $650,000 per household over 10 years, and the annually disposable income for an average household just vanishes.

In total, Americans will have to spend $155.5 billion to replace furnaces, $11.9 billion to replace gas dryers, $50 billion to replace water heaters, and $26 billion to replace stoves.

In the words of Michael Zehr from the Consumer Energy Alliance: ''American consumers need practical energy solutions that come from our Nation's existing mix of affordable energy resources. As it stands, the Green New Deal does not offer cost-efficient or sustainable solutions for hardworking families and businesses across our country.''

The Green New Deal is a job killer. The Green New Deal would eliminate 10.3 million jobs in the oil and gas industry, 600,000 jobs in the aviation industry, 1.4 million hydroelectric jobs, 100,000 jobs in nuclear energy, and 50,000 jobs in coal.

Mr. Speaker, while it is important to point out the most obvious and radical policies of the Green New Deal, such as the elimination of conventional energy sources and industries, there are several other policy consequences that should be highlighted.

Mr. Speaker, did you know that, according to the think tank Data Progress, the Green New Deal will reinstate the Obama administration's WOTUS, the waters of the U.S., and the so-called Clean Power Plan rules as part of this terrible policy? These two burdensome regulations in and of themselves did more to strip Americans of their property rights and shackle baseload power than any other regulations before them. Data Progress also reports that the Green New Deal will ban plastic straws and ban hydraulic fracturing.

The democratic socialists pushing the Green New Deal want to get rid of all energy sources except wind, solar, and batteries by 2030. How are we going to do that when wind and solar only produced 7.6 percent of our electricity in 2017? How are we going to domestically produce the critical minerals needed for this endeavor and renewables when democratic socialists and extreme environmentalists vehemently oppose mining?

As for America's farmers, the Green New Deal would also reduce current farming practices and land use by 70 percent by 2050 and ban groundwater irrigation by large-scale agribusiness. For many of my colleagues, that means unemployment for many and a significantly decreased standard of living for all. How are we going to feed ourselves? How are we going to feed the world?

When it comes to the Green New Deal, I think all of us must ask ourselves a simple question: Are we so arrogant to think that Washington, D.C., should control and dictate every aspect of the lives of the American people? My answer to that question is emphatically no. No, we should not. And, no, we will not allow the flawed policies of the Green New Deal to be adopted.

Renewables are playing, and will continue to play, an important role in our energy future, but they cannot exclusively be relied upon to provide all our energy and electrical needs.

Let's deal in reality and put an end to the socialist Green New Deal once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Arizona for yielding.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in strong opposition to H. Res. 109, the Green New Deal. This resolution is nothing short of a socialistic takeover of our energy, our transportation, and our agricultural industries that aims to change every single aspect of our lives, including how Americans eat, travel, stay warm, build their homes, and even what jobs we take.

As a fiscal conservative, I believe that the Green New Deal is entirely irresponsible. Recently, our national debt exceeded $22 trillion, and we have no realistic plan for paying that off. The Green New Deal would add trillions more to our debt, while simultaneously destroying the American economy.

It would also transfer tremendous costs onto the taxpayers, a total of $93 trillion over 10 years. For example, every home and every building would need to be retrofitted at the cost of $2.5 trillion over the next decade.

Additionally, the Green New Deal's stated goal is to achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions in that same timeframe, which will cost the taxpayer $11 trillion. Our current tax base could not support this catastrophic level of new spending. Therefore, taxes will need to be raised on every single American and business, inflicting massive damage on our economy due to the loss in take-home pay for the average family and resulting in job losses in the private sector.

Proponents of the Green New Deal also want to see all our American power come from wind or solar or batteries. This is completely unsustainable, currently, and will lead to blackouts, a dwindling food supply, and an all-out assault on private property rights.

The Green New Deal also contains no plan on what we will do with all the refuse and the trash that will be resulting from the millions of appliances, batteries, and buildings that need to be replaced or retrofitted.

This proposal, as grand in its scope as it is absent in its specifics, betrays a shocking naivete and a total absence of understanding of basic economic principles or even of our electric grid and infrastructure.

Most importantly, the authors of this proposal fail to appreciate the love of liberty and freedom that the American people share. Americans will never stand for such a radical, socialistic restructuring of our economy, and it must be strongly and emphatically rejected.

Over the last century, we have seen socialist governments around the world make the same empty promises of unlimited peace and prosperity if only their citizens would just relinquish control of their affairs and give up their freedoms and liberty to an overbearing government. The result has inevitably been the same: barren fields, crumbling infrastructure, broken economies, oppressed peoples, and, eventually, fleeing populations, as we

have seen firsthand in Venezuela, Cuba, the Soviet Union, and many other failed socialistic states.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL). The gentleman represents many agricultural producers whose livelihoods are greatly threatened by this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I had a young family in my office this morning, a wonderful, nice-looking 11-year-old boy who was in my office today with his dad, his mom, and several other people from southwest Kansas. He looked at me and he said: Congressman MARSHALL, will I be able to run cattle when I get older? My great-grandfather ran cattle; my grandfather ran cattle; my daddy ran cattle; and I would like to run cattle someday, but this Green New Deal scares me.

