

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HAGEDORN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, legislation to block fourth-trimester abortions, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. HAGEDORN. Madam Speaker, for the protection of life, I urge that the Speaker immediately schedule this important bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

ACT TO PROTECT THE UIGHUR COMMUNITY

(Ms. WILD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for constituents with whom I recently met whose family is one among millions of Uighurs, the ethnic Muslim community from Xinjiang in northwest China being persecuted by the Chinese Government.

My constituents' parents are among the estimated 1 million Uighurs and other Muslims who are currently being held in camps because of their faith and ethnicity. The reports of what is happening to this community—mass targeting, detention, and torture based on faith and origin—echo the darkest chapters in human history.

I am heartened to see that there is bipartisan support for doing something about it. That is why I say to leadership: Move the bipartisan UIGHUR Act and the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act through committee and to the floor so that we can pass these bills in the House, push the Senate to take them up, and get them signed into law.

Only by acting in moments like this can we truly live up to the pledge “never again.” Let’s stand together and say no to ethnic cleansing on our watch.

□ 1415

TITLE X GAG RULE PUTS LIVES AT RISK

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Trump administration’s Title X gag rule. The gag rule is a Federal prohibition on

funding for healthcare providers who may refer patients to an abortion.

The Title X gag rule will endanger patients who rely on health clinics that will lose Federal funding. That means women will have less access to cancer screening, reproductive health services, birth control, and health education.

By prohibiting medical caregivers from making decisions in the best interest of patients, the gag rule puts lives at risk. All patients, regardless of geography, income, race, or identity, should be able to access whatever medical care and health information their healthcare provider thinks is relevant.

The Trump administration should not be deciding what a doctor or a nurse or any healthcare giver tells their patients.

UNITY FOR ALL AMERICANS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we have gone through some very difficult times, and I want to call the roll: Tree of Life, Robert Gregory Bowers; Mother Emanuel Church, Dylann Roof; Christchurch, Brenton Harrison Tarrant; just recently, in San Diego, John Earnest; and recently arrested, Mark Steven Domingo.

First of all, I want to thank the FBI and its investigation for stopping Mark Steven Domingo.

I challenge all of us, as colleagues, to begin the debate and discussion on hate, White nationalism, and Nazism, for it is not something that we can allow to seed and grow. We can’t allow someone who wants to attack a White nationalist group that is meeting because of hatred, nor can we allow someone to gun people down in their synagogues or mosques or churches.

America is better than this, and we as Members of Congress need to begin to discuss race, discrimination, Nazism, White nationalism, sexism. We need to discuss it in a way that is even more than legislation.

So I call upon the Nation, I call upon this President to stand up and announce to America that enough is enough and that he stands for the unity of all of us.

ADDRESSING HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN VENEZUELA

(Mrs. MURPHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, there is a humanitarian crisis in Venezuela and it is man-made.

My view is simple. The people of Venezuela will not prosper as long as the Maduro regime remains in power. It has proven itself to be cruel, incompetent, and antidemocratic.

Ideally, the regime will go peacefully, but it must go.

The United States cannot be passive. We must stand behind the proud Ven-

ezuelan patriots who have taken to the streets and are struggling to reclaim their country from the regime that is destroying it. We must be ready to support these brave men and women with all elements of American power, always working alongside our partners in Latin America.

The Venezuelan people need to know that we have their backs. If the Maduro regime targets its own citizens with violence, it should be prepared to suffer the consequences.

To the Maduro regime, I say “enough,” “basta.” To the people of Venezuela, I say “be strong,” “fuerza”; “we are with you,” “estamos con ustedes.”

SUPPORTING EFFORTS OF NOAA CORPS

(Mr. CASE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, today, with my colleagues Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. HUFFMAN of California, I am proud to introduce the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Amendments Act of 2019.

The women and men of the NOAA Corps proudly and professionally operate NOAA’s highly specialized fleet of research and survey ships and aircraft, including the famed Hurricane Hunter aviators. Several of those ships are based in my State of Hawaii and conduct surveys used to manage our fisheries and protected species and study and map the ocean floor.

Like the other uniformed services, the NOAA Corps officers spend most of their careers away from home at sea, in the air, and in remote locations such as Antarctica conducting this important work but are often overlooked in the legislative and administrative process, resulting in a patchwork of statutory authorities, benefits, and obligations of service.

Our bill will help the NOAA Corps improve recruitment, retention, and diversity to attract the best and the brightest commissioned officers and better align this great Corps with the other uniformed services as they continue their great service to NOAA and to our Nation.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass this bill and support the efforts of the NOAA Corps.

PARIS AGREEMENT IS FUNDAMENTALLY FLAWED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Cox of California). 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 extraneous material 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 H.R. 9, which aims to prevent President Trump from withdrawing from the fundamentally flawed Paris Agreement.

In 2015, more than 170 countries signed a nonbinding agreement at the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in Paris. While most countries set a target reduction of carbon emissions below its 2005 level, the Obama administration sought to dramatically reduce the United States' carbon emissions by between 26 and 28 percent below its 2005 level by 2025.

Before I proceed any further, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS). He is a tireless advocate for small businesses in his district, many of whom have been harmed by this type of legislation.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GOSAR, and I appreciate his leading the Western Caucus Special Order hour of the day and all that he does, and the members of the Western Caucus, on these issues.

President Obama attempted to implement the Paris Agreement domestically through an executive order he issued in September 2016, but the Paris Agreement was never ratified by the United States Senate as is constitutionally required for a treaty to exist and, therefore, is not a legally binding treaty.

In June 2017, President Trump announced that the U.S. would cease all participation in the 2015 Paris Agreement, which is fully in its power to decide because, again, U.S. involvement is not legally binding. I applauded that decision then; I continue to applaud it now, and this is one of the reasons why.