He said: Will the Green New Deal keep me from running cattle?

I had to say: Unfortunately, yes, it would.

The Green New Deal would be the end of agriculture as we know it in Kansas. Agriculture makes up 40 percent of the economy of Kansas. For all practical purposes, it would be the end of the Kansas economy.

Another large part of our economy is oil and gas, and the Green New Deal would be the end of that.

I always try to think about the impact of something like the Green New Deal. First of all, it would triple your taxes. I think that would be well proven. But I always am especially concerned for that young family, maybe that family that I delivered 5 or 10 or 15 years ago, and they have two or three kids at home. How would the new Green New Deal impact them? First of all, their grocery bill is going to double or triple, I suppose. They would have to replace all the appliances in their home. Their utility bill is going to go up.

Then I think about the price of gas. I always noticed in my obstetrical practice that whenever the price of gasoline got about $3 a gallon, women would suddenly ask: Do we have to come back this often? Quite a few of my patients live 60 or 90 miles from me, and it was quite a challenge to come visit us. When the price of gasoline got about $3 a gallon, they didn't want to come quite as often.

I can't help but think what the Green New Deal would do to the cost of gasoline, if there is such a thing. I suppose we would all be driving electric cars.

Where I am from, I only wish that we could hop on a train and take public transportation, but there are just not enough trains to go around in Kansas. We are lucky to have roads in most places where we live, so public transportation just isn't an option.

All that being said, Mr. Speaker, I think, like the gentleman from Arizona, I want to leave this country and I want to leave the State of Kansas cleaner than I found it. I am so proud that Kansas waters and Kansas air are cleaner today than when I was growing up. I am very proud of that. I want to keep going in that direction.

I am very proud that the carbon imprint from the United States is less today than it was in 2004, and I want to keep going in that direction. But it is my belief that innovation is what is going to drive this and keep us going in that direction.

I am so proud of what the American entrepreneurs have done in Kansas and across this country, our ability to get more natural gas and to make all of our refineries cleaner. Where we produce electricity, so many of them are 97 percent cleaner.

The issue of ecology is a worldwide problem. It is a problem that the United States cannot cure by itself. We need to be a leader and keep going in the direction we are going.

I look forward to working with folks across the aisle to come up with real solutions that will really work for this country. I think that the American innovator will do great things and that better days are ahead for America.

□ 2000

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to recognize the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP is the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee and has been a steadfast leader in opposing the Green New Deal.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) taking the lead this evening and talking about this important issue.

Look, one of the things we always need to do is learn the lessons of history, so we simply do not repeat them.

In the late 1800–1900s, communism was the new government concept that excited the elites of that particular era to the point that it was such an expansive idea, that part of the reason that Woodrow Wilson wrote his 14 points was to intellectually challenge communism and restate the significance of democracy and republican forms of government.

When communism did obviously take root in the Soviet Union and China, it was not a philosophical statement, it was simply an excuse for the good, old-fashioned dictators to tell people how to live their lives.

So as Lenin called it, it was important to have the vanguard of the proletariat, so the government would tell people how to think until people realized that the government was right in the first place.

Those are some of the parts of history that we never want to repeat again.

Now, if the Green New Deal, this toothless wish, was merely a one-and-done manifesto, then maybe that would be one thing, but my fear is, it becomes an opening salvo into the dangers that are stated when we decide that the government must find the solutions, the government must tell people what to think and what to do, that elites are the ones who have all the ideas; when in reality, history has shown us that solutions always come from people who were empowered to find and make decisions for themselves, and find solutions for themselves.

People need to be given options. People need to be given choices, people need to be able to chart their own destiny.

My fear is elitism enriches and empowers would-be autocrats, denigrates the roles of individuals, and those are dangerous attitudes that must be discussed and must be understood in some way.

And let's face it, some of the people—the cheerleaders for the Green New Deal—they simply don't get it.

When they live in areas where commutes, family errands are measured in blocks and subway stops, that is different from other people in America who, when they take a drive into town to buy school clothes that is going to take the entire afternoon.

It is different than people who realize that they have to make a choice between healthcare and heating their home; and that is a real responsibility for them, and a real problem.

The burdens imposed by the Green New Deal, which have been outlined by several speakers already, are those that land squarely on the shoulders of humble, hardworking Americans while the elites pat themselves on the back.

For the rural west, my State of Utah, it is not really a Green New Deal; it is, rather, a green raw deal for them to live.

Now, recently in my committee where I am the ranking member, we had an amendment that Mr. GRAVES made to one of the rules that would request an analysis of economics before any bill was considered.

Now, one of the freshmen Democrats spoke to that issue, and I want to just restate what he said. I thought what he said was profound.

He stated, I think we have to be very mindful of the people, their jobs, their ability to pay their bills, because of the changes that we make.

And this is a discussion that should always be had. We shouldn't just be speaking in the theoretical.

Now, ironically, even though I thought his words were spot on, that motion to have that policy was defeated.

Nonetheless, I recently joined other ranking members in asking Speaker PELOSI that if there was serious discussion, that unlike H.R. 1, this is going to be heard by many committees, many voices will have a chance at talking about what will actually happen.

These hearings ought to ask how this Green New Deal might impact energy prices and home prices and jobs and healthcare.

So far, those who have done the series of studies—so far they're from the

outside—the outlook looks pretty bleak on what the potential could indeed be.

There are already many complex examples of negative impacts that would happen if this was actually to become a reality.

So as stated in our plea to Speaker PELOSI, I do fear that this Green New Deal would hurt Americans struggling to make ends meet, the very people it purports to help. And worst of all, it could permanently put the American Dream out of reach for millions of people.

We need to really look very carefully at this and not just assume statements that are being made taking place. We need to learn from history and not repeat those same mistakes.

Mr. Speaker, I am appreciative of having the opportunity of being here as part of this Special Order to try and talk about some of the realities of this purported deal.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's response, and thank him.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH represents the heart of Virginia coal country, an industry that would be eliminated if the Green New Deal would become law.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, you know I would like to engage in colloquies and talk about issues.

Mr. GOSAR. Sure.

Mr. GRIFFITH. And you know what is interesting about this is, I do represent a coal district, but if we shut down all of this, as we have discussed in the Green New Deal, are the Indians going to stop using coal?

Of course not.

Are the Chinese going to stop using coal?

Mr. GOSAR. No.

Mr. GRIFFITH. No. The rest of the world will continue to use these sources.

And, in fact, industries that are dependent upon our natural resources—coal, oil, natural gas—well, they will just move to the countries that will let them use it, and it will not have any effect on the environment.

But this really is not a proposal that should be taken seriously. It was clearly thrown together quickly in an attempt to get some press; and, unfortunately, 100 Members of the body decided to sign on to it.

But when you read it, you know it is not there. We have heard all the things that could happen if we take a watered-down version of the Green New Deal. But if we pass the Green New Deal and we actually do what it says, and you read the words, it says, remove greenhouse gases from the atmosphere. It doesn't say, reduce. It doesn't say, remove hazardous greenhouse gases.

So, I would ask my friend who holds a degree in the science field, and with whom we have lots of discussion about science on the floor and at various meetings; what happens if we eliminate the greenhouse gases of water vapor and carbon dioxide; eliminate them, remove them, as the Green New Deal calls for?

What happens if that occurs?

Mr. GOSAR. Well, photosynthesis; this is the key component of cellular growth in plants. They take carbon dioxide; they take dirty water; they have sunlight, and it produces oxygen and clean water. That is what we actually get with photosynthesis.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, and if you eliminate carbon dioxide—the gentleman is correct—we won't have any plants. If we don't have any plants, oxygen plummets in the atmosphere.

And as I told a group of high school students recently, and you know what that means for us?

And all, if not most, life forms that currently rely on either carbon dioxide or oxygen will die and all that will be left are the life forms, the microbial life forms that live near hot vents in the ocean or the edges of volcanoes, because they don't rely on that. The rest of life would be wiped out.

Now, I know that is not what the Democrats meant when they introduced this, but isn't that the scientific conclusion of removing greenhouse gases from the atmosphere; not reducing, removing? Isn't that correct?

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, it absolutely would be correct.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, and so while I know they weren't thinking about it or they probably didn't mean to go that far, it shows you that even if we modified it, it won't work for the people.

Jobs would be eliminated, jobs will be cut, and we really won't have any impact on the environment unless we go the full bore, in which case, we no longer have air to breathe and we won't have to worry about the global temperature in 20 years or 30 years or 40 years, because none of us will be here.

And it is just fascinating to me how they can get the science so messed up and, yet, lecture to us about the science.

Mr. GOSAR. Absolutely.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. In fact, the gentleman brings up a great point.

There is an article by Michael Shellenberger and it is, ''Why Renewables Can't Save the Planet.'' In this discussion—it is a wonderful article; it is in Quillette—he talks about renewable energy, particularly solar and wind.

They are low density. They don't have what they call basal power. They only produce when the sun is shining and when the wind is blowing. So you need batteries. And as he states so eloquently here, the new renaissance for batteries isn't coming any time soon.