This Paris accord has little efficacy. It will not save the world. Even if we take at face value the assumption that climate change poses an existential threat to the planet, U.S. compliance with the Paris Agreement, or even a full embrace of a far more expansive Green New Deal, would do little to avert that result.

The U.S. is no longer the primary source of global CO₂ emissions. In fact, between 2005 and 2017, our Nation has reduced CO₂ emissions by 862 million tons, and market forces are increasingly pushing us toward using cleaner and more efficient fuels.

Meanwhile, during roughly the same period, China increased its emissions by 4 billion tons and India by 1.3 billion tons. It is extremely unlikely that either China or India are going to fulfill their requirements within the Paris Agreement.

But even if they and every other country in the world, including the

U.S., were to comply, we would still only succeed in reducing global temperatures by less than one-half of 1 degree Celsius by the year 2100. That is according to the National Center for Atmospheric Research.

Like the Green New Deal, H.R. 9 is nothing more than cynical partisan messaging. I urge everyone in this Chamber to vote "no."

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BIGGS for his comments.

H.R. 9 seeks to mandate implementations of those same technically implausible and unrealistic emissions goals in order to appease extremists. The bill also seeks to prevent Federal funds from being used to withdraw from the flawed Paris Agreement.

Americans for Tax Reform estimates the Paris Agreement will cost the U.S. an estimated 6.5 million jobs by 2040 and reduce our gross domestic product by over \$2.5 trillion.

NERA Consulting estimates those numbers are even higher and that the Paris Agreement will cost the U.S. an estimated 31.6 million jobs by 2040 and reduce our GDP by over \$3 trillion.

In June of 2017, President Trump announced he will withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement, stating: "The Paris climate accord is simply the latest example of Washington entering into an agreement that disadvantages the United States to the exclusive benefit of other countries, leaving the American workers and taxpayers to absorb the costs in terms of lost jobs, lower wages, shuttering factories, and vastly diminishing economic production."

There are other significant flaws of the Paris Agreement. MIT found the Paris Agreement will only result in a global temperature reduction of 0.2 degrees Celsius by 2100. Under the Paris climate agreement, China and India will actually increase emissions until at least 2030.

The Climate Action Tracker, a group of European research organizations, found that participating parties will not meet their commitments, and those are the goals of the Paris Agreement.

The European Climate Action Network reported that no single country in Europe is performing sufficiently to meet Paris Agreement goals, and those that have been making the most progress on their promises did not make large commitments in the first place.

A recent United Nations Emissions Gap report found all participating countries will have to at least triple their efforts in order to meet the Paris Agreement's basic goals.

Given how unrealistic and illogical the Paris Agreement is, the U.S. should not inflict monumental harm on our economy chasing a white unicorn.

Fortunately, there is an alternative. Members of the Western Caucus support personal responsibility, less government intervention in our daily

lives, and freedom. 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.

Members of the caucus support local control and believe that stewardship of our environment and natural resources is best accomplished by empowering local stakeholders, not victimizing them.

The people who depend on the land to provide security for their families and communities understand these resources best. States and municipalities are best suited to deal with local issues than the distant, out-of-touch Washington bureaucrats.

The caucus seeks to promote access to our Nation's energy and resource potential while pursuing a truly all-of-the-above energy approach that aims to ensure the U.S. is a global energy leader.

Our vision utilizes the current energy renaissance and the American energy dominant policies currently being implemented by the Trump administration. America's energy renaissance is the backbone of our economy; 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 volatile foreign sources produced in Russia and Saudi Arabia.

Recent innovations and technology improvements associated with hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling have allowed shale resources previously deemed uneconomical to be developed and the main reason the U.S. was the world's leader in carbon emissions reductions in 2015, 2016, and 2017.

That is right. Fracking, demonized by environmental extremists without justification, has proven to be the best energy solution for our environment.

Abundant oil and natural gas have reduced electricity bills, kept gas prices low, and provided the largest share of U.S. electric power generation in recent years.

The United States is the world's top energy producer, and the American Dream is thriving. Passing H.R. 9 and staying in the Paris Agreement threatens that dream.

This is not a partisan issue. This is about doing what is right for America and about protecting freedom and opportunity for our children and grandchildren. I urge all Members on both sides of the aisle to reject H.R. 9.

Now, with that, I yield to my friend from Utah (Mr. BISHOP). As the Republican leader on the Natural Resources Committee and previously as its chairman, he has been one of the biggest leaders in promoting American energy dominance.

□ 1430

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GOSAR for yielding me time. I appreciate this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, look, I was listening to a lecture the other day about the old Romans, the Roman Empire. The Romans' success in creating their empire was that they were incredibly creative and adaptive. They saw situations that needed to be changed, something new, and they did it.

They had perfected the phalanx approach. They learned from the Greeks how to fight. Yet when they came against the Samnites who were living in the hills, that phalanx approach was totally useless. So what the Romans did is create a way around that, another source, to have a very flexible, highly mobile type of attack force, which they called the Legions. They simply became adaptive to the new situation.

This is where I wish the other side of this body would try to become less dogmatic and more adaptive, to try to find solutions.

Instead of bringing another resolution to the floor that has no chance of passing in the Senate and would be vetoed by the President, we should spend our time trying to come up with creative solutions that would be a win-win-win situation. We can do it. We need to.

It would be nice if the other side of the aisle could also understand what Article I actually means. In the last administration, instead of taking this accord through the normal constitutional process of having it ratified in the Senate and doing it by executive fiat, they have to realize what can be done by executive fiat instead of the constitutional way can be undone by executive fiat.

Rather than now trying to go back to the old document that has questionable efficacy, let us try to move forward.