In fact, we see many of the same people who propose the Green New Deal are obstinate in trying to allow mining for these critical and rare earths that are required for battery development.

In fact, over 90 percent of the world's market for critical minerals—or these rare earths—are dictated by China. So they are not going to come any time soon.

And then, let's talk about the ecological damage.

In fact, wind is the largest destroyer of large birds.

Now, small, little birds, cats will take care of, but what ends up happening, raptors—like condors and eagles and hawks—are the ones who are killed most often by these big rotary blades or turbines that turn. These are the birds that are most at peril right now in our world.

So once again, we are dooming the future because we are predominating selection to the government, and that is a sad thing.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Will the gentleman yield for a second?

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman may recall, I am a birdwatcher.

Mr. GOSAR. Yes, the gentleman is.

Mr. GRIFFITH. So when the gentleman started talking about birds, I came back to the mike.

We hope science will solve these problems, and that is why we need to have more research and development on all of this.

Instead of saying, stop everything, we need to do research and development. But isn't there also a problem today with solar and some of the larger solar arrays that they actually fry birds as they fly; whether it be large birds or small birds?

Mr. GOSAR. Absolutely.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Because the birds don't see the heat, and they fly into it, and they are fried to a crackly crunch.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly right.

Mr. GRIFFITH. And so there are lots of things we need to worry about in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman bringing that up today, because what we want to do is have a balanced approach.

We want renewables. We want all of the above. But we also have to make sure that we are not throwing the baby out with the bathwater, and in the end, killing off our large predator birds or killing birds with technologies that are not quite ready for prime time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely right. The renewables are very important, because what it allows us to do is take this wonderful wealth that we have of coal and nuclear and oil and gas and hydro, and really extend it into the future, where the best way that we can have an impact on this world is our democracy, our republic, our way of entrepreneurially changing things; not having dictations coming by the Federal Government. It is the entrepreneurial spirit of individuals.

So it is a wonderful aspect to use all the above. And I think that is what everybody would like to see.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Hear, hear, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I didn't mention that we are working on some technology right now that allows us to extract rare earth minerals out of some of our coal deposits to the United States and be able to take some of that business away from the Chinese and bring it back to the United States

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, the gentleman is very astute in regard to the overburden area, where many of these rare earths can be extracted; so we are not dependent upon the whims and wiles of the Chinese Government.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I just have to bring this up: I was meeting with some folks at Virginia Tech recently who are working on this very area. And as a part of the spinoff of the research and the technology they are doing to refine it and to try to get the other minerals out, they have also found a way of using that same technology to improve the steel industry. And they are now licensing some steel companies in India, which would lower their carbon footprint.

So we have the research into coal that is now going to help the steel industry in an area that doesn't have anywhere near the regulations we have to lower their carbon footprint.

This is the way we should be going in the United States: Use our entrepreneurial spirit; use our research; put some Federal money behind that research, but use our research to find ways to make the environment, worldwide, better instead of proclaiming broad edicts that we are not going to have cows in 10 years, or we are not going to do this in 10 years.

Instead, let's let our research and our entrepreneurial spirit and our ingenuity solve these problems for us and the world.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman also brings to my mind another opportunity that we actually see where the pulverization of coal is then injected into spaces within oil; we get a 50 percent additional better burn and a cleaner burn at that.

So once again, the technology is there for all these abundances of wealth that we have in the energy sector.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Absolutely.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

You know, when the gentleman talks about rare earths, they sit all over our western frontier.

□ 2015

In fact, in Arizona, they line our deserts.

These are geos, and typically, in the past, to extract those rare earths that are required for these batteries for solar and wind, it is very caustic by utilizing high concentrations of sulfuric acid. But we have got the entrepreneurial spirit of people back in Arizona who are using high concentrations of citric acids, like from limes and lemons, and actually extracting the same rare earths in that aspect.

Once again, the power of those entrepreneurial individuals out there in America are the ones who are changing the dynamics of the way our energy portfolio looks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for some additional comments.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity of speaking one more time here especially because this is such a significant issue that you are addressing to the people and because, as leader of the Congressional Western Caucus, you have held a whole lot of forums to discuss the implications of what could be there.

So in one of the last forums, we had policy think tanks and industry and conservation groups that were there testifying. I was struck by the comments of Thomas Pyle, president of the American Energy Alliance, when he said: ''For nearly a decade now, the United States, long blessed with vast natural resources, has benefited from the greatest energy expansion in the history of the world. Our energy producers have delivered the low-cost, affordable, and reliable energy that has fueled economic growth and opportunity for all Americans, no matter their race, sex, creed, or color.''