This is happening all over the place. The State of California has a lot of talk about green talk, yet they have increased their dependence on foreign oil in the last year by 57 percent. That is foreign oil.

We have to do things in a way different than simply talking about it. We had a bunch of hearings in our committee about climate change. We heard from the Hip Hop Caucus. We even heard from people who thought NFL concussions were a problem and needed to be solved somehow through climate change. I don't know how that fit, but it was an interesting day.

Let me try to talk to you instead about something that is in the purview of our government, that can be done and that can be a creative and adaptive solution to this problem of too much carbon in the environment: simply, carbon sequestration.

I would refer you to a guy, a doctor by the name of Williams, who took 1,000 acres of land in Mississippi that had been farmed for 150 years, most of that in cotton. Instead, he turned it into rangeland, grazing rangeland.

He had had no herbicides, no pesticides, no seeding, no artificial fertilizer. The only management technique he used was intensive grazing followed by periods of rest so that the soil, the plant life, could recover. That is the only thing he did.

They tell me that the results after 4 years was simply an increase in the number of foraged species that were there, an increase in the number of native species that were reappearing, and an increase in the general biodiversity of insects and wildlife and everything else.

He told me, in technical talk that I don't understand, that for every 0.6 percent increase in soil C per acre in 1 foot of soil, whatever that means, you can take 35 metric tons of CO₂ out of the atmosphere. That means nothing to me.

What this guy in Mississippi was able to do is come up with a 2.3 percent increase in that soil carbon, I am assuming, which would equate to 140,000 metric tons of CO₂ taken out of the atmosphere. Those numbers also mean nothing to me; I don't know what it means.

What I do understand is that what he was able to do was the equivalent of taking out emissions from 7,600 automobiles every year and sequestering it into his 1,000 acres of ground. That is the equivalent of burning 13,000 tons of coal that he was able to take out of the atmosphere and sequester it into the ground.

Mississippi alone has 10 million acres of land that is farmland of all types. If you were able to use all of that, Mississippi alone could take out of the atmosphere 7 percent of all the emissions that we have and sequester it into their ground in that State simply by itself, which means, if you extend that out mathematically to 150 million acres, the United States could be a net negative emitter. We could be taking more carbon out of the atmosphere and putting it into the ground than we are sending into the atmosphere.

Approximately 5.1, I am told, gigatons of CO₂ emissions are automatically sequestered into the oceans and our terrestrial sinks. If you understand what that means, you are a better man than I am. That is what I have been told. That means, to become net zero, we would only have to have 75 million acres of land being used for carbon sequestration, 75.

In the United States, we have 527 million acres of pasture and rangeland. Twenty-seven percent of the land that we have is in pasture and rangeland. We have 410 million acres, which is 21 percent of all land, in forestry.

Simply by having an aggressive way of grazing, improving grazing and improving the quality of our forests, we can suck carbon out of the atmosphere, which would be far easier and far better than anything in the questionable efficacy of the Paris accord.

You could do it with no cost. You wouldn't have to cost jobs or energy increases. You can do it with virtually no

cost except for the initial cost of buying the livestock to put on the land, which is why it is there.

We could have the benefits of a better watershed, better wildlife, better biodiversity, and economic productivity of our rural lands. All those things are easily within our reach.

We could help solve the food shortage. We could help solve drought resistance in agricultural lands. We could have watershed integrity, which would provide abundant and cleaner water for us all, as well as biodiversity for wildlife.

I was recently in Arkansas, if I can go on with this. The State forestlands, they had 2 pieces that they were working on. One they just let go on so they could see what would happen, let nature run its course. The other they went through with active management by thinning the trees.

What happened in the one that they just left alone? It was crowded. It was dark. There was no sunlight getting to the ground, which was barren of all kinds of foliage.

On the portion that the State managed, where they allowed the sunlight to get to the ground, there was vegetation. There was forage. There was the ability to have food. Wildlife had a habitat they could use.

That has also been replicated in my home State, where on private property, some of my sheep ranchers did the exact same thing. They improved the ground.

Not only have they improved the ground, but they can also now suck more carbon out of the atmosphere into that ground, which you don't do if you just leave it alone.

We had a hearing in our committee one time, and they simply said the idea was that plants need carbon, so you have plant life sucking the carbon out of the atmosphere. It goes down into the root system, which makes the plant healthier, the land healthier, and you are taking carbon out of the atmosphere. That is a wonderful idea.

We had four witnesses. Even the Democratic witnesses were saying that grazing helps us to accomplish this.

One of our good Eastern members said: Well, look, if plant life sucks the carbon out of the atmosphere, why don't we take the cows out, and then you will have more plant life. They won't eat any of it.

Even the Democratic witness said, no, that is not the way it works.

If you allow the plant just to grow, it grows large and sprouts out and hides the ground so that you don't have any kind of new plant life coming on. You take the cows out, and their hooves don't claw up the land as they walk around, so nothing is germinating. All you have is a bunch of dry, dead leaves that are easy bait for wildfires. What you have to do is allow them to eat and then move them off the land.

Can we destroy the land with bad grazing practices? Of course. But if you do it the right way, we can easily solve the problems.

We have two kinds of problems with carbon: one is emissions and the other is concentration, stuff already out there.

If we just do grazing practices and carbon sequestration on the lands that the Federal Government owns now, we can easily not only solve our problem of emissions but take the concentration out and put it back into the ground, where it does good for plant life and expands and grows that.

We have here the resources that we need to solve this problem. What we need to do is free up people to be able to solve this problem by themselves and not insist that the government tell us what to do, when to do it, and how to do it. It doesn't work that way. This can be a win-win situation.

H.R. 9, I am sorry, does not have anybody winning. It has all of us losing. That is why it would be nice to see that there are solutions out there.

All we need to do is be like the old Romans and be a little bit creative and adaptive, find something that works with material we already have. We can do that. There is a better way to go forward than H.R. 9.

H.R. 9 is simply more dogma to try to rehash the past. It doesn't move us forward at all.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. GOSAR for having this Special Order here so we can talk about these kinds of issues as well as the costs that would be involved.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, to the Member, to the gentleman, we are also getting another benefit because the catastrophic wildfires that we are seeing out West are a contributor. There is more carbon and pollution that occurs during these catastrophic wildfires in one day than in a year of exhaust from cars.

What we do is we get a benefit there because we have a much more dynamic forest, much more dynamic interfaces. The fires are smaller. They are not as catastrophic, so we don't go further in debt.

This is something that the Natural Resources Committee has been pushing under Mr. BISHOP's watch, and I thank the gentleman. There is plenty of benefit in regard to understanding the natural cycle of plants and trees.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) is spot-on accurate. I thank him for bringing this up.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I also want to bring up the point that the Western Caucus was dynamic in going to Houston to see Petra Nova in Texas. It is the only carbon sequestration coal plant in the United States, one of only two in the world.

Basically, what they do is they capture the carbon sequestration and pressurize it into pipes. They pipe it down to their oil fields. Once they frack the oil fields, they take this pressurized carbon and force it into the oil field. What it does is it forces out the rest of the gas and oil with it that is still re-

maining and then solidifies in the ground.

What amazing technology. Once again, going back to the whole application that technology, innovation, the private sector is right there to answer the call.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA). Mr. LAMALFA knows firsthand the negative effects that policies like H.R. 9 can have, given the proposals that have gone into effect in California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Arizona, Mr. GOSAR, for hosting this Special Order on this important topic and for his very good work on the Congressional Western Caucus.

As we know, this week, the House will vote on H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act. In light of the United States' incredible efforts and achievements in becoming more energy independent and a global leader in energy development and production, we should call it the U.S. Energy Disadvantage Act.

This shortsighted legislation would seek to prevent President Trump from withdrawing from the misguided 2016 Paris Agreement enacted by President Obama. Of course, this agreement was passed without consent from Congress and no economic impact or cost-benefit analysis.

The American people deserve to know what a plan like this is going to cost them. According to several reports, the Paris Agreement could cost the U.S. \$250 billion and 2.7 million jobs by just 2025 and many more jobs over a longer period, and even as much as \$3 trillion by 2040.

Furthermore, this bill is completely one-sided. It received no congressional hearings or feedback from the administration, stakeholders, or outside experts.

Bottom line, this bill would result in an unfair economic playing field against the United States and in favor of all the other countries.

We have already seen the results of this agreement in the city of Paris itself, where protests have erupted over their own gas price increases.

Just like the Green New Deal boondoggle, enacting this legislation would have an almost insignificant effect on decreasing global emissions. Indeed, the United States is already by far the leader in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and has lowered our levels of emissions by 18 percent between 2000 and 2014, leading other major countries and producers.

Why do we need to be in the Paris accord when we are already leading the way? We need to drag the others along in this process and have them do more about their own emissions, such as China, which emits more carbon dioxide than the U.S. and the European Union combined.

Why are they let off the hook in this until the year 2030? Why is India let off the hook until 2030? I guess American consumers and the higher prices they

are paying at the pump, especially Californians at over \$4, would like to know the answer to that question.

It is another attack by the left to undermine the responsible production of energy in America. We don't need to be in the accord to achieve these reductions, as we have already seen these results.

If forced to stay in the Paris climate agreement, the U.S. economy will suffer while achieving no meaningful benefits or reduction in global emissions.

This is like many climate change schemes that are focused on transferring power via taxation and regulation to the government away from the producers of this country.

□ 1445

Are we going to have the power in the hands of elected officials and bureaucrats or the people that innovate better ways of doing things, better forms of energy, and more efficient forms of energy, and have them produced right here in the U.S., including California, which is a leading producer of energy?

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this measure and any other climate change scheme that hurts our economy and our energy production when we are the innovators of doing things better around the world.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER). With his background in the technology industry, he knows firsthand how businesses in his district and across the country are already innovating and helping to reduce our carbon emissions.

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the members of the Western Caucus for this important Special Order.

Let me start by saying that my home State of Idaho has been a good example of how to utilize renewable energy resources.

According to the Energy Information Administration, in 2017, 82 percent of Idaho's net electricity generation came from renewable energy sources, and 60 percent was supplied by hydroelectric power.

Idaho's use of renewable energy technology came about because we are blessed with bountiful natural resources in our State. But, Mr. Speaker, not every State is blessed with those renewable natural resources and many have to rely on nonrenewable sources of energy.

However, because the Federal Government controls 63 percent of the land in Idaho, many of those resources are not accessible and, all too often, literally go up in smoke.

Sole Federal control of resources inhibits economic growth, harms the environment, and has created numerous obstacles for our citizens due to inadequate management.

H.R. 9 and the Paris Agreement represent a similar obstacle to every State and every district my colleagues represent.

H.R. 9 would reinstate the one-size-fits-all mandates of the Paris Agreement and require the U.S. to drastically change the only ways that we generate electricity.

What has enabled the United States to lead the world in reducing carbon emissions is locally-driven solutions that fit the need of our local citizens, whether it be clean, liquid natural gas in Texas, hydropower in Idaho, or solar facilities in Arizona.

The Paris Agreement is an attack on our national sovereignty and received no congressional input when it was enacted in 2015. In fact, we are one of only 12 countries that signed the agreement that did not include their legislative branch in that adoption process. Mr. Speaker, even China's legislature was consulted in the adoption of the agreement.