Now, it is interesting, as we talk about this concept, that, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, by 2020 the United States will become a net exporter of energy for the first time since 1953. That means no longer are we going to be reliant upon questionable foreign powers like Russia or Saudi Arabia for our energy.

Even the concepts that we have developed, the fracking and horizontal drilling, those concepts have allowed us not only to expand what we are doing, but also have allowed us to have a carbon emission reduction at the same time. We were the world leader in carbon reduction in 2015, 2016, and 2017, and we are still on that same track again.

In fact, one of the things I find unique about the Green New Deal is it fails to realize that, because of what we have been able to do in oil and natural gas, energy prices are down for those who are most vulnerable in our society. We can afford to cook our food and heat our homes better than ever before.

And while this production has risen significantly, methane emissions have decreased at the same time. In fact, the EPA reported that U.S. greenhouse gas emissions are already down 10 percent in the last 10 years.

So while the Green New Deal has every potential of destroying jobs for millions of people, it still also ignores other alternatives for green energy. For example, it says absolutely nothing about nuclear or hydropower.

Let's face it, 10 percent of our energy today stills comes from hydropower, and hydropower is clean. It leaves behind no waste. It is considered one of the most effective ways of producing electricity. And yet it is absurd to believe that we can achieve zero net carbon emissions without dealing with nuclear or without dealing with hydropower as part of the mix. That is part of the reality that needs to be brought out here.

We have grown our economics. We have cleaned our environment. We have lowered the cost of living for so many people.

We should not denigrate everything that the current system is already doing that for some people, for some elitists, they simply want to try to ignore that and ignore the fact that, if we want to continue on this path, what we need to do is empower people to be able to come up with solutions on their own. It is not going to happen by the government telling people how to live and what to think. We need to empower people, not empower the government.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the opportunity of expressing that idea again.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to engage the gentleman in a colloquy.

The gentleman and I went on a codel over to Europe. We saw Germany, Lithuania, and Norway. We saw the power of the influence that our energy can actually provide, particularly in Lithuania.

Can the gentleman highlight that for us?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that Baltic countries have—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—is they are right next-door to the monolith Russia, that has used its energy potential to blackmail and intimidate these other countries. Even today, they have finally broken away from their oil and gas dependency on Russia. Their electrical grid is still tied to Russia.

What Lithuania was able to do is import a natural gas mobile station. They were able to get off of the Russian dependency so they could, once again, have their own resources coming in there.

Estonia does the same thing with their oil shale. They have been able to produce their own energy, which allows them to have independence and not be bullied by large countries, in this case, by Russia.

That is one of the things we are doing in what we are already doing. That is one of the futures that we are having. In fact, it is interesting that some of the countries we visited that were very proud of what they were doing with alternative energy, they always have to have a backup system.

Mr. GOSAR. That is right.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. And that backup system is based on coal. Without that, they could not guarantee baseloads that they have to have just to keep their countries going.

Mr. GOSAR. Well, the first country we visited was Germany, and they were very proud of what they were getting rid of in coal and nuclear; and yet their baseload was going to be dependent upon Russia, on Nord Stream 1 and 2—absolutely crazy. We want to be less dependent on Russia.

This whole country has gone through this whole Russia this and Russiagate that. So we want to see that dependency being more entrepreneurial, and the United States is perfectly suited for that.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I guess what the gentleman is saying is, if you want the economy to grow, if you want people to be empowered, if you want to find solutions not only to environmental issues but also energy issues, empower people to come up with that. We are actually doing that.

America's history is a history that is positive. Empower that to go forward. Don't try and stop it with some other elitist idea from the top-down theories.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I agree, absolutely.

It also extends even far into our agricultural aspects. Never before in the world have we seen less aspects of poverty. Today the lowest aspects around the world are poverty; and at the same time, we see the lowest incidence of hunger. How is that possible? It is the entrepreneurial farmer. We reproduce more that we can supply around the world.

And what do they need? They need abundant energy. They need abundant water. All of these things are plausible because, once again, it is the entrepreneur who actually solves these problems, not the government.

If the government can give all, it can take all; and it has done so, whether it be the Soviet Union, whether it be Mao's China, or whether it be the Venezuela experiment that is going dramatically wrong today. It never works because you eventually run out of everybody else's money.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, that is true.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, once again, a lot of our proponents backstab us by saying: Listen, we lack a vision.

America's energy renaissance is the backbone of our economy. We just talked about it. It is a story of freedom, prosperity, and opportunity.

After decades of reliance on other countries to meet our energy needs, the U.S. Energy Information Administration projects that America will export more energy than it imports, starting in 2020. We are no longer dependent on foreign sources like Russia and Saudi Arabia.

The innovations of technology improvements associated with fracking and horizontal drilling have allowed shale resources, previously deemed uneconomical, to be developed and are the main reason the U.S. was the world leader in carbon emissions reductions.