The flawed Paris Agreement has committed the United States to getting billions of dollars to the Green Climate Fund while many countries don't contribute at all. All too often, that money ends up in the hands of governments who have no intention of using it to reduce their carbon emissions.

This agreement forces jobs to relocate to areas with the poorest environmental records, like China, which only makes matters worse. Instead of focusing on spending money paying for projects to reduce carbon emissions in other countries, the Democrat majority in this House should focus on the immediate pressures facing this country, like border security and healthcare reform.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this terrible proposal.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Idaho for those remarks. You can see where this is going. The right way is not this Paris accord, but through technology and through innovation.

Mr. Speaker, a point that has been brought up multiple times by my colleagues is how the Paris Agreement is a direct violation of our Nation's sovereignty. I could not agree more. Article II, section 2 of the Constitution states that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

President Obama took unilateral action when he signed the Paris Agreement back in 2015 and failed to consult Congress. There were no committee hearings leading up to the adoption of the agreement and no vote was held by the Senate, as mandated by our Constitution.

Members on the other side will say that the Paris Agreement does not constitute a treaty. But when the Foreign Affairs Committee held a hearing on this very bill, every witness believed the agreement was a treaty. This included multiple Democratic witnesses.

The practice of avoiding congressional approval was nothing new for the Obama administration when it

came to natural resources and energy policy.

Fortunately, Members will have a chance to correct this unconstitutional action by voting for my amendment that was made in order this week instructing the Senate to take a vote as to whether the Paris Agreement is a treaty or not.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH), my good friend. He has some background on this information.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Part of what happened was that they danced through a lot of different hoops to try to make sure that they didn't have to have it be a treaty. If they could at least make the argument that it was not a treaty, because they knew they couldn't get Senate confirmation.

And, in fact, the Democrat champion, Senator Pell, who was the chairman at the time of the appropriate committee, actually put in their committee report that should there later be a conference—and they were talking about the original conference that we had entered into, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which this is not an extension of—many people say it is, but they had to adopt all new rules and all new aspects, because they knew they couldn't just add this on to the original one.

But Senator Pell says, "The committee notes that a decision by the conference of the parties"—referencing the U.N. commission—"to adopt targets and timetables would have to be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent before the United States could deposit its instruments of ratification for such an agreement."

Now, the Paris accord, the Paris treaty, ostensibly says that there are targets and timetables. But even the Democrats recognized in 1992 that if you were to put in targets and timetables, you had to have that document submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent. So, a decision by the conference to adopt targets and timetables would have to be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent before the United States could deposit its instruments of ratification for such an agreement.

Clearly, they anticipated that someday there might be timetables and targets and they wanted to make sure that everybody knew that in 1992, just because we joined that conference, did not mean that we had agreed to later being bound to timetables and targets.

Now, we are doing very well on those timetables and targets without having announced we are leaving. And even if we are not a member of the Paris accord, agreement, treaty, whatever you end up calling it, we are doing very well at reducing our carbon footprint.

The Chinese are producing about twice as much carbon dioxide as we are today. They have the number two economy and we have the number one economy per job, and from a production

standpoint we are doing a lot better. They are not even bound until 2030 under this so-called treaty agreement. But it is very clear that in order to bind us to anything, it had to be approved by the Senate and it has not been approved by the Senate.

So, what we are arguing about, in essence, is merely a political point for the people on the other side of the aisle, because these targets, as they currently exist without ratification from the Senate, are merely suggestions. We are doing what we can in a reasonable way. We need to do more on research so that we can continue to have the jobs and have the wealth and be the number one economic nation and continue to reduce our carbon footprint.

Now, I've got to tell you, I get a little amazed sometimes at some of these folks, because the World Bank decided they weren't going to invest in any more coal-fired power plants—now I know I am going off subject, but let me run. The World Bank decided they weren't going to invest in any more coal-fired power plants. The top ten donors to the World Bank include nine western countries and Japan. So, basically, the west and Japan decided that they were not going to invest in those things. So guess who is investing? You can guess.

Mr. GOSAR. Russia.

Mr. GRIFFITH. It is China. And Russia is probably doing some, too. But China is heavily out there. And they are getting a two-for because the developing world, particularly sub-Saharan Africa, want to have power and energy for their people, because they want their people to not live in the dark and have electricity. They want their people to have jobs. They know that in order to have better jobs, they have got to have electricity in their country across the board, not just in the big cities. They have got to have a source of power, and they have coal. For them, that is their most affordable source.

So what the Chinese are doing, they are basically laughing at us. We are going to agree to these timetables that haven't been ratified by the Senate and these targets, while they get to continue increasing. Even though they are the number two economy in the world, they are going to continue to increase their carbon footprint, and they are going to build coal-fired power plants in sub-Saharan Africa for which they get a lot of goodwill in the foreign affairs and foreign relations department. But wait, there is more.

In many of these cases—I can't say all, but the ones I have read about—they are, for a fee, going to run those coal-fired power plants for the nations that they are building them in. So not only are they going to build goodwill and good relations around the world using coal in contravention of these goals set forth in the Paris accord, but they are going to make a profit at it, as well.

Mr. GOSAR. Absolutely. The one road initiative. They are taking and leveraging resources across the world and, at the same time, being paid for it. And I dare you not keep up with your payments because it rescinds right back to them.

Going back to your first point, the gentleman from Virginia, what you are telling me is that this body will have that opportunity, with my amendment, to get this right, instructing the Senate to take a vote on the Paris accord to actually see if it can become a treaty, would you agree?

Mr. GRIFFITH. Well, your amendment would certainly do that, and I will support that amendment. While I can't support the underlying bill, I can support that amendment because that does make the underlying bill better. If we are going to bind our hands and seal our fate to be the number two or number three or number five economy in the world, instead of being the number one economy in the world, if that is what we are going to do, then there ought to be votes taken down the hall. Men and women in the United States Senate should put their name on the line and say yes or no. The American people then will know who has voted yes and who has voted no. They won't be hiding behind any games or circumstances or procedural maneuvers. Then the American people can use the power that was given to them by our Constitution and an inalienable right granted by God to use the ballot box to make a decision as to whether or not they wanted to be bound, whether or not they wanted to have their economy reduced, and have their children and grandchildren to be lesser than what we have today in our economic wealth.

Mr. GOSAR. So, what you are really telling me is when you have good process, you build good policy, which builds good politics. It is kind of that simple, isn't it?

Mr. GRIFFITH. It is that simple. You shouldn't hide behind games or trickery to say, well, this is not really a treaty that has to go to the Senate because the targets are merely aspirational. If they are merely aspirational, why are we spending billions of dollars on it and why are we participating at all, which I think was the President's point.

Why would we spend billions of dollars to send to countries, some of whom might actually be kleptocracies, and the money is never getting to where it is supposed to go? Why would we spend billions of dollars on something that we know is not going to be effective? Let's spend our billions of dollars on research and find new technologies.

You may have heard me tell the story, because it has been my favorite story the last couple of weeks, but I have a professor at Virginia Tech who has been working on technology to separate coal from rare Earth minerals. But there is a side effect. It also can make poor coal better coal. And they are selling that technology.

Now they are licensing a company in India for two steel mills—steel, for those who don't speak southwest Virginian, steel mills—and they are licensing them to use this technology, so they can take Indian coal and make it better and then reduce their carbon footprint and still produce the steel.

The Indians aren't going to say they are not going to use the coal and we are not going to produce steel. They want what everybody wants. They want a better economy. They want jobs. They want those people in their country—and I understand there are hundreds of millions—who don't have electricity to have electricity in their homes.

Like everybody else, they want clean air and clean water, too. But it is not going to happen by an edict of the Paris accord. It is going to happen by research that makes sense and that economically says you can have the steel to build new factories, to build new cities, to build new things in your country to make your country better, wherever you are: sub-Saharan Africa, Asia, Europe, America, South America, North America, wherever you are. But you can do it better and you can do it cleaner and you can do it where it is cost effective. That is what we have to focus on, not arbitrary, capricious goals set with different countries having different standards. As an American, as U.S. citizens, we have a higher target, and there is no target for the Chinese.

□ 1500

Mr. GOSAR. The gentleman brings up that when we look at coal, the separation of rare earths, that is the technology that is so important. This is the technology that is driving this renaissance of technology in our country, that plethora of energy where we can geopolitically decide to help other countries become more independent, away from China's and from Russia's jurisdiction.

The entrepreneurial spirit is bred with having energy independence. This H.R. 9 kills jobs.

I also want to bring up to the gentleman, with technology, there is another technology at the same time that takes up pulverized coal and infuses it into oil. When they burn it, they get a 50 percent additional Btu factor and a cleaner burning application, once again reducing the carbon footprint.

Once again, talking about new technologies is what saves us. It is that entrepreneurial spirit making things better. The infusion of new technology helps us get an advancement of cleaner technology.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, what is exciting for the American people, what is exciting for me, I would say to the gentleman, is that we have just mentioned a couple of areas where technology is working, making things better, and reducing our carbon footprint. In our universities and our think tanks across the country, there are hundreds

and thousands of ideas percolating out there that can help us move forward.

You may not agree with me on this, but I think we can spend more money from the Federal Government on research to find better ways to use fossil fuels. Wave energy, wind, solar, whatever it is, we need to be leading on the research end of this.

If we think we are going to eliminate fossil fuels, Mr. Speaker, we are mistaken, because the world is going to continue to use fossil fuels. If you say to a developing economy that they have to rely on wind, they are going to know that you are full of hot wind.

Mr. GOSAR. That is right.

Mr. GRIFFITH. If you say to them, however, that we are going to try to do all of the above, so we are going to help you burn the coal you have; we are going to help you find the fuels that work for you, but we want to try to help you do it in a cleaner fashion; and we want to make that coal a little bit better, to make that oil a little bit better, to make it burn hotter, to make it burn more efficiently, that is how you lower your carbon footprint.

I like what the gentleman from Utah had to talk about in grazing on our Federal lands. If we started using different techniques, we can absorb a lot of carbon. We should probably spend some research money to find out if those crops and those plants that can be utilized to suck up more carbon can maybe produce other products as well.

These are things that we need to do, instead of saying we are not going to use any of this in the future because we might do that to the detriment of our jobs here in the United States. We are going to shift those jobs to other countries where they will use dirtier coal, dirtier oil, dirtier techniques for burning fossil fuels to produce the products that we then buy back, making them the richer nations in the world and we the lesser.

When I am on my deathbed, I want to be able to look my kids in the eye—hopefully, I will have grandkids some day—and say: You know what? We kept the United States of America number one in the economic situation, and we looked out for the planet at the same time.

It can be done, but it can't be done if all you say is, no, we are not going to look at fossil fuels.

Mr. GOSAR. The gentleman brings up a great point, along with the former chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, not only in the grazing application but in the stewardship of our natural resources called our forests, dynamic forests. Instead of being victims of these catastrophic wildfires that put so much of the emissions and pollution into the air, we then relegate it, so when we do have fires, it is relegated to low-level type fires that are not as devastating and catastrophic.

I want to bring up one other point. Included in the Paris Agreement was the creation of a slush fund called the Green Climate Fund, which the Obama

administration unconstitutionally utilized to shift \$1 billion in taxpayer funds without authorization from Congress. Once again, we were imposed upon by having the money, Uncle Sam Warbucks.