We have got to say it again. As Ranking Member BISHOP said, reductions in 2015, 2016, and 2017—that is right, fracking that is demonized by environmental extremists without justification, has proven to be the best energy solution for our environment.

Abundant oil and natural gas has reduced electricity bills, kept prices low, and provided the largest share of U.S. electric power generation in recent years. The oil and gas industry supports more than 10.3 million jobs and nearly 8 percent of our economy.

The United States is now the top energy producer, and the American Dream is thriving. January 2019 saw the 100th consecutive month of positive job growth in America, the longest period of continuous job growth on record. The U.S. job market is strong, and in December, employers posted 7.3 million open jobs—once again, a new record.

Members of the Congressional Western Caucus support personal responsibility and less government intervention in our daily lives and freedoms. They defend property rights and believe that private ownership of property is a fundamental right in America. Our vision encourages innovation and less burdensome mandates.

People want clean water. People want clean air, and they are striving for that. The people who depend on the land to provide security for their families and communities understand their resources the best. States and municipalities are better suited to deal with the local issues than distant, out-of-touch Washington bureaucrats.

The caucus seeks to promote access to our Nation's energy and resources potential, while pursuing a true all-of-the-above energy approach that aims to ensure that the U.S. is the global energy leader. We know how to do this best. We ought to be doing it right.

Our vision utilizes the current energy renaissance and the American energy dominance policy currently being implemented by the Trump administration in the State of Texas. Texas leads the country in wind production.

According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Texas had more generating capacity than any other State last year and more installed wind power capacity than all but five countries in the world.

Once again, think that through. Texas was the fifth largest in the world in power production by wind. The country's only large clean-capture coal facility is found in Texas. The Petra Nova facility is the only carbon capture and storage coal-fired plant in the United States, and it is only one of two facilities that utilizes that technology in the world.

Once again, American entrepreneurs are at it again, making things better, making things more achievable. Coal generates baseload power that prevents rolling blackouts when renewables fall short in extreme weather. Most people don't understand that.

Alternative or intermittent power is when the wind doesn't blow and the Sun doesn't shine. In fact, you heard President Trump at one of his speeches talk about: Hey, honey, I would like to watch television. Is the wind blowing?

If you didn't have baseload power and the wind wasn't blowing, you couldn't watch television. So what baseload is, it runs 24/7. That is called hydroelectric. That is called natural gas. That is called oil and coal. That is also nuclear, one of the largest density energy productions all around, and we, once again, could not do it without it.

According to the third quarter 2018 report from the Solar Energy Industries Association, Texas is poised to become a nationwide leader in solar energy, with more than 4 gigawatts of capacity expected to be installed over the next 5 years.

Now, think about this. Texas is the fifth largest in both solar and wind, once again, having a plethora of our baseload energy in oil and gas and coal. There are two operating nuclear power plants in Texas, and my home State of Arizona has the largest nuclear power plant.

The U.S. Energy Information Administration previously reported that Texas is among the top 10 States with the greatest nuclear power generation capacity in the country.

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Western Caucus' alternative vision to the vision currently being pursued by the Trump administration and the great State of Texas are concurrent. They are opposite of the Green New Deal. That is a pipe dream. If we go down this Green New Deal path, the United States will be walking in its own green mile.

Now, Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents continue to ask me: What is actually in the Green New Deal?

Confusion has arisen, given that it is light on details and Members ran from the summary document put out by Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ' office.

One significant piece of information that my constituents asked me about is whether the Green New Deal includes a jobs guarantee for everyone in the United States, including those who are unwilling to work.

As part of the frequently asked questions document that was released with legislation, it was stated that economic security would be provided for those who ''are unwilling to work.'' Many of my constituents just can't believe that that is actually in there and an objective of the people pushing the Green New Deal.

Staff have since retracted Representative OCASIO-CORTEZ' frequently asked questions document.

But the message I hope the American people hear is: We know the motives behind the Green New Deal and we know how its proponents plan to carry out its objectives. From ending airplane travel to shuttering down all nuclear power, hydropower, and even getting rid of all natural gas, some people, unfortunately, on the other side of the aisle are threatening our way of life and the American economy.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the links for the two most frequently asked questions documents, which I have in my hand, that were released by Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ's office to the press and posted on her website.

The first link is: https://westerncaucus.house.gov/uploadedfiles/green-new-deal-faq__provided__to__npr__v2.pdf

The second link is: https://web.archive.org/web/20190207191119/https:/ocasio-cortez.house.gov/media/blog-posts/green-new-deal-faq

Mr. Speaker, I want to focus on how the Green New Deal will affect our agriculture industry. It has been the lifeblood of our rural communities the Western Caucus represents, and the Green New Deal stands to decimate it. The Green New Deal is nothing short of an all-out attack on agriculture by the socialist left.