The Green Climate Fund was a goal of raising \$100 billion a year through voluntary contributions from countries that signed the Paris Agreement. While developed countries are expected to finance their respective agreements under the Paris Agreement, the Green Climate Fund aims to subsidize the agreements of developing countries that cannot afford the commitments they made when signing the Paris Agreement.

In fact, since the United States ratified the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in 1992, the United States has given hundreds of millions of dollars to developing countries to help them mitigate climate change. Amazing.

We know that much of the money we have given over the years has gone to some of the most corrupt countries in the world. My question is, how can we rely on these countries to spend the money properly? When you look, for example, in 2014, the top recipients for climate funds all received failing grades in Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index. Amazing.

What has been the return on investment for the money that we were giving to these countries? It is nice to be able to fund this, but what are the results? What are we getting from that?

Mr. GRIFFITH. If the gentleman would tell me.

Mr. GOSAR. The facts are that carbon emissions from the developing countries have gone up. We know that much of the money was not used to reduce carbon emissions.

Once again, we are not solving it.

It is clear that H.R. 9, that is what it will do. It will put the country back on the road to job losses, higher electric bills, and more government regulations while wasting significant amounts of taxpayer money in the process.

We become victims in this economy. We should be leading the way. Freedom comes with technology and opportunity, and that is what the American people want.

This is something where we should show the way by leadership, by saying: Listen, follow us by the way that we do things.

That seems like a better approach, doesn't it, to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, it absolutely is a better approach. It really does bother me that we are just handing cash over to these countries.

As you said, they don't have transparency. Some of them are known to have corrupt governments, which means that at least a portion of that money is probably ending up in the pockets of the rulers' friends, neighbors, and cousins.

If we are going to spend the money, let's go in and spend the money on something that will make a difference for the folks in those countries.

I am not saying as the richest nation in the world that we don't have a responsibility, but let's make sure that we don't cripple ourselves in the process. Let's make sure that if we are going to spend the money, which I am okay with spending some of it, that we make sure it is going to projects that will improve the environment in those countries and help lower the carbon footprint in those respective nations.

They are not going to sit back and have their people be impoverished just because a group of Western nations got together or a group of nations got together that already have some money and said: You stop using fossil fuels so that the world won't get warmer.

They may be concerned about that, and I think they probably are, but they are not going to impoverish their people to target 1.5 degrees centigrade.

If we can show them a way to get more wealth for their people, to bring electricity to all regions of their countries, and to lower their carbon footprint, they are all in. That is where we can lead.

We don't have to spend money by just handing cash to potentates around the world. We can spend that money on research right here in our own colleges, in our own universities, in our own think tanks with people. Some of them will fail, but some of them will come up with new technology. Like when looking for a way to separate rare earth from coal and they figure out a way to lower the carbon footprint at steel mills in India, those kinds of things happen when you are looking for answers to problems instead of looking for problems.

Mr. GOSAR. Right, the carrot versus the whip. What you are looking at is the opportunity for solutions, that incentivization to find a new opportunity. I think that is the value. We are protecting 6.5 million jobs here.

It scraps the unconstitutional application of the treaty, and it ensures safe, reliable, affordable energy.

Everybody has to have energy. When we start looking at this Paris accord, it is accomplished in so many different ways that H.R. 9 is not something that is a valid or constitutional agreement.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GOSAR. Having said that, the Paris Agreement may have been their most egregious breach of constitutional authority. Many Members on the other side have stated in the past that President Trump does not have the authority to unilaterally withdraw the United States without the consent of Congress.

By virtue of the executive's role as the sole organ of the government charged with making official communications with foreign states, it is responsible for communicating the United States' intention to withdraw

from international agreements and political commitments.

In the case of this executive agreement, President Obama had independent authority to enter into an executive agreement. President Trump may also independently terminate the agreement without congressional approval.

In addition to there being no congressional input on the agreement, there was no congressional input when drafting the agreement. This is not the way an agreement as wide-reaching as the Paris Agreement should have been agreed upon.

Passage of H.R. 9 will bring us back to the foreign policy of President Obama and the practice of putting other countries' interests above our own. This is the same foreign policy that brought us Benghazi, the rise of ISIS, and the disastrous Iran nuclear agreement.

President Trump's promise to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement marked a dramatic change in America's foreign policy—for the better, I might add. The Paris Agreement fails to put America first, and President Trump is right to withdraw us from this sovereignty-sacrificing agreement.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are becoming clearer about the realities and failures of the Paris climate agreement.

First of all, let's talk about the good news. The United States reduced its carbon emissions by 40 million metric tons in 2017. Yes, our emissions did rise slightly in 2018 due to increased domestic manufacturing, but the U.S. Energy Information Administration projects that our carbon emissions will continue to fall in 2019 and 2020.

Now for some bad news. The United States' reductions in carbon emissions are totally erased when you account for China's dramatic increase in carbon emissions. Several speakers have talked about that. In fact, China's increase in emissions is three times larger than the U.S.'s decrease in emissions.

Mr. Speaker, this highlights two of the fundamental failures in the framework of the Paris Agreement, which is the fact that there are no mechanisms in place to hold countries accountable for not reaching their emissions reduction targets, and there are no requirements or required countries to establish equitable emissions reductions over the same period.

It is not just China, either. India, for example, saw its emissions rise 4.8 percent in 2017. Forty-seven of the 50 most polluted cities in the world are located in either China or in India.

Well, you may say, let's look to Europe. They are probably on the forefront of following the standards set forth in the agreement.

People would think that, but that would be wrong, as all EU countries are off-target in reaching the goals set forth by the Paris Agreement. Germany, for example, has spent almost

\$600 billion in renewable energy subsidies and has seen no meaningful decrease in carbon emissions.

Mr. Speaker, the United States was already a leader in reducing carbon emissions before the Paris Agreement was signed. Since 1970, the United States has reduced six key air pollutants by 73 percent and has seen the largest absolute reduction of CO₂ of any country in the world since 2000.

Instead of focusing on bringing us back to the past, we should focus on encouraging innovations that we are already seeing in the energy sector today. Whether it be carbon capture technology, clean coal, or taking advantage of the liquid natural gas revolution that is taking place across the country, the private sector is leading the way in creating a cleaner energy future for this country.

That is the way it should be, not through a heavy-handed government imposing unrealistic, top-down mandates.

Requiring the U.S. to follow the requirements of the Paris Agreement will stifle innovations and return us to the policies of the past when energy was more expensive and economic growth was abysmal.

It appears that I am running out of time, so what I will do is implore my folks to, first, relook at this.

I thank all the Western Caucus members who contributed to the Special Order. It is truly a privilege to be chair of the caucus, which is now 74 bipartisan members strong.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue to lead the fight against the extreme agenda, which is why we organized the Special Order in opposition to H.R. 9.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, I will close with a quote from the National Federation of Independent Business, who oppose this legislation.

Under this legislation,

Small businesses would face significant future government mandates, additional regulatory and legal burdens, and unworkable government policies that would result in skyrocketing energy prices.

At a time when the small business economy is booming with small business owners reporting record hiring of new employees and historically strong compensation increases for their employees, Congress should be considering policies that will allow this economic boom to continue, not bring it to a halt.

I hope this legislation is voted down by the House this week and we get serious as a Congress about promoting energy dominance for the betterment of our economy, energy consumers, the environment, and geopolitically across the world.

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

PARIS ACCORDS WERE FLAWED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the

gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, years ago, the administration, working through an international group, had helped to negotiate and put together an agreement on climate change known as the Kyoto Protocol. That protocol was resoundingly rejected by the United States Senate.

It actually had provisions in it that indicated that should the United States in the future end up entering into some sort of climate agreement or any type of agreement, that there would have to be some type of a consent by the United States Senate; that this would have to be presented before the United States Senate.

We don't have a unilateral government. We don't have a dictatorship. We have scenario whereby we have a Congress, we have a President, and we work together. In this case what has happened is, under the Obama administration, these Paris accords were agreed to unilaterally, meaning they were never submitted to the Congress. They were never submitted to the United States Senate for approval.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the American people have their Representatives. Their Representative is their Senator, and that is how their voice is heard on agreements like this.

Yet, we had a President that unilaterally agreed to the Paris accords and did not submit it to the United States Senate. So now we have a President that is saying: Well, this was unilaterally agreed to. I am unilaterally withdrawing.

We have a bill this week, H.R. 9, that attempts to prevent the President from withdrawing from this. So I want to stick with procedure here for just a minute, Mr. Speaker.

We unilaterally entered into an agreement that we don't believe should have been entered into unilaterally. We think it should have been presented to the United States Senate. It was not.

Now the President is saying, I am withdrawing. And now this bill is trying to prevent that. So, on the one hand they think that a President should be able to unilaterally act, and in another scenario, the withdrawal that President Trump has proposed, you have folks saying with H.R. 9 that, no, no, you can't do that. You can't have both. One or the other, take your pick.

Now, let's actually get into the contents of the agreement. The Paris accords set targets on emissions reductions for the United States. All right, so they try and set emissions reductions.

Mr. Speaker, under this agreement, we could eliminate all emissions from the United States, all greenhouse gases. We can eliminate all of them, and China can come in and they can emit 10 times what we were emitting before we cut. Under this agreement that is totally legal. It doesn't make sense.

To add insult to injury, China can go years and years increasing emissions; not reducing, increasing. I want to remind you, we live in a global environment. As much as we like to think we are the only country in the world, we are not. It is a global environment. If you care about the whole environment for the entire globe, you have got to look holistically.

You can't come to the United States and say: Okay, you have to cut emissions. Yet, in China, they can double, triple, they can go tenfold increasing their emissions, twentyfold increasing their emissions, and that is all legal under this agreement. That is inappropriate. If we care about the global environment, let's care about the global environment.

Now, to add insult to injury, the agreement also establishes an entirely different metric for developing countries like China than it does for the United States.

Now, think about this, if we are in the Olympics; we are running a race, and you win the race. But then somebody comes, and they say: No, no we are giving this Chinese runner a 20-second deduction. That is not fair. And that is what has happened here.

They have an entirely different metric that they are measured by. Why? If we live in a global environment, if we care about overall reducing emissions, why are we giving different standards, different measurements? That is inappropriate. This entire agreement is flawed.

Now, some of you may be sitting there thinking: Well, wait a minute. I care about the environment. I care about emissions reduction.

Let me read you a statement that was included in the International Energy Agency's Global Energy & CO₂ Status Report.

Here is the statement: "Emissions in the United States remain around their 1990 levels, 14 percent and 800 metric tons of CO₂ below their peak in 2000."

Now, here is the kicker. Listen to this statement. "This is the largest absolute decline among all countries since 2000."

I am going to say that again. "This is the largest absolute decline among all countries since 2000."

Let me translate that, Mr. Speaker. What that means is that the United States, over the last, nearly 20 years, has reduced emissions greater than every other country.

So, we are actually operating without a requirement, just with an incentive. We are operating on already reducing emissions. We are already transitioning to an all-of-the-above energy strategy which includes solar, which includes wind, which includes geothermal, which includes hydro, and nuclear, and natural gas, and coal, and oil, and other things, all of the above, whichever makes the most sense.

We had a hearing today in the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis and it was fascinating listening to people