Reading directly from the text of the bill, the Green New Deal seeks to eliminate ''pollution and greenhouse gas emissions from the agricultural sector as much as is technologically feasible.''

We had a nice conversation with my friend from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH). The agriculture industry supports more than 21 million jobs, 11 percent of the U.S. jobs, according to the Farm Bureau. Representative OCASIO-CORTEZ has attacked agriculture, cows, hamburgers, and factory farming in pushing the Green New Deal. In fact, in the fact sheet released by her office, it mentions a desire to get rid of farting cows.

OCASIO-CORTEZ doubled down on agriculture, cows, hamburgers, and factory farming in an interview, stating, in the Green New Deal, ''what we talk about is . . . that we need to take a look at factory farming, period. It is wild. . . . Maybe we shouldn't be eating a hamburger for breakfast, lunch, and dinner. . . . We have to take a look at everything.''

Well, Mr. Speaker, the last time I checked, this is a common bodily function of nearly every animal, and eliminating animals for this reason would mean an end to livestock in agriculture.

Land needed for agriculture is also under assault under the Green New Deal. In fact, when it comes to land needed for agriculture, the agriculture, energy, and transportation industries are linked because of land needed to build high-speed rail and solar wind farms.

Farmland will likely need to be seized by the Federal Government in order to build tracks for the high-speed rail and to build wind and solar farms. How does that work going across an ocean, I wonder? Sailboats. That would be fun for those in Guam and Hawaii.

The elimination of farmland in order to build these projects will cost us jobs and put our food supply in jeopardy. As I highlighted, in the world today is the lowest poverty rate, the lowest rate ever of people going unfed. It is unbelievable.

The Green New Deal also aims to ban groundwater mining by large-scale agribusinesses, making irrigation needed to sustain this form of agriculture truly impossible.

According to the think tank Data Progress, the Green New Deal will reinstate the Obama administration's WOTUS rule. This WOTUS rule by the previous administration expanded the definition of navigable waters beyond any reasonable interpretation intended by the Clean Water Act. It attempted to assert national regulatory jurisdiction over areas with even the least of connections to water resources, including man-made conveyances.

Farmers, ranchers, and property owners suffer under this overreaching land and water grab.

WOTUS contradicts the prior Supreme Court rulings and seeks to expand agency control over 60 percent of our country's streams and millions of acres of wetlands that were previously nonjurisdictional, once again empowering the government, not the entrepreneur and not the individual.

Mr. Speaker, clearly, the Green New Deal would impose disastrous consequences on our agricultural sector. Ranchers and farmers would suffer significant harm, and private property rights would become a thing of the past. America's rural communities, where I am from, and agricultural economies, where I am also from, can't afford the Green New Deal. It should be rejected on that basis.

Mr. Speaker, many Democrats are supporting the Green New Deal, so let's take a look. While many of us laugh at some of the policies in the Green New Deal and think they are just ridiculous, we must take them seriously, given the large amount of Democratic support for the Green New Deal. In fact, the Green New Deal currently has 90 House cosponsors and 11 Senate cosponsors, including BERNIE SANDERS, KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND, KAMALA HARRIS, ELIZABETH WARREN, CORY BOOKER, and AMY KLOBUCHAR.

There are 14 Democratic Presidential candidates—14 of the current—who have endorsed the Green New Deal, including Senators SANDERS, GILLIBRAND, HARRIS, WARREN, BOOKER, and KLOBUCHAR; former Representative Beto O'Rourke; Washington Governor Jay Inslee; Representative ERIC SWALWELL; Representative TULSI GABBARD; former Representative John Delaney; author Marianne Williamson; former HUD Secretary Julio Castro; and South Bend mayor Pete Buttigieg. Once again, everybody is supporting something that is not possible.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to now focus on the Green New Deal's effect and how it would affect our transportation system. The Green New Deal calls for the abolition of all gas and diesel engine vehicles and replacing them with electric vehicles, mass transit, and high-speed trains.

Once again, this would require batteries, something that is not coming very soon, particularly with the other side's obstinance in trying to stop mining for these rare earths that are required for these batteries.

In the forum that the Western Caucus held last month, we heard from several witnesses who spoke about the effects of the Green New Deal and how they would have an effect on our transportation infrastructure.

To quote Thomas Pyle: ''The Green New Deal also envisions a massive build-out of high-speed rail across the country. High-speed rail, in order to reach said high speeds, must travel in a virtually straight line. In a wealthy, developed society like the United States, carving these straight lines means taking the homes and land in the path. There is just no way to even contemplate high-speed rail without sweeping use of eminent domain.''

Sweeping eminent domain will be a complete infringement of the property rights of every American citizen and could easily be abused. As we have seen, certain existing high-speed light rail projects such as the bullet train project in California have turned into quagmires that have cost the taxpayers billions of dollars with no return.

One of the main modes of shipping products into our country is by boat. In fact, most of the bulk commodities imported into this country are transported by ship. The large shipping vessels are powered by—you guessed it—diesel-burning engines, which there are currently no replacements for.

Are we just going to scrap one of the main modes of transporting products into this country? If so, what are we going to replace it with?

Along the same lines of ship transportation, what implications does the Green New Deal have for air travel? One would assume it would suffer the same fate.

How would we see our colleagues from Hawaii, Mr. Speaker? For example, the dean of the House, Mr. YOUNG from Alaska, would he have to take a train all the way to Washington, D.C., from Alaska? How would that affect the water, the air, and also the critters along the way?

The airline industry employs 600,000 people. The Green New Deal would destroy these very jobs. The Green New Deal aims to get rid of all combustion engines. This means getting rid of all hotrods, classic cars, big trucks, tractors, large SUVs, and, yes, even mom's van.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. was the world leader in emissions reductions in 2015, 2016, and 2017. We discussed this earlier. This was the renaissance of oil and gas production and the clean use of that. If we allow American innovation to continue to flourish and to continue to embrace a truly all-of-the-above energy strategy, we will continue to lead the world in emissions reductions without radically changing our way of life, being provocative on how we change

the rest of the world, and we won't get rid of our classic cars.

Mr. Speaker, the Green New Deal is a proposal that should not be taken lightly. The Green New Deal would codify into law a one-size-fits-all government healthcare system, offer free college for all, and create a Federal job guarantee.

According to figures released by the American Action Forum, the Green New Deal would cost every household $600,000 over 10 years.

The Green New Deal will implement the radical socialist utopian idea of Medicare for All, which would cost American taxpayers $36 trillion over a 10-year period. That means it would be Medicare for no one. The cost it would impose on the taxpayers would be so unsustainable that the Medicare for All proposal, once again, would be blamed and be renamed Medicare for None.

The Green New Deal would cause harm to the American worker. This fact is even recognized by the AFL–CIO, which has come out strongly against the Green New Deal. They recognize that the only outcome of this bill is to take away good-paying jobs from their members and cause harm to their families.

The United States is currently undergoing an energy renaissance, as we talked about earlier, with natural gas leading the way. The natural gas industry has brought millions of jobs to this country and helped us reduce our carbon footprint in 3 straight years, starting in 2015.

Science shows that the Green New Deal will have a negligible impact on its stated goal of fighting climate change. In fact, the Green New Deal would actually cause climate change and emissions to worsen as energy production would leave the United States and go to countries like China and India that don't have the same environmental regulations and standards as the United States, producing more emissions in the process than if we did so cleanly and responsibly like we do here in the United States.

This legislation only stands to lower temperatures by 0.137 degrees Celsius by 2100, according to the same metrics used by the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

This bill completely ignores the reality that the biggest sources of carbon dioxide are developing countries. The sponsors of the Green New Deal may say that the U.S. can become a leader in exporting new renewable technologies in the developing world, but would a developing nation give up cheap and abundant energy in return for a more expensive form of energy, Mr. Speaker?

In fact, I quoted this Quillette article about how renewables can't fight climate change. Everyone who is engaged in a renewable-type energy sector has seen their energy portfolios go up three times—much more expensive—three times.

Mr. Speaker, the Western Caucus looks forward to contributing to the debate on this important subject, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 26, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 1477, the Russian-Venezuelan Threat Mitigation Act, would have no significant effect on direct spending or revenues, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 1839, the Medicaid Services Investment and Accountability Act of 2019, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 1839

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2019–2024	2010–2029
NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (−) IN THE DEFICIT													
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	32	15	16	2	5	2	−2	−6	−15	−21	−28	71	−1

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

434. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's interim final rule — Margin and Capital Requirements for Covered Swap Entities (RIN: 2590-AB02) received March 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

435. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standards for the Growing, Harvesting, Packing, and Holding of Produce for Human Consumption; Extension of Compliance Dates for Subpart E [Docket No.: FDA-2011-N-0921] (RIN: 0910-AH93) received March 19, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

436. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i) Post Transition Table of DTV Allotments (Cookeville and Franklin, Tennessee) [MB Docket No.: 18-383] (RM-11822) received March 19, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

437. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period of June 1, 2018, through July 31, 2018, pursuant to Sec. 620C(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and in accordance with Sec. 1(a)(6) of Executive Order 13313; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

438. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Cumberland River, Kentucky [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0127] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

439. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Security Zone; Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, TX [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0128] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received March 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

440. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Regulated Navigation Areas, Safety Zones, Security Zones, and Special Local Regulations within District 7 [Docket No.: USCG-2018-0231] received March 15, 2019, pursuant to 5